

## ATTACHMENT A

## SCHEDULE OF DOCUMENTS - FOI 2640

Document No.	Date	Number of pages	Description	Decision on access <sup>1</sup>	Exemption/s applied
1	28 May 2021	5	South Australia Health submission on Policy Guidance for Menu Labelling in Australia and New Zealand	RE	section 47F - part
2	7 June 2021	4	Tasmania Health submission on Policy Guidance for Menu Labelling in Australia and New Zealand	RE	section 47F - part
3	19 September 2018	7	South Australia Health submission on Labelling of sugars on packaged foods and drinks	RE	section 47F - part
4	19 September 2018	11	Queensland Health submission on Labelling of sugars on packaged foods and drinks	RE	section 47F - part
5	18 September 2018	9	Tasmania Health submission on Labelling of sugars on packaged foods and drinks	RE	section 47F - part
6	18 September 2018	11	Victoria Health submission on Labelling of sugars on packaged foods and drinks	RE	section 47F - part
7	12 September 2018	23	Western Australia Health submission on Labelling of sugars on packaged foods and drinks	RE	section 47F - part
8	15 March 2018	3	South Australia Health submission on Review of fast-food menu labelling schemes	R	N/A

<sup>1</sup> R = Release in full, RE = Release with exempt material removed.

9	16 March 2018	3	Tasmania Health submission on Review of fast-food menu labelling schemes	RE	section 47F – part
10	13 March 2018	7	Western Australia Health submission on Review of fast-food menu labelling schemes	RE	section 47F – part
11	13 March 2018	7	Queensland Health submission on Review of fast-food menu labelling schemes	RE	section 47F – part

Submitted to Public Consultation – Policy Guidance for Menu Labelling in Australia and New Zealand  
Submitted on 2021-05-28 11:47:48

## About you

A What is your name?

Name:

s 47F on Behalf of Food and Controlled Drugs Branch, SA Health

B What is your email address?

Email:

s 47F

C What sector do you represent?

Drop down list about which sector the respondent represents:  
Government

If 'other' sector selected, please specify in the text box:

D What is your organisation?

Organisation:

SA Health

E Which country are you responding from?

Drop down list about which country the respondent represents:  
Australia

If you selected 'other' please specify country:

F An opportunity to submit any other information about your organisation you would like to provide.

An opportunity to provide any other information about your organisation.:

In South Australia (SA), Section 12 of the Food Regulation 2017 requires multisite food businesses to display the energy content of the Standardised food items and display average adult energy intake. Details of SA menu labelling requirements are outlined in the user guide for 'Display of Kilojoules at Multi-site Food Businesses'. Link to the user guide is provided on SA Health website as below.

<https://www.sahealth.sa.gov.au/wps/wcm/connect/fb6e82004e98364f03be3a30168144/User+Guide+for+the+Display+of+Kilojoules+at+Multiple-Site+Food+Busi>

G Do you give permission for your submission to be published?

Drop down list with options for agreeing whether submission can be published:  
Agree for submission (entire) to be published

## Section 1: Introduction

1 Is your business voluntarily displaying energy information in New Zealand? Please provide details, where possible.

Drop down list about whether the business is voluntarily displaying energy labelling information:  
Not applicable

Text box to provide details:

2 Does your New Zealand business sell standard food items and is it a chain (i.e. more than one outlet operated/owned under franchise arrangements or the same trading name, or owned by one parent company/central owner/corporation)?

Drop down list about whether the business sells standard food items and if it is a chain:  
Not applicable

If so, how many outlets do you have in New Zealand?:

3 Is it a problem for New Zealand consumers that energy information is not mandated at the point-of-sale?

Drop down list about whether it is a problem for New Zealand consumers that energy information is not mandated at point of sale:  
Not applicable

If so, please explain your view and/or detail the impact.:

## Section 2.1: Nationally inconsistent menu labelling legislation

### 4 Do these differences between states and territories create problems for Australian businesses?

Drop down list about whether differences between states and territories create a problem:

Yes

If so, please detail the impact:

Inconsistent menu labelling legislations creates an unfair competitive market for South Australian food businesses. In South Australia, supermarkets, convenience stores, Dine-In restaurants, caterers and Not for Profit Home Delivery of Meals are exempted from menu labelling. At the time of development of SA Regulations, these businesses were mostly retail orientated and not selling any standardised food items. Many supermarkets in SA have modified their models of food supply and have now entered the food service arena and selling standardised food items, which are currently not captured by the legislation. Additionally, some cafés produce standardised food items but are not captured by KJ legislation because they do not meet the criteria (min 20 stores in SA or 5 in SA with 50 stores nationally). In some other jurisdictions, these businesses are captured under their own jurisdictional legislation. These inconsistencies in coverage create an uneven and unfair business environment. Additionally the national companies must dedicate extra resources to liaise with multiple jurisdictions to ensure compliance which adds a regulatory burden on them.

### 5 Do these differences impact Australian consumers?

Drop down list about whether differences impact Australian consumers:

Yes

If so, please detail the impact:

Yes, these differences impact Consumers in several ways.

For example: Current legislation outlines energy content display requirements for static menus. Recently, many national chains have implemented digital menu boards that display dynamic menus. Menu items are displayed for limited times, which force the consumer to memorise the energy information to make comparison between the products. This makes it hard for them to make informed decision about their food products.

South Australia has an ageing population and it can be assumed that older people are not normally tech savvy. In the current COVID-19 environment, most food businesses were taking orders online via apps or through third party delivery online platforms. Requirements to display KJ information through these mediums are not clearly outlined in the current legislation therefore food businesses are either not displaying it or doing it inconsistently. This makes it difficult for consumers to access and use this information.

## Section 2.2: An uneven playing field with respect to menu labelling for businesses selling standard food items

### 6 Is the uneven playing field with respect to menu labelling requirements a problem for standard food outlets in Australia?

Drop down list about whether the uneven playing field is a problem for standard food outlets in Australia:

Yes

If so, please detail the impact. Please indicate if your business is currently captured by state or territory legislation, and/or whether your business is exempt in one or more jurisdictions. :

Many food business types in SA are selling standardised food items. Business owners are confused and concerned when other similar businesses are not captured. During the KJ compliance survey conducted by SA in year 2014, many food businesses were complaining about supermarkets and cafes that were selling standardised food items but not captured by legislation. The number of supermarkets and other businesses that are now selling standardised food items have significantly increased but SA legislation still does not capture these businesses. This highlights the uneven playing field for SA food businesses, and it must be addressed by the suitable policy option.

### 7 Is it a problem for Australian consumers that energy information is not at the point-of-sale in all businesses selling standard food items?

Drop down list about whether it is a problem for Australian consumers that energy information is not at the point of sale in all businesses:

Yes

If so, please detail the impact.:

SA Health does receive occasional queries about supermarkets and some cafes not displaying KJ information in SA. It is assumed that consumers who are required to monitor their calorie intake due to medical reasons are the ones most affected by unavailability of energy information at the point of sale in all businesses selling standard food items. This limits their food choices and makes it difficult for them to compare the products in order to make informed choice about their meals.

### 8 Are there other business types (not already listed in Appendix 3) that are selling standard food items in Australia or New Zealand?

Drop down list about whether there are other business types selling standard food items:

Yes

If so, please detail.:

School canteens should be considered, as some canteens are offering standardised meals.

### Section 2.3: Emerging trends for promoting, offering, and selling standard food items are not addressed by the 2011 Principles

9 What, if any, other new ways of promoting, offering, and selling standard food items have emerged since 2011, or are likely to emerge in the future and are not covered in this document?

Text box to provide details:

Refer response to Question 5.

10 Is it a problem for consumers when energy information is not available for all menu items and/or on all ordering platforms and menu infrastructure?

Drop down list about whether it is a problem for consumers when energy information is not available:

Yes

If so, please detail the problem and its impact:

The lack of energy information on all similar foods is not in line with the intent of the menu labelling policy. The intent of the policy is to reduce energy intake and improve diet quality by helping consumers make better-informed decisions and to encourage food retailers and restaurant businesses to reformulate menu items and reduce and standardize serving sizes to meet recommended nutrient targets. If consumers are unable to compare the energy information on the products of their choice due to lack of consistent information, they will either be left with limited choices or they will stop looking for energy values. It should also be noted that many consumers are still not even aware that the system exists and some additional education to help make informed choices may still be required regardless of which policy option is finalised.

11 Has the increased use of different menu infrastructure and online platforms changed the cost of implementing menu labelling in Australia?

Drop down list about whether use of different menu infrastructure and platforms has changed costs:

Do not know

Please provide details:

12 Do you agree with the overall statement of the problem presented (section 2, 2.1-2.3)?

Drop down list about whether you agree with the overall statement of the problem:

Yes

If so why?:

The statement of the problem has been presented comprehensively. Splitting the concerns in to 3 key categories is the best approach to address the menu labelling issues and all 3 concerns has been adequately covered in the RIS.

If you do not agree with this statement, please provide reasons:

13 Do you agree that this problem requires government intervention?

Drop down list about whether the problem requires government intervention:

Yes

If so, why?:

Without government intervention it is difficult for industry to agree to a criterion that can address all the 3 concerns raised in the problem statement. Industry may be reluctant to change or come to an agreement where a solution to the problem may incur a temporary additional cost or affect certain sectors of business which are exempted in the current arrangement.

If not, please provide your reasons:

### Section 3: Objectives

14 Do you agree with the proposed objectives?

Drop down list about whether you agree with the proposed objectives:

Yes

If not, please suggest alternate objectives and provide your reasons:

Yes, the objectives presented in the RIS address all 3 key concerns raised in the statement of the problem. We acknowledge that RIS considers both regulatory and non-regulatory options.

#### Section 4: Options

15 Are the proposed options appropriate to address the stated problem and achieve the proposed objectives?

Drop down list about whether the proposed options are appropriate:

Yes

If not, please suggest variations or alternative options. Please justify variations / alternatives and describe their costs and benefits.:

Yes, the proposed options that include regulatory and non-regulatory approaches provide an unbiased view to the public and industry for their considerations. The greatest net benefit and risk associated with each option has been comprehensively explained.

#### Section 5: Impact analysis

16 Would your business incur higher implementation costs if legislative changes were not timely and uniform across all jurisdictions?

Drop down list about whether businesses would incur higher implementation costs if legislative changes were not timely and uniform:

Not applicable

If so, please describe.:

17a Are the benefits and costs associated with the four proposed options and the complementary strategies accurate?

Drop down list about whether the benefits and costs are accurate:

Do not know

Provide detail:

17b Are there any other benefits, costs or unintended consequences which have not been identified above?

Drop down list about whether there are other benefits, costs or unintended consequences:

Do not know

If so, please describe:

18 Are the average annual regulatory costs representative of the costs incurred/likely to be incurred by your business?

Drop down list about whether regulatory costs are representative of those expected for your business:

Not applicable

Please provide your reasons:

19 If the regulatory costs outlined above do not represent the costs incurred / likely to be incurred by your business, what are / would be the costs per year to comply with the proposed changes to menu labelling regulation? Please indicate if costs are for initial implementation or for ongoing maintenance, the type of costs (e.g. administrative, menu design and printing, nutritional analysis) and which jurisdiction/s your business operates in. For businesses already implementing menu labelling, please only provide the additional costs associated with implementing the proposed changes to the regulation. Please only provide the cost of providing energy information, and do not include business-as-usual costs that would be incurred in the absence of menu labelling regulation.

Provide detail:

The following cost implications may be incurred to government:

- Cost associated with repealing existing legislations
- Cost associated with compliance monitoring if the option finalised after consultation significantly increases the number of businesses captured by menu labelling legislations in SA.

20a Would your Australian business be likely to meet the proposed definition of a standard food outlet?

Drop down list about whether your Australian business would meet the proposed definition of a standard food outlet:

Not applicable

If so, how many outlets do you have in each jurisdiction?:

20b If not, is the reason because you do not sell standard food items, do not meet the business size threshold, or do not operate as a chain?

Note for New Zealand businesses, this information is sought at Question 2.

Drop down list about reasons for not meeting standard food outlet definition:

Not applicable

## Section 7: Preferred option

### 21 What is your preferred option and why?

Drop down list about preferred option:

Option 3

Comment box:

In South Australia, the preferred option as a regulator is option no. 3 i.e. Develop a Ministerial Policy guideline for menu labelling to inform the development of a proposed binational food regulatory measure in the Food Standards Code.

This is the only option among the 4 proposed options that addresses all the 3 key concerns raised in the RIS. Most of the businesses captured under menu labelling legislations in SA are national chains. It will reduce their regulatory costs of achieving compliance with one nationally uniform menu labelling legislation. It may incur temporary increase in the cost to achieve new compliance requirements however the impact is likely to be minimal and in the long term will benefit both industry and consumers alike.

Consumers will have access to energy information of more standardised products due to increase in the scope of coverage of business types across all jurisdictions. Energy information will be consistent across businesses in all jurisdictions and easy to compare between different product types in order to make informed healthier choices.

Some SA based businesses that are currently exempt in the SA legislations may have to bear extra administrative costs and regulatory burden to implement the menu labelling for their standardised products. However, it may create an equitable business environment for more businesses that sell standardised food items. It may encourage businesses to improve their recipes to reduce the energy content in order to get the marketing advantage which in return helps consumers to have access of more healthy choices.

If option 3 is finalised and regulatory measures are developed, SA Health will work to repeal its own legislation. Although there is cost involved in this process, it will be a one-time exercise and much easier than changing the legislation each time a new menu labelling requirement is introduced.

### 22 If Option 4 is your preferred option, how do you see it being implemented and operationalised?

Provide detail:

Option 4, where food businesses are required to voluntarily implement enhancements to menu labelling has very low chances of achieving the desired outcomes. It may increase the inconsistencies in display of energy information depending upon how industry will implement the enhancements. The businesses which are currently exempt from labelling under the current provisions will be less likely to engage due to cost implications therefore it may not create a level playing field for multi-site businesses. An example of where a non-regulatory voluntary approach has failed is pregnancy warning labels. In this case businesses were given a 2-year transition period followed by another 2 years to consistently implement the warning labels on the alcoholic products. Some sectors did well but many others did not apply warning labels consistently. After a cost benefit analysis government decided to mandate the pregnancy warning labelling to achieve the desired outcomes.

Submitted to Public Consultation – Policy Guidance for Menu Labelling in Australia and New Zealand  
Submitted on 2021-06-07 12:44:21

## About you

A What is your name?

Name:

s 47F

B What is your email address?

Email:

s 47F

C What sector do you represent?

Drop down list about which sector the respondent represents:  
Government

If 'other' sector selected, please specify in the text box:

D What is your organisation?

Organisation:  
department of health

E Which country are you responding from?

Drop down list about which country the respondent represents:  
Australia

If you selected 'other' please specify country:  
TAS

F An opportunity to submit any other information about your organisation you would like to provide.

An opportunity to provide any other information about your organisation.:

G Do you give permission for your submission to be published?

Drop down list with options for agreeing whether submission can be published:  
Agree for submission (entire) to be published

## Section 2.1: Nationally inconsistent menu labelling legislation

4 Do these differences between states and territories create problems for Australian businesses?

Drop down list about whether differences between states and territories create a problem:

If so, please detail the impact:

5 Do these differences impact Australian consumers?

Drop down list about whether differences impact Australian consumers:  
Yes

If so, please detail the impact:

These differences between jurisdictions have the potential to impact consumers ability to make an informed choice. For a labelling scheme to be successful consumers need consistent formatting that meets legibility requirements such as contrasting font colour and minimum size requirements. Items that are included in combination meals/snacks also needs to be consistent (ie includes/excludes drinks, pre-packaged products etc). Differences in jurisdictional requirements limits the potential impact of menu labelling schemes.

## Section 2.2: An uneven playing field with respect to menu labelling for businesses selling standard food items

6 Is the uneven playing field with respect to menu labelling requirements a problem for standard food outlets in Australia?



Drop down list about whether the uneven playing field is a problem for standard food outlets in Australia:

If so, please detail the impact. Please indicate if your business is currently captured by state or territory legislation, and/or whether your business is exempt in one or more jurisdictions. :

7 Is it a problem for Australian consumers that energy information is not at the point-of-sale in all businesses selling standard food items?

Drop down list about whether it is a problem for Australian consumers that energy information is not at the point of sale in all businesses:

If so, please detail the impact.:

8 Are there other business types (not already listed in Appendix 3) that are selling standard food items in Australia or New Zealand?

Drop down list about whether there are other business types selling standard food items:

If so, please detail.:

### Section 2.3: Emerging trends for promoting, offering, and selling standard food items are not addressed by the 2011 Principles

9 What, if any, other new ways of promoting, offering, and selling standard food items have emerged since 2011, or are likely to emerge in the future and are not covered in this document?

Text box to provide details:

10 Is it a problem for consumers when energy information is not available for all menu items and/or on all ordering platforms and menu infrastructure?

Drop down list about whether it is a problem for consumers when energy information is not available:

Yes

If so, please detail the problem and its impact:

Yes, as it impacts on consumers ability to compare products and make fully informed purchasing decisions. COVID-19 has created a growing trend for greater use of digital online and delivery including third party delivery apps that need to be captured in this legislation.

11 Has the increased use of different menu infrastructure and online platforms changed the cost of implementing menu labelling in Australia?

Drop down list about whether use of different menu infrastructure and platforms has changed costs:

Please provide details:

12 Do you agree with the overall statement of the problem presented (section 2, 2.1-2.3)?

Drop down list about whether you agree with the overall statement of the problem:

Yes

If so why?:

The review of fast food menu labelling highlighted three key concerns:

1. nationally inconsistent menu labelling legislation
2. an uneven playing field with respect to menu labelling for businesses selling standard food items; and
3. emerging trends for promoting, offering, and selling standard food items are not addressed by the 2011 Principles.

Tasmania agrees with the statement of the problem and supports the concerns raised, particularly the need for nationally consistent menu labelling legislation. The inclusion of menu labelling within the Food Standards Code would reduce inconsistencies, benefiting both industry and consumers. It would provide a potential cost saving for Australian businesses by creating a single regulatory mechanism and ensure consistency around compliance and interpretation of the legislation. Consumers would have greater access to energy information at point-of-sale which may lead to healthier food choices.

If you do not agree with this statement, please provide reasons:

13 Do you agree that this problem requires government intervention?

Drop down list about whether the problem requires government intervention:

Yes

If so, why?:

Tasmania agrees that this problem requires government intervention. Since the 2011 Principles were endorsed by Food Ministers, harmonisation of menu labelling regulations between jurisdictions has not been possible. There are a number of differences in the way five jurisdictions have introduced menu labelling which adds to industry and consumer confusion. Tasmania refrained from introducing these 2011 Principles into legislation as many multi-national food companies introduced the menu labelling in Tasmania by default. Unless there is government intervention to ensure national consistency, Tasmania is unlikely to include any changes into our legislation. We have very few businesses that have 20 or more outlets in Tasmania that sell standard food items that would not be captured already by larger jurisdictions regulations.

If not, please provide your reasons:

### Section 3: Objectives

14 Do you agree with the proposed objectives?

Drop down list about whether you agree with the proposed objectives:

Yes

If not, please suggest alternate objectives and provide your reasons:

Tasmania agrees with the proposed objectives as they address key stakeholders' concerns including the Australian industry, public health and consumer organisations. Addressing inconsistencies between jurisdictions and achieving national consistency was a recurring theme that addresses these objectives in previous consultations. Being able to capture emerging trends on promoting, offering and selling products will be the challenge to ensure the option going forward are future proof.

### Section 4: Options

15 Are the proposed options appropriate to address the stated problem and achieve the proposed objectives?

Drop down list about whether the proposed options are appropriate:

Yes

If not, please suggest variations or alternative options. Please justify variations / alternatives and describe their costs and benefits.:

### Section 5: Impact analysis

16 Would your business incur higher implementation costs if legislative changes were not timely and uniform across all jurisdictions?

Drop down list about whether businesses would incur higher implementation costs if legislative changes were not timely and uniform:

If so, please describe.:

17a Are the benefits and costs associated with the four proposed options and the complementary strategies accurate?

Drop down list about whether the benefits and costs are accurate:

Provide detail:

17b Are there any other benefits, costs or unintended consequences which have not been identified above?

Drop down list about whether there are other benefits, costs or unintended consequences:

If so, please describe:

18 Are the average annual regulatory costs representative of the costs incurred/likely to be incurred by your business?

Drop down list about whether regulatory costs are representative of those expected for your business:

Please provide your reasons:

19 If the regulatory costs outlined above do not represent the costs incurred / likely to be incurred by your business, what are / would be the costs per year to comply with the proposed changes to menu labelling regulation? Please indicate if costs are for initial implementation or for ongoing maintenance, the type of costs (e.g. administrative, menu design and printing, nutritional analysis) and which jurisdiction/s your business operates in. For businesses already implementing menu labelling, please only provide the additional costs associated with implementing the proposed changes to the regulation. Please only provide the cost of providing energy information, and do not include business-as-usual costs that would be incurred in the absence of menu labelling regulation.

Provide detail:

20a Would your Australian business be likely to meet the proposed definition of a standard food outlet?

Drop down list about whether your Australian business would meet the proposed definition of a standard food outlet:

If so, how many outlets do you have in each jurisdiction?:

20b If not, is the reason because you do not sell standard food items, do not meet the business size threshold, or do not operate as a chain?  
Note for New Zealand businesses, this information is sought at Question 2.

Drop down list about reasons for not meeting standard food outlet definition:

## Section 7: Preferred option

21 What is your preferred option and why?

Drop down list about preferred option:

Option 3

Comment box:

Tasmania's preferred option is Option 3: Develop a Ministerial Policy Guideline for menu labelling to inform the development of a proposed bi-national food regulatory measure in the Food Standards Code (jurisdictions to repeal own legislation once regulatory measure developed). In August 2019 Ministers agreed the most effective way forward was to develop a food regulatory measure under the Food Standards Code. Option 3 provides the greatest net benefit in the number of outlets/businesses and consumers affected.

Option 3 is the preferred option if the food regulatory measure aligns with the intent of the proposed Policy Guideline as this will ensure the concerns with the current 2011 Principles are addressed.

22 If Option 4 is your preferred option, how do you see it being implemented and operationalised?

Provide detail:

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN RELEASED UNDER  
THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 1982 (CTH)  
BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

Privacy and confidential information and permissions - Consent	No
Privacy and confidential information and permissions - If you want all or parts of this submission to be confidential, please state why.	
Submitter information - Full name	1 471
Submitter information - Are you answering on behalf of an organisation?	Yes
Submitter information - If you answered yes to the question above, please provide your organisation's name	SA Health
Submitter information - Sector	Government
Submitter information - Please provide your email address	1 471
Submitter information - Phone Number	
Submitter information - If we require further information in relation to this submission, can we contact you?	Yes
Have you read the Public Consultation Regulation Impact Statement: Labelling of sugars on packaged foods and drinks?	
(Please click on the link above to open the document) : Have you read the Public Consultation Regulation Impact Statement: Labelling of sugars on packaged foods and drinks	Yes
Do you support the statement of the problem:	
"Information about sugar provided on food labels in Australia and New Zealand does not provide adequate contextual information to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of dietary guidelines"? Do you support the statement of the problem: information about sugar provided on food labels in Australia and New Zealand does not provide adequate contextual information to enable consumers to make	Not Answered
Do you support the statement of the problem:	
"Information about sugar provided on food labels in Australia and New Zealand does not provide adequate contextual information to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of dietary guidelines"? If you do not support this statement, please justify why not with your reasons.	
Do you support the statement of the problem:	
"Information about sugar provided on food labels in Australia and New Zealand does not provide adequate contextual information to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of dietary guidelines"? If you would like to provide an alternate problem definition, please enter it below and justify your statement with evidence	
Do you support the statement of the problem:	
"Information about sugar provided on food labels in Australia and New Zealand does not provide adequate contextual information to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of dietary guidelines"? Please attach references here	Not Answered
Do you support the statement of the problem:	
"Information about sugar provided on food labels in Australia and New Zealand does not provide adequate contextual information to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of dietary guidelines"? Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Are you aware of any form of information about added sugars that is provided on food labels in addition to those identified in section 1.6 of the Consultation paper? - Are you aware of any form of information about added sugars that is provided on food labels in addition to those identified - in section 1.5 of the Consultation paper?	Not Answered
Are you aware of any form of information about added sugars that is provided on food labels in addition to those identified in section 1.6 of the Consultation paper? - If yes, please provide details here and justify with evidence.	
Are you aware of any form of information about added sugars that is provided on food labels in addition to those identified in section 1.6 of the Consultation paper? - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	Not Answered
Are you aware of any form of information about added sugars that is provided on food labels in addition to those identified in section 1.6 of the Consultation paper? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Are you aware of other sources of information (publically available or otherwise) on the added sugars content of foods available in Australia and New Zealand beside those described in section 1.8 of the Consultation paper? - Are you aware of other sources of information (publically or otherwise) on the added sugars content of food available in Australia and New Zealand?	Not Answered
Are you aware of other sources of information (publically available or otherwise) on the added sugars content of foods available in Australia and New Zealand beside those described in section 1.8 of the Consultation paper? - If yes, please provide details here and justify with evidence.	
Are you aware of other sources of information (publically available or otherwise) on the added sugars content of foods available in Australia and New Zealand beside those described in section 1.8 of the Consultation paper? - Please attach references.	Not Answered
Are you aware of other sources of information (publically available or otherwise) on the added sugars content of foods available in Australia and New Zealand beside those described in section 1.8 of the Consultation paper? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Do you agree with the desired outcome of this work: "Food labels provide adequate contextual information about sugars to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of the dietary guidelines"? - Do you agree with the desired outcome of this work: Food labels provide adequate contextual information about sugars to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of the dietary guidelines?	Not Answered
Do you agree with the desired outcome of this work: "Food labels provide adequate contextual information about sugars to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of the dietary guidelines"? - If no, please suggest an alternate desired outcome and justify your suggestion.	
Do you agree with the desired outcome of this work: "Food labels provide adequate contextual information about sugars to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of the dietary guidelines"? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Do you agree with the desired outcome of this work: "Food labels provide adequate contextual information about sugars to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of the dietary guidelines"? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option	
- How effective would this option be in addressing the policy issue and achieving the desired outcome?	Effective in combination with another option (please specify below)
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option	SA Health does not consider Option 2 (i.e. an education strategy alone, to assist consumers on how to read and interpret the current labelling arrangements) would adequately address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome. This option assumes no changes to the current labelling arrangements. Given the Australian Dietary Guidelines emphasise limiting foods containing added sugar, not changing the current food labelling will not assist consumers to make informed choices in support of the (Australian) dietary guidelines with regard to added sugar consumption.
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option	However, SA Health would be supportive in principle of an education strategy to support any changes to sugar labelling that may be agreed to in the future. An education campaign would need adequate funding to maximise duration and exposure to key target groups. The recent Mass media campaigns addressing physical activity, nutrition and obesity in Australia 1995-2015: an updated narrative review by Grunseit et al (2016) has a number of key recommendations for mass media campaigns in Australia worthy of consideration should any future campaign be recommended as part of a consumer education strategy.
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option	References
- Please provide evidence to justify your views.	Grunseit A, Bellw B, Goldbaum E, Gale J, Bauman A. Mass media campaigns addressing physical activity, nutrition and obesity in Australia: An updated narrative review. Sydney: The Australian Prevention Partnership Centre: 2016. <a href="https://preventioncentre.org.au/resources/evidence-reviews/an-updated-narrative-review-mass-media-campaigns-addressing-physical-activity-nutrition-and-obesity-in-australia-1995-2015/">https://preventioncentre.org.au/resources/evidence-reviews/an-updated-narrative-review-mass-media-campaigns-addressing-physical-activity-nutrition-and-obesity-in-australia-1995-2015/</a>
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option	
- Is the description of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed option (compared to the status quo) accurate?	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option	
- Please provide evidence to justify your views.	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option	
- Please attach references here	<a href="https://consultations.health.gov.au/chronic-disease-and-food-policy/branch/consultation/labelling-of-sugars-on-foods/drinks/consultation/download_file?liquid-question=2018-06-29-3474107166-file&amp;subquestion=1&amp;user=ANON-VSES-G41M-V">https://consultations.health.gov.au/chronic-disease-and-food-policy/branch/consultation/labelling-of-sugars-on-foods/drinks/consultation/download_file?liquid-question=2018-06-29-3474107166-file&amp;subquestion=1&amp;user=ANON-VSES-G41M-V</a>
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option	
- Are there additional strengths and weaknesses associated with the proposed option (compared with the status quo)?	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option	
- Please describe what these are?	

Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option	
- Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option	
- Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential	Not Answered
Impacts	
- How would this option impact you?	Somewhat
Impacts	
- Please provide impacts and cost relevant to you, with evidence to justify your views	It is anticipated that any future education strategy would be in the form of a National campaign of which SA Health would be contributing funds to (e.g. if the Australian Health Ministers' Advisory Council formula is used). In addition there would be further SA Health resourcing, including state-based promotion through social media and other channels, information dissemination to stakeholders and the public, and warehousing of any hard copy education materials. It is also noted that an education campaign such as this may be more useful if it encompassed all aspects of the Australian Dietary Guidelines (e.g. a campaign on healthy eating, not just sugar alone. It would however include the changes to sugar labelling that eventuate.
Impacts	
- Please attach evidence to justify your views	Not Answered
Impacts	
- Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - How effective would this option be in addressing the policy issue and achieving the desired outcome?	Effective
	SA Health considers this option has potential benefit, given 72% of Australians surveyed reported using the ingredient list for a first time purchase of a food (Food Standards Australia New Zealand (FSANZ), 2016). However FSANZ (2016) Rapid evidence assessment on consumer knowledge, attitudes and behaviours relating to sugars in the ingredients list noted the following key findings below:  Consumer use of the ingredient list: •Grocery shoppers who are more likely to use the ingredient list have one or more of the following attributes: female; higher formal education; greater nutrition knowledge; higher income. •The ingredient list is used by consumers who are wishing to avoid particular ingredients, so their dietary requirements/choices (e.g. allergen, religious, ethical) are met. •Little information on the use of the ingredient list to obtain information on specific sugars, fats, and oils was located. The one series of studies that examined this issue found that a reasonably large proportion of consumers used the ingredient list to obtain information on these nutrients in order to identify products to avoid. However, consumers also have beliefs about the sorts of products that are, for example, high in fat, and may rely on these beliefs instead of checking the ingredient list. •Consumers appear to value the ingredient list highly, even though relatively few appear to use this label element. Consumer understanding of the ingredient list: •Relatively few studies were located that addressed consumer understanding. No Australia/New Zealand studies were found. •The few international studies suggest that there is consumer confusion about the comprehensiveness of the ingredient list and some of the ingredient terms used. Consumer preferences for sugars, fats, oils information in the ingredient list: •Based on the international literature, sizeable proportions of consumers find ingredient lists to be difficult to understand •No study examined the outcome of grouping added sugars, fats, and oils in the ingredient list. If Option 1 was supported for further exploration, SA Health would suggest that research is required to test consumer support and understanding of changes to the ingredient list such as via a bracketed list of the sugar-based ingredients alone, and against Option 4 approaches. This would expand the gap in evidence identified by FSANZ (2016) that no study examined the outcome of grouping added sugars, fats, and oils in the ingredient list. If a bracketed list was selected as the option to move forward with, it is suggested that a percentage (%) for amount of sugars is included, similar to current characterising ingredients requirements in the Food Standards Code. With regards to the other ways of changing the statement of ingredients, SA Health would not recommend embedding sugar based ingredients so as not to confuse these ingredients with allergens (a common practice in industry). The use of an asterisk to provide further information is already used for referencing mandated statements when industry chooses to include percentage daily intake information and therefore should also be avoided.  FSANZ research shows that people do highly value the ingredients list. Whilst the scientific community appears to deem this labelling element as a topic of little interest, this does not mean that it is not a viable option or useful element. SA Health's experience in consumer level enquiries indicates that consumers do understand how to use ingredient lists.
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views	References FSANZ (2016) Rapid evidence assessment on consumer knowledge, attitudes and behaviours relating to sugars in the ingredients list Food Standards Australia New Zealand, Canberra. <a href="http://www.foodstandards.gov.au/consumer/labelling/evaluation/Documents/R112_104%20Rapid%20evidence%20assessment.pdf">http://www.foodstandards.gov.au/consumer/labelling/evaluation/Documents/R112_104%20Rapid%20evidence%20assessment.pdf</a>
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	<a href="https://consultations.health.gov.au/chronic-disease-and-food-policy-branch/consultation-labelling-of-sugars-on-foods-drinks/consultation/download_file?liquid-question=2018-06-29%209417069861-filesubquestion=User+ANON-VSE%20G41M-V">https://consultations.health.gov.au/chronic-disease-and-food-policy-branch/consultation-labelling-of-sugars-on-foods-drinks/consultation/download_file?liquid-question=2018-06-29%209417069861-filesubquestion=User+ANON-VSE%20G41M-V</a>
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Is the description of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed option (compared to the status quo) accurate?	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Are there additional strengths and weaknesses associated with the proposed option (compared to the status quo)?	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please describe what these are?	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential	Not Answered
Impacts - How would this option impact you?	Somewhat
Impacts - Please provide impacts and cost relevant to you, with evidence to justify your view	From an enforcement experience perspective, the ingredient list option is potentially the easiest to implement which would be a benefit.
Impacts - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Impacts - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential	Not Answered
Implementation mechanism - Referring to Table 1 in section 3 in the Consultation paper: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms", which implementation mechanism would be most appropriate for this policy option?	Regulatory
Implementation mechanism - Please provide the pros and cons of your selected implementation mechanism, using evidence to justify your view	Pros: It would be best for this option to be implemented as a mandatory intervention to provide a level playing field and consistent labelling formats across the food supply. Cons: Ingredients can change due to seasonal availability causing more impact on businesses. Labels need to be changed on a seasonal basis.
Implementation mechanism - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Implementation mechanism - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential	Not Answered
would this option be in addressing the policy issue and achieving the desired outcome?	Effective
	SA Health notes that research has been conducted which supports that additional contextual information is more effective than just using the nutrition information panel (NIP) alone: •New Zealand research (de Murchu et al. 2017) found that grocery labels use integrated nutrition labels (Health Star Rating (HSR) and Traffic Light) found them to be significantly more useful and easy to understand compared with the NIP, with both HSR and Traffic Light users having significantly healthier food purchases. •HSR randomised controlled research by Thandrup et al (2017) tested response (N=209 adults) to labelling conditions (six with information about added sugar in different formats). Participants viewed 10 food or beverage images with either: (1) no label (control); (2) the current Nutrition Facts Label (NFL) without added sugar; (3) the proposed NFL with only added sugar; or the proposed NFL with added sugar in (4) grams, (5) grams and teaspoons, (6) grams and percent Daily Value (NDV), (7) grams with HIGH/MEDIUM/LOW text, or (8) grams with HIGH/MEDIUM/LOW text and NDV. Results found that presenting added sugar in grams plus HIGH/MEDIUM/LOW contexts with and without NDV led to the highest added sugar understanding scores compared to when added sugar was not on the label, or was displayed in grams only. Interestingly, displaying added sugar in teaspoons did not significantly improve understanding beyond grams alone. SA Health supports in principle further exploration of Option 4: added sugars quantified in the NIP, enhanced with additional contextual information such as HIGH/MEDIUM/LOW/NL.
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views	Reference de Murchu C, Volkova S, Jiang Y, Eyles H, Michie A, Neill B, Blakely T, Swinburn B, Rayner M (2017) Effects of interpretive nutrition labels on consumer food purchases: the Starlight randomised control trial. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 105(3): 695-704 doi: 10.3945/ajcn.116.144956 Thandrup N, Graham DL, & Roberto CA (2017). Simplifying mental math: Changing how added sugars are displayed on the nutrition facts label can improve consumer understanding. Appetite, 114, 38-46. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2017.03.015">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2017.03.015</a>
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	<a href="https://consultations.health.gov.au/chronic-disease-and-food-policy-branch/consultation-labelling-of-sugars-on-foods-drinks/consultation/download_file?liquid-question=2018-07-02%208974543830-filesubquestion=18User+ANON-VSE%20G41M-V">https://consultations.health.gov.au/chronic-disease-and-food-policy-branch/consultation-labelling-of-sugars-on-foods-drinks/consultation/download_file?liquid-question=2018-07-02%208974543830-filesubquestion=18User+ANON-VSE%20G41M-V</a>
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Is the description of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed option (compared to the status quo) accurate?	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	<a href="https://consultations.health.gov.au/chronic-disease-and-food-policy-branch/consultation-labelling-of-sugars-on-foods-drinks/consultation/download_file?liquid-question=2018-07-02%208974543830-filesubquestion=18User+ANON-VSE%20G41M-V">https://consultations.health.gov.au/chronic-disease-and-food-policy-branch/consultation-labelling-of-sugars-on-foods-drinks/consultation/download_file?liquid-question=2018-07-02%208974543830-filesubquestion=18User+ANON-VSE%20G41M-V</a>
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Are there additional strengths and weaknesses associated with the proposed option (compared to the status quo)?	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please describe what these are?	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential	Not Answered
Impacts	
- How would this option impact you?	Somewhat
Impacts	
- Please provide impacts and cost relevant to you, with evidence to justify your view	
Impacts	
- Please attach references here	Not Answered
Impacts	
- Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential	Not Answered

Impact on existing elements of a food label - How would the proposed option impact existing elements of a food label (both mandatory and voluntary)?	Option 4: added sugars quantified in the nutrition information panel (NIP) enhanced with additional contextual information, such as HIGH/MEDIUM/LOW/NL, would require a small amount of extra space on the NIP to list added sugars. For example, an extra line in the NIP indented under total sugars, preceded with wording of which is added - x grams.
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Would adopting this option require another element of a food label to be removed from the package?	No
Impact on existing elements of a food label - If so, which labelling element/s would be removed?	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please provide evidence to justify your response.	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Implementation mechanism - Referring to Table 1 in Section 3 of the Consultation paper: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms", which implementation mechanism would be most appropriate for this policy option	Regulatory
Implementation mechanism - Please provide further comments here	Mandatory would be considered the most appropriate for this policy option for additional added sugar information in the nutrition information panel, enhanced with additional contextual information such as HIGH/MEDIUM/LOW.
Implementation mechanism - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Implementation mechanism - Please provide pros and cons of your selected implementation mechanism, using evidence to justify your response.	Pros: It would be best for this option to be implemented as a regulatory intervention for a level playing field to provide consistent labelling formats across the food supply. Cons: Costs to industry to introduce label changes.
Implementation mechanism - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Implementation mechanism - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - How effective would this option be in addressing the policy issue and achieving the desired outcome?	Partially effective  SA Health considers advisory labels would be effective in addressing the policy problem and desired outcomes (see references below). However while it may be subjectively effective, this option places a focus on sugar in comparison to other risk nutrients, including saturated fat and salt (sodium). If warning labels are used for sugar, it could be considered that warning labels are also required for saturated fat and salt.  It is important to note that the Health Star Rating (HSR) system already provides interpretation on food labels for all of the aforementioned risk nutrients.  The Billich et al (2018) study investigated whether various formats of front of pack (FOP) labels reduced the intended choice of sugar-sweetened beverages (SSBs) in an online choice experiment with young Australian adults. The FOP formats were: a graphic warning, text warning (i.e. words only, no pictorial graphics), sugar information (with the number of teaspoons of added sugar) or HSR. Compared to the control group who were not exposed to a label, the graphic warning, text warning, sugar information and HSR labels all significantly reduced selection of a SSB in the choice scenario. The magnitude of effect was greatest for the graphic warning label. Compared to the control group only the HSR label significantly increased selection of the high HSR drinks. The study concluded that •FOP labels, particularly those with graphic warnings, have the potential to reduce intended SSB purchases and are the most effective. •Labels that also identify healthier alternatives may influence consumers to substitute SSBs with healthier drinks.  This study found the graphic warning label most effective label. However the authors note that as HSR is already in effect, the HSR system is the most viable FOP labelling strategy to target SSB consumption in Australia. For the text warning, this study demonstrated similar reductions in the percentage of participants who selected a SSB (approximately 20% reduction) to US studies with adolescents by VanEpps & Roberts, 2016.  However, there may be low stakeholder uptake to adopt additional advisory/warning labels on packaged foods and drinks, particularly in light of the voluntary Health Star Rating (HSR) already being in effect in Australia and New Zealand.  References Billich N, Blake MR, Bachholder K, Cobcroft M, Li V, Peeters A. The effect of sugar-sweetened beverage front-of-pack labels on drink selection, health knowledge and awareness: An online randomised controlled trial. <i>Appetite</i> . Volume 128, 2018, Pages 233-241, <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2018.05.149">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2018.05.149</a> . VanEpps EM, Roberto CA. The Influence of Sugar-Sweetened Beverage Warnings - A Randomized Trial of Adolescents' Choices and Beliefs. <i>Am J Prev Med</i> 2016 Nov; 51(5):664-672
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	<a href="https://consultations.health.gov.au/chronic-disease-and-food-policy-branch/consultation/labelling-of-sugars-on-foods/drinks/consultation/download_file?liquid-question=2018-07-09_2877101616_file&amp;subquestion=User+ANON_VSES_G41M_V">https://consultations.health.gov.au/chronic-disease-and-food-policy-branch/consultation/labelling-of-sugars-on-foods/drinks/consultation/download_file?liquid-question=2018-07-09_2877101616_file&amp;subquestion=User+ANON_VSES_G41M_V</a>
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Is the description of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed option (compared to the status quo) accurate?	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	<a href="https://consultations.health.gov.au/chronic-disease-and-food-policy-branch/consultation/labelling-of-sugars-on-foods/drinks/consultation/download_file?liquid-question=2018-07-09_2877101616_file&amp;subquestion=1&amp;user=ANON_VSES_G41M_V">https://consultations.health.gov.au/chronic-disease-and-food-policy-branch/consultation/labelling-of-sugars-on-foods/drinks/consultation/download_file?liquid-question=2018-07-09_2877101616_file&amp;subquestion=1&amp;user=ANON_VSES_G41M_V</a>
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Are there additional strengths and weaknesses associated with the proposed option (compared with the status quo)?	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please describe what these are?	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Impact - How would this option impact you?	Somewhat
Impact - Please provide impacts and cost relevant to you, with evidence to justify your response.	
Impact - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Impact - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Impact on existing elements of a food label - How would the proposed option impact existing elements of a food label (both mandatory and voluntary)?	Labelling space is already limited for many foods and drink products, hence an advisory label could compete with front of pack space on products using the voluntary Health Star Rating (HSR).  References Billich N, Blake MR, Bachholder K, Cobcroft M, Li V, Peeters A. The effect of sugar-sweetened beverage front-of-pack labels on drink selection, health knowledge and awareness: An online randomised controlled trial. <i>Appetite</i> . Volume 128, 2018, Pages 233-241, <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2018.05.149">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2018.05.149</a> . Peters SA, Dunford E, Johns A, et al. Incorporating Added Sugar Improves the Performance of the Health Star Rating Front-of-Pack Labelling System in Australia. <i>Nutrients</i> . 2017;9(7):701. doi:10.3390/nu9070701. <a href="http://www.mdpi.com/2072-6643/9/7/701">http://www.mdpi.com/2072-6643/9/7/701</a>
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Would adopting this option require another element of a food label to be removed from the package?	Depends
Impact on existing elements of a food label - If so, which labelling element/s would be removed?	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please provide evidence to justify your response.	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please attach references here	<a href="https://consultations.health.gov.au/chronic-disease-and-food-policy-branch/consultation/labelling-of-sugars-on-foods/drinks/consultation/download_file?liquid-question=2018-07-05_4098284577_file&amp;subquestion=User+ANON_VSES_G41M_V">https://consultations.health.gov.au/chronic-disease-and-food-policy-branch/consultation/labelling-of-sugars-on-foods/drinks/consultation/download_file?liquid-question=2018-07-05_4098284577_file&amp;subquestion=User+ANON_VSES_G41M_V</a>
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Implementation mechanism - Referring to Table 1 in Section 3 of the Consultation paper: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms", which implementation mechanism would be most appropriate for this policy option?	
Implementation mechanism - Please provide pros and cons of your selected implementation mechanism, using evidence to justify your response.	
Implementation mechanism - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Implementation mechanism - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - How effective would this option be in addressing the policy issue and achieving the desired outcome?	Partially effective  As discussed further in question 30, this option may be useful for particular sectors that are not displaying the visible Health Star Rating (HSR) system's star logo and/or additional nutrient icons. The strengths and weaknesses of warning labels (both text and graphic), and sugar information labels with the number of teaspoons of added sugar have also been outlined in the consultation paper.  SA Health notes that there may be value in exploring Option 4 over Option 6, noting the following relevant research findings: •MS randomized controlled research, by Khandpur et al (2017), testing eight labelling conditions (six with information about added sugar in different formats) found that presenting added sugar in grams plus HIGH/MEDIUM/LOW contexts with and without percent daily value (%DV) led to the highest added sugar understanding scores compared to when added sugar was not on the label, or was displayed in grams only. Displaying added sugar in teaspoons did not significantly improve understanding beyond grams alone. •The Billich et al (2018) study investigated whether various formats of front of pack (FOP) labels reduced the intended choice of sugar-sweetened beverages (SSBs) in an online choice experiment with young Australian adults. The FOP formats were: a graphic warning, text warning (i.e. words only, no pictorial graphics), sugar information (with the number of teaspoons of added sugar) or HSR. Compared to the control group who were not exposed to a label, the graphic warning, text warning, sugar information and HSR labels all significantly reduced selection of a SSB in the choice scenario. The magnitude of effect was greatest for the graphic warning label, reducing SSB selection from two-thirds (2/3) to just over a quarter. The sugar information label, HSR and text warning label groups reduced SSB selection from 2/3 to just under half. The study concluded that: •FOP labels, particularly those with graphic warnings, have the potential to reduce intended SSB purchases. •Labels that also identify healthier alternatives may influence consumers to substitute SSBs with healthier drinks.  References Billich N, Blake MR, Bachholder K, Cobcroft M, Li V, Peeters A. The effect of sugar-sweetened beverage front-of-pack labels on drink selection, health knowledge and awareness: An online randomised controlled trial. <i>Appetite</i> . Volume 128, 2018, Pages 233-241, <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2018.05.149">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2018.05.149</a> . Khandpur, N., Graham, D. J., & Roberto, C. A. (2017). Simplifying mental math: Changing how added sugars are displayed on the nutrition facts label can improve consumer understanding. <i>Appetite</i> , 114, 38-46. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2017.03.015">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2017.03.015</a>
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	<a href="https://consultations.health.gov.au/chronic-disease-and-food-policy-branch/consultation/labelling-of-sugars-on-foods/drinks/consultation/download_file?liquid-question=2018-07-05_2832134050_file&amp;subquestion=User+ANON_VSES_G41M_V">https://consultations.health.gov.au/chronic-disease-and-food-policy-branch/consultation/labelling-of-sugars-on-foods/drinks/consultation/download_file?liquid-question=2018-07-05_2832134050_file&amp;subquestion=User+ANON_VSES_G41M_V</a>
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Is the description of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed option (compared to the status quo) accurate?	

Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach evidence here	<a href="https://consultations.health.gov.au/chronic-disease-and-food-policy-branch/consultation/labelling-of-sugars-on-foods-drinks/consultation/download_file?liquid-question=2018-07-09-2832314050&amp;filesubquestion=18&amp;user=NON-VSES-G41M-V">https://consultations.health.gov.au/chronic-disease-and-food-policy-branch/consultation/labelling-of-sugars-on-foods-drinks/consultation/download_file?liquid-question=2018-07-09-2832314050&amp;filesubquestion=18&amp;user=NON-VSES-G41M-V</a>
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Are there additional strengths and weaknesses associated with the proposed option (compared with the status quo)?	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please describe what these are?	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Impact - How would this option impact you?	Somewhat
Impact - Please provide impacts and cost relevant to you, with evidence to justify your response	
Impact - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Impact - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Impact on existing elements of a food label - How would the proposed option impact existing elements of a food label (both mandatory and voluntary)?	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Would adopting this option require another element of a food label to be removed from the package?	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - If so, which labelling elements would be removed?	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please provide evidence to justify your response.	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Implementation mechanism - Referring to Table 1 in Section 3 of the Consultation paper: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms", which implementation mechanism would be most appropriate for this policy option?	Code of practice - government driven
Implementation mechanism - Please provide pros and cons of your selected implementation mechanism, using evidence to justify your response.	If there was wide support for Option 6, SA Health would suggest that the implementation mechanism be in line with the current HSR system such that there is consistency between front of pack labelling interventions. The HSR system is currently a voluntary system implemented via a government enforced Guide to Industry.  References Health Star Rating System. Guide for Industry to the Health Star Rating Calculator V6 (2018). <a href="http://healthstarrating.gov.au/internet/healthstarrating/publishing.nsf/Content/E380CCAD7E1E47CA2570A500960845F16/Guide%20for%20Industry%20on%20the%20Health%20Star%20Rating%20Calculator.pdf">http://healthstarrating.gov.au/internet/healthstarrating/publishing.nsf/Content/E380CCAD7E1E47CA2570A500960845F16/Guide%20for%20Industry%20on%20the%20Health%20Star%20Rating%20Calculator.pdf</a>
Implementation mechanism - Please attach references here	<a href="https://consultations.health.gov.au/chronic-disease-and-food-policy-branch/consultation/labelling-of-sugars-on-foods-drinks/consultation/download_file?liquid-question=2018-07-09-3224967895&amp;filesubquestion=1&amp;user=NON-VSES-G41M-V">https://consultations.health.gov.au/chronic-disease-and-food-policy-branch/consultation/labelling-of-sugars-on-foods-drinks/consultation/download_file?liquid-question=2018-07-09-3224967895&amp;filesubquestion=1&amp;user=NON-VSES-G41M-V</a>
Implementation mechanism - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - How effective would this option be in addressing the policy issue and achieving the desired outcome?	Effective in combination with another option (please specify below)
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	This option alone is not considered to provide an effective solution to achieving the desired policy outcome. It does not support consumers with immediate 'at a glance' easy to access information for consumers. It would only be accessed by motivated consumers with a device that can scan QR codes and also does not take into consideration the section of our population with low literacy and numeracy skills or those with low technology competency. However, this option would be useful as an additional tool for any of the other options.
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Is the description of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed option (compared to the status quo) accurate?	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Are there additional strengths and weaknesses associated with the proposed option (compared with the status quo)?	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please describe what these are?	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Impact - How would this option impact you?	Somewhat
Impact - Please provide impacts and cost relevant to you, with evidence to justify your response.	
Impact - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Impact - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Impact on existing elements of a food label - How would the proposed option impact existing elements of a food label (both mandatory and voluntary)?	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Would adopting this option require another element of a food label to be removed from the package?	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - If so, which labelling elements would be removed?	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please provide evidence to justify your response.	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Implementation mechanisms - Referring to Table 1 in Section 3 of the Consultation paper: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms", which implementation mechanism would be most appropriate for this policy option?	Voluntary implementation
Implementation mechanisms - Please provide pros and cons of your selected implementation mechanism, using evidence to justify your response.	
Implementation mechanisms - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Implementation mechanisms - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Are there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome? - re there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome?	Yes
Are there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome? - If yes, please describe your suggested option and how it addresses the policy issue and would achieve the desired outcome.	SA Health suggests another option for consideration - that a combination of contextual information (from option 4), and using a pre-existing pictorial approach (i.e. Health Star Rating) (option 6) as described below. (This does not discount the comments made for options 3, 4 and 6 discussed previously.)  Adding NIL/LOW/MEDIUM/HIGH (or LOW/HIGH) contexts to total and, if adopted in the future, added sugars, to the nutrient information accompanying the Health Star Rating (HSR) (note that the HSR is currently based on total sugars, not added sugars).  Further consumer testing is required on all label option combinations recommended to determine the most effective and viable labelling options.

	<p>This option is supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•New Zealand research (M Murchu et al, 2017) found that shoppers who use interpretive nutrition labels (HSR and Traffic Light) found them to be significantly more useful and easy to understand compared with the nutrition information panel (NIP), with both HSR and Traffic Light users having significantly healthier food purchases.</li> <li>•Waters et al (2017) investigated whether the HSR could better discriminate between core and discretionary foods by including added sugar in the underlying algorithm, and found that discrimination was improved when added sugar was included. Pending the Five Year Review of the HSR report, the case for incorporating added sugar into the HSR algorithm will be considered. If it was supported, then added sugar could also appear as one of the 'risk' nutrients in the nutrient information next to the HSR.</li> <li>•Consumer research has found that HSR can influence consumer purchases. Monitoring of consumer awareness and ability to use the HSR system correctly during Dec 2017 – March 2018 (National Heart Foundation, April 2018) shows that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Unprompted awareness of the HSR logo is high, with 84% of respondents aware of the HSR system.</li> <li>•Adherence to HSR and purchasing behaviour: 70% of respondents have bought a HSR product in the last 3 months, with 46% saying they 'always' or 'most of the time' include a HSR product in their shopping basket.</li> <li>•When shopping, 57% of respondents reported being influenced by the HSR system in their purchasing decision. Of the people influenced, 35% were influenced to buy a product with more stars.</li> <li>•Interestingly there has been a 20% decrease in the proportion of respondents who believe the HSR will influence their future purchasing decision to 52%, down from 72% in September 2015.</li> </ul> </li> <li>•HSR Health notes one Australian study by Talbot et al (2016) where various front of pack labelling (FoPL) formats were shown to consumer focus groups: one reductive FoPL (the Daily Intake Guide), an existing evaluative FoPL (multiple traffic lights), and a new evaluative FoPL (the HSR). Most participants reported being motivated to use the evaluative FoPLs (particularly the HSR) to make choices about foods consumed as part of regular daily meals, but not for discretionary foods consumed as snacks or desserts.</li> <li>•A critical assessment of food labels in the US and Canada (Temple and Fraser, 2014) recommended front of pack (FoP) labels should have colour and words that indicate 'high', 'medium' and 'low' levels.</li> </ul> <p>References</p> <p>Billich N, Blake MR, Bachelder K, Cobcroft M, Li V, Peeters A. The effect of sugar-sweetened beverage front-of-pack labels on drink selection, health knowledge and awareness: An online randomised controlled trial, <i>Appetite</i>, Volume 128,2018, Pages 233-241, <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2018.05.149">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2018.05.149</a></p> <p>National Heart Foundation of Australia (April 2018). Report on the monitoring of the implementation of the Health Star Rating system: Key findings for Area of Enquiry 2 – Consumer awareness and ability to use the Health Star Rating system correctly. Prepared for the Commonwealth Department of Health. <a href="http://healthstar-rating.gov.au/interact/healthstar-rating/publishing-and-control/monitoring-reports">http://healthstar-rating.gov.au/interact/healthstar-rating/publishing-and-control/monitoring-reports</a></p> <p>Murchu C, Volkova E, Jiang Y, Eyles H, Mische L, Neal B, Blakely T, Swinburn B, Rayner M (2017) Effects of interpretive nutrition labels on consumer food purchases: the Starlight randomised control trial. <i>American Journal of Clinical Nutrition</i> 105(3): 695-704 doi: 10.3945/ajcn.116.144956</p> <p>Peters SA, Dunford S, Jones A, et al. Incorporating Added Sugar Improves the Performance of the Health Star Rating Front-of-Pack Labelling System in Australia. <i>Nutrients</i>. 2017;9(7):701. doi:10.3390/nut9070701. <a href="http://www.mdpi.com/2072-6643/9/7/701">http://www.mdpi.com/2072-6643/9/7/701</a></p> <p>Talbot Z, Pettigrew S, Kelly B, Ball K, Dixon H, Shilton T. Consumer responses to front-of-pack labels that vary by interpretive content. <i>Appetite</i>. 2016 Jun 1;105:296-311. doi: 10.1016/j.appet.2016.03.009. Epub 2016 Mar 10.</p> <p>Temple NJ, Fraser J. Food labels: a critical assessment. <i>Nutrition</i>. 2014 Mar;30(3):257-60. doi: 10.1016/j.nut.2013.06.012.</p> <p><i>Not all references have been uploaded as the ability to upload files is limited to one file only, if you require copies of the references, please do not hesitate to contact me.</i></p>
Are there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome? - Please provide evidence to justify your response.	<a href="https://consultations.health.gov.au/chronic-disease-and-food-policy-branch/consultation/labelling-of-sugars-on-foods/drinks/consultation/download_file?upload-question=2018-07-05-955445920-filesubquestion=&amp;user=&amp;NON-VSES-G41M-V">https://consultations.health.gov.au/chronic-disease-and-food-policy-branch/consultation/labelling-of-sugars-on-foods/drinks/consultation/download_file?upload-question=2018-07-05-955445920-filesubquestion=&amp;user=&amp;NON-VSES-G41M-V</a>
Are there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome? - Please attach references here	
Are there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome? - Please also describe the cost of implementing your proposed option.	
Are there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome? - Please provide evidence for costing assumptions.	
Are there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome? - Please attach references here	<a href="https://consultations.health.gov.au/chronic-disease-and-food-policy-branch/consultation/labelling-of-sugars-on-foods/drinks/consultation/download_file?upload-question=2018-07-05-955445920-filesubquestion=1&amp;user=&amp;NON-VSES-G41M-V">https://consultations.health.gov.au/chronic-disease-and-food-policy-branch/consultation/labelling-of-sugars-on-foods/drinks/consultation/download_file?upload-question=2018-07-05-955445920-filesubquestion=1&amp;user=&amp;NON-VSES-G41M-V</a>
Are there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
	<p>Adding <b>NI/LOW/MEDIUM/HIGH</b> contexts to the information accompanying the Health Star Rating (HSR) Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Research demonstrating effectiveness and understanding of these descriptors on front of pack labels and nutrition information panels (NIPs).</li> <li>•Considerable success of the HSR in terms of uptake by industry, use and understanding by consumers.</li> <li>•Low, medium and high descriptors are options within the UK traffic light front of pack labelling with green, amber and red colour coding respectively. The colour coding (and low, medium, high descriptors, if applied), are determined by nutrient criteria for food and drinks with respect to (total) sugars, fat, saturated fat and salt (per 100g or per portion when portions/serving sizes are greater than 100g or 150ml).</li> <li>•The addition of added sugars to the HSR nutrient information would allow comparisons to be made between food products by consumers.</li> <li>•Modelling by Peters et al (2017) demonstrates the potential for added sugars to be included in the HSR algorithm to be included, resulting in better discrimination between core and discretionary foods.</li> <li>•Provides additional information to assist consumers to identify foods containing added sugars and use this information to make informed choices in support of dietary guidelines regarding reducing/limiting foods containing added sugars.</li> <li>•May reduce consumer confusion between added and total sugars, where consumer understanding is low.</li> <li>•Consumers report having an interest in sugars and may be receptive to additional labelling.</li> <li>•Supports reformulation of products to lower levels of sugar.</li> </ul> <p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•HIGH/MEDIUM/LOW (or HIGH/LOW) type advice adds complexity to the HSR system; however the LOW descriptor already exists for risk nutrients, and high for the optional positive nutrient.</li> <li>•Consumer research testing these descriptors with and without corresponding red/amber/green colour coding on the HSR nutrient information would ideally be required to determine the best understood format for consumers.</li> <li>•Technical issues of defining sugar-based ingredients/added sugars. There is concern around where the limits would be drawn for the contextual definitions.</li> <li>•Presents challenges for monitoring, enforcement and compliance due to cost and immaturity of analytical methods, and difficulties associated with a supply chain or recipe-based approach.</li> <li>•Interpretative advice on only sugar without including other negative nutrients – saturated fat and salt, could imply sugars are a more concerning nutrient which is inconsistent with the dietary guidelines. This may lead some consumers to place too much emphasis on sugars, resulting in less accurate evaluations of a food's overall healthiness and may have unintended consequences for intakes of other nutrients and reformulation. If applied to sugar only, it could be used on food categories where sugar is the only risk nutrient affecting that category (e.g. sugary drinks).</li> <li>•Impact on industry to implement additional labelling, including cost associated with label changes and use of additional space on package.</li> </ul> <p>Reference</p> <p>Food Standards Agency. Guide to creating a front of pack (FoP) nutrition label for pre-packaged products sold through retail outlets <a href="https://www.food.gov.uk/sites/default/files/media/document/fof-guidance_0.pdf">https://www.food.gov.uk/sites/default/files/media/document/fof-guidance_0.pdf</a></p> <p>Peters SA, Dunford S, Jones A, et al. Incorporating Added Sugar Improves the Performance of the Health Star Rating Front-of-Pack Labelling System in Australia. <i>Nutrients</i>. 2017;9(7):701. doi:10.3390/nut9070701. <a href="http://www.mdpi.com/2072-6643/9/7/701">http://www.mdpi.com/2072-6643/9/7/701</a></p>
If you proposed a different option at question 26, please detail the strengths and weaknesses of your proposed option, compared with the status quo. - If you proposed a different option at question 26, please detail the strengths and weaknesses of your proposed option, compared with the status quo. Please provide evidence to justify your response.	<a href="https://consultations.health.gov.au/chronic-disease-and-food-policy-branch/consultation/labelling-of-sugars-on-foods/drinks/consultation/download_file?upload-question=2018-07-05-955445920-filesubquestion=&amp;user=&amp;NON-VSES-G41M-V">https://consultations.health.gov.au/chronic-disease-and-food-policy-branch/consultation/labelling-of-sugars-on-foods/drinks/consultation/download_file?upload-question=2018-07-05-955445920-filesubquestion=&amp;user=&amp;NON-VSES-G41M-V</a>
If you proposed a different option at question 26, please detail the strengths and weaknesses of your proposed option, compared with the status quo. - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Option 3 - Change to statement of ingredients - All packaged foods	All packaged foods
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Option 3 - Change to statement of ingredients - Particular foods or food categories (please specify below)	
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Option 4 - Added sugars quantified in NIP - All packaged foods	All packaged foods
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Option 4 - Added sugars quantified in NIP - Particular foods or food categories (please specify below)	
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Option 5 - Advisory labels for foods high in added sugars - All packaged foods	
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Option 5 - Advisory labels for foods high in added sugars - Particular foods or food categories (please specify below)	Particular foods or food categories (please specify below)
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Option 6 - Pictorial approaches to convey the amount or types of sugars in a serving of food - All packaged foods	
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Option 6 - Pictorial approaches to convey the amount or types of sugars in a serving of food - Particular foods or food categories (please specify below)	Particular foods or food categories (please specify below)



	<p>SA Health suggests that Option 3 and 4 would ideally apply to all packaged foods in the food supply.</p> <p>8</p> <p>Option 5 or 6 could be considered for adoption only on beverages i.e. the food categories that contribute the largest proportions of added sugar to population dietary intake. Limiting product categories to which a particular intervention is used can make it simpler and easier to target the key issues/parameters. Further consideration of an effective labelling option for beverages is supported in principle including the use of the NIL/LOW/MEDIUM/HIGH contextual information.</p> <p>The Australian Health Survey: Nutrition First Results – Foods and Nutrients, 2011-12 data showed that the major source of total sugars (natural and added) in the diets of Australians (age 2 years and over) were as follows, note the bolded items include/may include added sugar: Fruit (providing 16% of sugars), Soft drinks and flavoured mineral waters (9.7%), Dairy milk (8.1%, note that flavoured milks may be sweetened with added sugar), Fruit and vegetable juices and drinks (7.5%; note that some juice varieties have added sugar), Sugar, honey and syrups (6.5%), Cakes, muffins, scones, cake-type desserts (5.8%).</p> <p>SA Health also notes with interest that the Billich et al (2018) Australian study also demonstrated the ability of the HSR to identify healthier alternatives as a substitute for sugar-sweetened beverages (SSBs):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•This online choice experiment of 994 Australian young adults demonstrated that FOP warning labels (both text and graphic), sugar information labels with the number of teaspoons of added sugar, and Health Star Rating (HSR) labels all have the potential to reduce intended choice of SSBs.</li> <li>•The graphic warning label (containing a picture of dental caries) was the most effective at reducing intended choice of a SSB compared to both the control group and the other label groups, reducing the proportion of respondents who indicated they would choose a SSB from almost 2 in 3 to just over one quarter.</li> <li>•This study also found that the HSR, as the only existing FOP label in the market, has the potential to influence substitution from SSBs to drinks with higher star ratings.</li> <li>•The authors noted "it will be important to test these labels in a variety of real world settings, and amongst different consumer groups, to further estimate their potential for decreasing population SSB consumption".</li> </ul> <p>Given the HSR system is already in effect, it is the most viable front of pack (FOP) labelling strategy to target SSB consumption in Australia if consistently applied by industry. (It is noted that the current HSR System does not incorporate additional nutrient information about added sugars.)</p> <p>References</p> <p>Australian Bureau of Statistics (2014). Australian Health Survey: Nutrition first results - foods and nutrients. 2011-12 (4364.0.55.007). <a href="http://abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/by%20Subject/4364.0.55.007~2011-12~Main%20Features~Key%20Findings~1">http://abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/by%20Subject/4364.0.55.007~2011-12~Main%20Features~Key%20Findings~1</a></p> <p>Billich N, Blake MR, Backholer K, Cobcroft M, Li V, Peeters A. The effect of sugar-sweetened beverage front-of-pack labels on drink selection, health knowledge and awareness: An online randomised controlled trial. <i>Appetite</i>. Volume 128-2018. Pages 233-242. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2018.05.149">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2018.05.149</a></p>
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - If you have selected any particular food categories, please specify which foods or food categories and justify your position provide examples of foods.	<p>Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Please attach references here</p> <p><a href="https://consultations.health.gov.au/chronic-disease-and-food-policy/branch/consultation/labelling-of-sugars-on-foods/drinks/consultation/download_file?liquid-question=2018-07-05_4333381600_filesubquestion&amp;user=ANON_VSES-G41M-V">https://consultations.health.gov.au/chronic-disease-and-food-policy/branch/consultation/labelling-of-sugars-on-foods/drinks/consultation/download_file?liquid-question=2018-07-05_4333381600_filesubquestion&amp;user=ANON_VSES-G41M-V</a></p>
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Voluntary	
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Code of Practice - Voluntary	
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Code of Practice - Government driven	
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Regulatory	
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Voluntary - are there other pros and cons?	
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Voluntary: if yes, other pros and cons associated with this mechanism.	
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Code of Practice - Voluntary: are there other pros and cons?	
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Code of Practice - Voluntary: if yes, other pros and cons associated with this mechanism.	
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Code of Practice - Government driven: are there other pros and cons?	
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Code of Practice - Government driven: if yes, other pros and cons associated with this mechanism.	
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Regulatory: are there other pros and cons?	
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Regulatory: if yes, other pros and cons associated with this mechanism	
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Are there other benefits or costs associated with the proposed labelling options which have not been identified? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Are there any other benefits or costs associated with the proposed labelling options which have not been identified? - Are there any other benefits or costs associated with the proposed labelling options which have not been identified?	Not Answered
Are there any other benefits or costs associated with the proposed labelling options which have not been identified? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Are there any other benefits or costs associated with the proposed labelling options which have not been identified? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Should there be exemptions or other accommodations (such as longer transition periods) made for small businesses, to minimise the regulatory burden? - Should there be exemptions or other accommodations (such as longer transition periods) made for small businesses, to minimise the regulatory burden?	Not Answered
Should there be exemptions or other accommodations (such as longer transition periods) made for small businesses, to minimise the regulatory burden? - If so, what exemptions or other accommodations do you suggest? Please justify your response.	
Should there be exemptions or other accommodations (such as longer transition periods) made for small businesses, to minimise the regulatory burden? - Please attach references here	Not Answered

Should there be exemptions or other accommodations (such as longer transition periods) made for small businesses, to minimise the regulatory burden? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
What would be the cost per year for industry to self-regulate (e.g. voluntary code of practice-industry driven)? - What would be the cost per year for industry to self-regulate. Please justify your response with hours of time, and number of staff required.	
What would be the cost per year for industry to self-regulate (e.g. voluntary code of practice-industry driven)? - Please specify which country (Australia or New Zealand) your evidence is based on.	
What would be the cost per year for industry to self-regulate (e.g. voluntary code of practice-industry driven)? - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	
What would be the cost per year for industry to self-regulate (e.g. voluntary code of practice-industry driven)? - Please attach references here.	Not Answered
What would be the cost per year for industry to self-regulate (e.g. voluntary code of practice-industry driven)? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Would industry pass any of the costs associated with implementing the proposed options on to consumers? - Would industry pass any of the costs associated with implementing the proposed options on to consumers?	
Would industry pass any of the costs associated with implementing the proposed options on to consumers? - What is the basis for your view?	
Would industry pass any of the costs associated with implementing the proposed options on to consumers? - Please attach references here.	Not Answered
Would industry pass any of the costs associated with implementing the proposed options on to consumers? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Last Modified Date	2018-09-19 15:16:22
Response ID	ANON-9585-641M-V
IP Address	1.47
Created Date	2018-09-19 14:24:36
Content Space Version	v3.1.1.8 v3-frontend
Consultation State	Open
Browser Identification	Mozilla/5.0 (Windows NT 6.1; Win64; x64; AppleWebKit/537.36 (KHTML, like Gecko) Chrome/70.0.3071.109 Safari/537.36
Submitted Date	2018-09-19 15:16:59
Visited Pages - Submitter details	Submitter details
Visited Pages - Have you read the Consultation Regulation Impact Statement?	Have you read the Consultation Regulation Impact Statement?
Visited Pages - Survey Questions 3-4	Survey Questions 3-4
Visited Pages - Option 2: Education on how to read and interpret labelling information about sugars	Option 2: Education on how to read and interpret labelling information about sugars
Visited Pages - Option 3: Change to statement of ingredients	Option 3: Change to statement of ingredients
Visited Pages - Option 4: Added sugars quantified in the NIP	Option 4: Added sugars quantified in the NIP
Visited Pages - Option 5: Advisory labels for foods high in added sugars	Option 5: Advisory labels for foods high in added sugars
Visited Pages - Option 6: Pictorial approaches to convey the amount or types of sugars in a serving of food	Option 6: Pictorial approaches to convey the amount or types of sugars in a serving of food.
Visited Pages - Option 7: Digital linking to off label web-based information about added sugars content	Option 7: Digital linking to off label web-based information about added sugars content
Visited Pages - Survey Questions 26-30 (on all proposed policy options)	Survey Questions 26-30 (on all proposed policy options)
Visited Pages - Implementation mechanisms	Implementation mechanisms
Visited Pages - Impact analysis (costs and benefits)	Impact analysis (costs and benefits)

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN RELEASED UNDER  
THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 1982 (CTH)  
BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

Privacy and confidential information and permissions - Consent	No
Privacy and confidential information and permissions - If you want all or parts of this submission to be confidential, please state why.	
Submitter information - Full name	Food Safety Standards and Regulation
Submitter information - Are you answering on behalf of an organisation?	Yes
Submitter information - If you answered yes to the question above, please provide your organisations' name	Queensland Health
Submitter information - Sector	Government
Submitter information - Please provide your email address.	s 47F
Submitter information - Phone Number	s 47F
Submitter information - If we require further information in relation to this submission, can we contact you?	Yes
Have you read the Public Consultation Regulation Impact Statement Labelling of sugars on packaged foods and drinks?  (Please click on the link above to open the document) - Have you read the Public Consultation Regulation Impact Statement Labelling of sugars on packaged foods and drinks	Yes
"Information about sugar provided on food labels in Australia and New Zealand does not provide adequate contextual information to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of dietary guidelines"? - Do you support the statement of the problem Information about sugar provided on food labels in Australia and New Zealand does not provide adequate contextual information to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of dietary guidelines.	Yes
Do you support the statement of the problem  "Information about sugar provided on food labels in Australia and New Zealand does not provide adequate contextual information to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of dietary guidelines"? - If you do not support this statement, please justify why not with your reasons.	
Do you support the statement of the problem  "Information about sugar provided on food labels in Australia and New Zealand does not provide adequate contextual information to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of dietary guidelines"? - If you would like to provide an alternate problem definition, please enter it below and justify your statement with evidence	
Do you support the statement of the problem  "Information about sugar provided on food labels in Australia and New Zealand does not provide adequate contextual information to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of dietary guidelines"? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Do you support the statement of the problem  "Information about sugar provided on food labels in Australia and New Zealand does not provide adequate contextual information to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of dietary guidelines"? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Are you aware of any form of information about added sugars that is provided on food labels in addition to those identified in section 1.6 of the Consultation paper? - Are you aware of any form of information about added sugars that is provided on food labels in addition to those identified - in section 1.5 of the Consultation paper?	No
Are you aware of any form of information about added sugars that is provided on food labels in addition to those identified in section 1.6 of the Consultation paper? - If yes, please provide details here and justify with evidence.	
Are you aware of any form of information about added sugars that is provided on food labels in addition to those identified in section 1.6 of the Consultation paper? - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	Not Answered
Are you aware of any form of information about added sugars that is provided on food labels in addition to those identified in section 1.6 of the Consultation paper? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Are you aware of other sources of information (publically available or otherwise) on the added sugars content of foods available in Australia and New Zealand beside those described in section 1.8 of the Consultation paper? - Are you aware of other sources of information (publically or otherwise) on the added sugars content of food available in Australia and New Zealand?	No

Are you aware of other sources of information (publically available or otherwise) on the added sugars content of foods available in Australia and New Zealand beside those described in section 1.8 of the Consultation paper? - If yes, please provide details here and justify with evidence.	
Are you aware of other sources of information (publically available or otherwise) on the added sugars content of foods available in Australia and New Zealand beside those described in section 1.8 of the Consultation paper? - Please attach references.	Not Answered
Are you aware of other sources of information (publically available or otherwise) on the added sugars content of foods available in Australia and New Zealand beside those described in section 1.8 of the Consultation paper? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Do you agree with the desired outcome of this work "Food labels provide adequate contextual information about sugars to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of the dietary guidelines"? - Do you agree with the desired outcome of this work Food labels provide adequate contextual information about sugars to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of the dietary guidelines?	Yes
Do you agree with the desired outcome of this work "Food labels provide adequate contextual information about sugars to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of the dietary guidelines"? - If no, please suggest an alternate desired outcome and justify your suggestion.	
Do you agree with the desired outcome of this work "Food labels provide adequate contextual information about sugars to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of the dietary guidelines"? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Do you agree with the desired outcome of this work "Food labels provide adequate contextual information about sugars to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of the dietary guidelines"? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option  - How effective would this option be in addressing the policy issue and achieving the desired outcome?	Not effective
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option  - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	<p>We know from Labelling Logic, that there is a need for greater consumer awareness of the relative healthiness of different foods to facilitate better food choices. The food label is one arm of a comprehensive approach to tackling public health problems that is supported and reinforced by other initiatives such as education, social marketing, individualised dietary guidance, food literacy skill development and changes in the food supply.</p> <p>Therefore, while education will raise consumer awareness and may assist consumers to interpret existing information on food labels, as a stand-alone option it will not address the policy problem. It will not provide consumers with contextual information on the types of ingredients which are sugars (e.g. glucose, honey, corn syrup or high-fructose corn syrup).</p> <p>It is considered that consumer education should underpin the progression of any option to achieve the policy problem; but that it should only be considered in association with the preferred option/s, and not as a stand-alone option.</p> <p>While regulators and public health professionals know the consumption of added sugar plays a role in overweight and obesity, as there is no recommended dietary intake guide equivalent to other nutrients, sugar needs to be considered within an individual's whole diet and lifestyle. It is therefore recommended that education be progressed as a part of overarching healthy eating guidance which will then allow consumers to make educated decisions within the context of the overall diet instead of looking at individual products which may make up a very small proportion of their diet.</p>
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option  - Is the description of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed option (compared to the status quo) accurate?	Yes
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option  - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option  - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option  - Are there additional strengths and weaknesses associated with the proposed option (compared with the status quo)?	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option  - Please describe what these are?	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option  - Please attach references here	Not Answered

Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Impacts - How would this option impact you?	Somewhat
Impacts - Please provide impacts and cost relevant to you, with evidence to justify your views.	<p>More than half of Queensland children and adults consume over 10 percent of their total daily energy from added sugars found in food and beverages such as soft drinks, confectionery, cakes and biscuits. This excess consumption of added sugar contributes to weight gain, which leads to higher risk of obesity and development of chronic diseases, particularly diabetes, and increases the risk of tooth decay. Education about the existing information for sugar on food labels may assist Queenslanders to better understand the total sugar content of food, leading to healthier purchasing decisions, and healthier eating.</p> <p>Given education is being discussed in multiple areas relating to food labelling, including the Health Star Rating 5-year review, kilojoule menu labelling, food waste and added sugars, it may be beneficial to consider an overarching education campaign which incorporates all components of a food label to help consumers to interpret and make healthier choices in a whole-of-diet context. It is assumed that an education campaign will be funded by jurisdictions using the AHMAC cost-sharing formula. Further advice or consideration in relation to Queensland's support would be made following further development and costings of the education strategy. Alternatively, a campaign could be funded through ISFR/FRSC project funds.</p> <p>Unless a national campaign provides new information, it would be difficult for Queensland Health to support it. That is, the national campaign would need to be focussed on labelling changes that had been agreed.</p>
Impacts - Please attach evidence to justify your views.	Not Answered
Impacts - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - How effective would this option be in addressing the policy issue and achieving the desired outcome?	Effective
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	<p>Labelling Logic identifies that the primary role of the ingredient list is to reassure the purchaser that the food contains the ingredients expected to be present, as depicted by the name of the food. It presents a list of the components of the product, including the percentage of key or characterising ingredients, provides information on food components that the consumer may wish to avoid (e.g., allergens, some additives); and could act to support dietary guidelines through identification of wholegrains, fruit, vegetable and nut components. Information is specific in nature.</p> <p>Therefore, having added sugars collectively grouped, or bracketed, in the ingredients list will provide an accurate reflection of added sugars in products as opposed to these ingredients being listed separately. While it is technically accurate for manufacturers to list added sugars separately, consumers often do not have the knowledge to be able to identify which ingredients are sugars, reducing the opportunity for the consumer to quickly assess the overall contribution of added sugars in a food.</p> <p>Collective placement of added sugars in the ingredient list will maximise the impact of the nutrition information and provide consumers with contextual information as to the contribution added sugar makes to the product. Collective placement also could help reduce consumer confusion around names used for sugar-based ingredients; and increase consumer trust in food manufacturers.</p> <p>Queensland Health does not support added sugars being bolded or marked by an asterisk in the ingredient list as this may cause confusion with the mandatory labelling of allergens and does not allow for a simple point-of-purchase decision when trying to either add up differing ingredients or locate information on the label that relates to an asterisk.</p> <p>Listing ingredients in a standardised manner will provide basic information to enable consumers to make easier and more informed decisions regarding the selection of foods to meet their dietary needs.</p>
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Is the description of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed option (compared to the status quo) accurate?	Yes
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Are there additional strengths and weaknesses associated with the proposed option (compared with the status quo)?	No
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please describe what these are?	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Impacts - How would this option impact you?	Somewhat
Impacts - Please provide impacts and cost relevant to you, with evidence to justify your view.	<p>Queensland Health would be impacted via costs of monitoring and enforcement to be undertaken by regulatory officers. While it is considered that enforcement would be undertaken within existing resources as a part of ongoing compliance monitoring and enforcement, it is expected that initially, this additional resource would be required to develop resources and information packs for both industry and consumers to explain the provisions.</p> <p>The Queensland Government's Our Future State priorities include increasing the number of Queenslanders with a healthy body weight. Clearly highlighting the sugar-based ingredients on food labels supports this priority as it may assist Queenslanders to better understand the added sugar content of food, leading to healthier purchasing decisions, and healthier eating. However, as previously indicated, it would be important for this labelling change to be accompanied by education. Some consumers may not be aware that ingredients are listed in accordance with weight. This message would be important to include in education strategies, so that consumers understand the meaning of collective placement of sugar-based ingredients.</p>
Impacts - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Impacts - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Implementation mechanism - Referring to Table 1 in section 3 in the Consultation paper "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms", which implementation mechanism would be most appropriate for this policy option?	Regulatory

	<p>It can be argued that a voluntary system will provide no difference than status quo and that industry led or government driven codes of practice may compete with the Health Star Rating system. Given the Health Star Rating provides an overarching picture for the product, Queensland Health would not like to see any system for a single nutrient which may reduce uptake or compete with the Health Star Rating.</p> <p>It is considered that the only appropriate implementation mechanism for this option is regulation. The Food Standards Code already mandates the statement of ingredients under Standard 1.2.4. This Standard could be amended to require industry to collectively place added sugars in the statement of ingredients.</p> <p>'Upstream' interventions delivered on a broad scale, such as legislation, typically achieve greater return on investment. A 2017 systematic review of the return of investment from existing public health interventions delivered in Australia and other industrialised countries showed that for every dollar invested in legislation there was a median return of \$46, compared with a median return of \$2 for health promotion initiatives (Masters R, Anwar E, Collins B, et al. Return on investment of public health interventions - a systematic review, Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health 2017;71 827-834).</p>
Implementation mechanism - Please provide the pros and cons of your selected implementation mechanism, using evidence to justify your view.	While Queensland Health supports regulation, it considers that any regulatory measures should be developed in consultation with industry, public health groups and other stakeholders.
Implementation mechanism - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Implementation mechanism - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
would this option be in addressing the policy issue and achieving the desired outcome?	Effective
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	<p>The Nutrition Information Panel (NIP) provides an important role within a comprehensive approach to the provision of nutrition information on the food label. (JM Wills, DB Schmidt, F Pillo-Blocka &amp; G Cairns, 'Exploring global consumer attitudes toward nutrition information on food labels', Nutrition Reviews, vol. 67, supplement 1, 2009, pp. S102-S106.) Within the context of the overall food label, the NIP provides quantitative information on nutrients in the food and can act as an important link between the various nutrition labelling components. The NIP acts to augment other nutritional information on the label. As the NIP allows consumers to make a quick numerical assessment of nutritional information, it is considered that the inclusion of added sugars into the NIP in addition to current requirements will provide consumers with contextual information on added sugar allowing those who prefer numbers over words to make an informed decision. However, it is suggested that to achieve the policy intent, added sugars should be both included in the NIP and grouped collectively within the ingredients list to cater for differing literacy levels.</p> <p>The presentation of the NIP has in previous reviews, received considerable attention as consumers have found it confusing, if not misleading. This is particularly the case in relation to the declaration of amounts of nutrients per serve and the practice of nutrient declaration as a percentage of daily intake.</p> <p>Percentage of daily intake was ruled out during the development of the Health Star Rating due to consumers needing high numeracy skills to be able to consider this information in association with other foods consumed. Therefore, it is not considered appropriate to incorporate percentage daily intake information into the NIP next to the amount of added sugar.</p> <p>In addition, with the known low literacy for rates for label interpretation, categorisation such as high/medium/low will not give consumers context regarding consumption of those products in relation to their whole-of-diet and lifestyle. This type of rating does not give context around what makes it high/medium/low sugar (and the limits used to determine the rating) or whether high/medium/low intake is good and how this compares to other nutrients, i.e. low sugar, high dietary fibre, or medium sugar, low saturated fat. There is a risk that Queenslanders consume excessive amounts of products lower in added sugars that are promoted as 'healthier', even when they are higher in energy, saturated fat and/or sodium, a phenomenon known as the 'halo' effect.</p> <p>There is also concern that the inclusion of contextual information such as high/medium/low for sugar only, will place a higher weighting of importance on sugar over other nutrients including saturated fat, sodium, fibre and energy. There is also concern in relation to how the rating (i.e. 5% or less is low, 15% or more is high) will impact products with naturally occurring sugar such as yogurt or breakfast cereals with dried fruit. It is therefore considered that a ranking system will cause confusion to consumers and is not supported by Queensland Health. Noting the role of the Health Star Rating in relation to a whole-of-product context, it is important that any option considered does not undermine the intent of the Health Star Rating. Queensland Health therefore does not support the inclusion of additional contextual information such as percentage of daily intake or high/medium/low, but does support added sugars being clearly articulated in the NIP as a separate line under sugars.</p>
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Is the description of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed option (compared to the status quo) accurate?	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Are there additional strengths and weaknesses associated with the proposed option (compared with the status quo)?	No
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please describe what these are?	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Impacts - How would this option impact you?	Somewhat
Impacts - Please provide impacts and cost relevant to you, with evidence to justify your view.	<p>Queensland Health would be impacted via costs of monitoring and enforcement to be undertaken by regulatory officers. While it is considered that enforcement would be undertaken within existing resources as a part of ongoing compliance monitoring and enforcement, it is expected that initially, this additional resource would be required to develop resources and information packs for both industry and consumers to explain the provisions.</p> <p>The Queensland Government's Our Future State priorities include increasing the number of Queenslanders with a healthy body weight. Expanding the NIP requirements to include added sugar supports this priority as it may assist Queenslanders to better understand the added sugar content of food, leading to healthier purchasing decisions, and healthier eating. However, as previously indicated, it would be important for this labelling change to be accompanied by education on how to read and use the NIP.</p>
Impacts - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Impacts - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Impact on existing elements of a food label - How would the proposed option impact existing elements of a food label (both mandatory and voluntary)?	<p>The NIP provides quantified information on major nutrients in sufficient detail to inform consumers who have or are concerned about specific chronic illnesses/conditions. It is acknowledged that space on a label is in high demand and industry may be reluctant to make any changes to the label including expansion of the NIP.</p> <p>However, to provide an overarching context on the impact added sugars have on a product, it is considered that the addition of one line in the NIP will not impose on the industry's ability to incorporate this minor amendment which will have significant impact for concerned consumers.</p> <p>Acknowledging work undertaken as part of progression of pregnancy warning labels on alcohol, in Australia, it is the estimated to cost approximately \$340 AUD per SKU to change labels. When spread across the entire SKU, this amount equates to a cent or less per item. It is therefore considered that industry will merely absorb this minimal cost per item rather than pass it onto consumers. This evidence shows that industry can easily and cost effectively incorporate this change with minimal cost.</p> <p>The inclusion of added sugar in the NIP would support the nutrition content claims (e.g. low sugar, no added sugar, unsweetened) that are allowed in relation to sugar.</p> <p>The issue of including added sugar rather than total sugar in the algorithm to determine the star rating has been raised during the five-year review of the Health Star Rating. If the NIP is required to include added sugar, it would be appropriate to consider amending the Health Star Rating algorithm to align with the NIP. However, it would be essential that comprehensive modelling is undertaken to determine the impact of this change on all products that are eligible to display the Health Star Rating.</p>
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Would adopting this option require another element of a food label to be removed from the package?	Maybe
Impact on existing elements of a food label - If so, which labelling element/s would be removed?	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please provide evidence to justify your response.	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered

Implementation mechanism - Referring to Table 1 in Section 3 of the Consultation paper "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms", which implementation mechanism would be most appropriate for this policy option	Regulatory
Implementation mechanism - Please provide further comments here	Please see response to question 9. It is considered that the only appropriate implementation mechanism for this option is regulation. The Food Standards Code already mandates the NIP under Standard 1.2.8. This Standard could be amended to require industry to disclose the amount of added sugar in the NIP.
Implementation mechanism - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Implementation mechanism - Please provide pros and cons of your selected implementation mechanism, using evidence to justify your response.	
Implementation mechanism - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Implementation mechanism - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - How effective would this option be in addressing the policy issue and achieving the desired outcome?	Not effective
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	<p>In the interests of fairness and equity, Governments who instigate mandatory messages that support preventative health strategies need to meet the same high standards demanded of industry-initiated health claims in terms of substantiation requirements. In equivalence with industry-initiated health claims, the proposed actions would need to be sustained by a comprehensive nutrition policy or national health guidelines. However, unlike industry which invests its own money in making industry-initiated health claims, government is investing tax payer funds so an even higher standard should be demanded. Therefore, for any mandated public health message, the epidemiological evidence would have to be powerful, justifying the intervention by reference to both the extent of the health problem in the population and the strength of the causal relations between the health problems and the messages.</p> <p>Noting the food regulation system and Ministers have previously acknowledged that space on a label is in high demand, should the requirement for advisory labels be introduced, this will further reduce the space available for commercial interests and industry are likely to be reluctant to pursue such an option.</p> <p>Should an advisory statement be progressed for sugar, there is concern that this may overshadow or negate other nutrients and may undermine the Health Star Rating which provides a wholistic view of the product, not a single nutrient.</p> <p>The evidence underpinning the Australian Dietary Guidelines indicates a probable association between consumption of sugar-sweetened drinks and increased risk of weight gain in adults and children. Australians, on average, consume 60 grams (14 teaspoons) of added sugar every day, with half coming from sugar-sweetened drinks. However, given that both the evidence and the overconsumption of added sugars, relates to sugar-sweetened drinks, it could be argued that if mandatory advisory labels were introduced, that they apply to sugar-sweetened drinks only. It is likely that consumers are already aware that sugar-sweetened drinks are high in sugar, and therefore the effectiveness of mandatory advisory labels on reducing consumption may be minimal.</p> <p>In the event a limit is set for when an advisory statement must be included, like the requirements implemented in Chile (i.e. high in sugars), there is concern how this proposal may impact products that are naturally high in sugar such as yoghurt or dried fruit. As Queensland Health supports the Australian Dietary Guidelines of consuming a varied diet of nutritious foods from the five groups, while also limiting consumption of added sugar, saturated fat and sodium, any proposed option progressed must be mindful of whole-of-diet requirements.</p>
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Is the description of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed option (compared to the status quo) accurate?	Mostly
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Are there additional strengths and weaknesses associated with the proposed option (compared with the status quo)?	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please describe what these are?	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Impact - How would this option impact you?	Somewhat
Impact - Please provide impacts and cost relevant to you, with evidence to justify your response.	<p>There is concern over how limits such as low/medium/high will be enforced and associated costs with analysis required to determine compliance.</p> <p>Queensland Health would be impacted via costs of monitoring and enforcement to be undertaken by regulatory officers. While it is considered that enforcement would be undertaken within existing resources as a part of ongoing compliance monitoring and enforcement, it is expected that initially, this additional resource would be required to develop resources and information packs for both industry and consumers to explain the provisions.</p> <p>As indicated previously, the Queensland Government's Our Future State priorities include increasing the number of Queenslanders with a healthy body weight. Mandatory advisory labels for products high in sugar supports this priority as it may assist Queenslanders to better understand the added sugar content of food, leading to healthier purchasing decisions, and healthier eating. However, it would be important to consider the effectiveness of this approach over the other options proposed.</p>
Impact - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Impact - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered

Impact on existing elements of a food label - How would the proposed option impact existing elements of a food label (both mandatory and voluntary)?	<p>As discussed in question 14, the introduction of advisory labels would result in competition for space on the label. Noting costs (minor but albeit costs) to industry to change labels and the available space, it is likely that should mandatory advisory labels be introduced, some other component, likely to be a voluntary component, would need to be removed to enable all mandatory components to be accommodated.</p> <p>Depending on where advisory labels are required to be located, i.e. in a prominent location on the front-of-pack, ensuring the information is easily accessible to consumers when making product choice, it is expected that this option may result in businesses removing the Health Star Rating. Concerns over the removal of the Health Star Rating has been discussed in previous responses.</p> <p>While implementation of advisory labels may give industry the incentive to change products to emphasise their positive attributes and minimise negative attributes (for example, reformulation), this may also result in other consequences. For example, trans fats may be replaced with saturated fat or consumers may feel encouraged to eat more when a product is promoted as 'healthier' (i.e. medium sugar content rather than high), a phenomenon known as the 'halo' effect.</p> <p>Therefore, while food labelling can facilitate changes in product formulation and support the increased availability of healthy food products, the process needs to be monitored and managed to ensure that unintended negative consequences do not result.</p>
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Would adopting this option require another element of a food label to be removed from the package?	Depends
Impact on existing elements of a food label - If so, which labelling elements would be removed?	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please provide evidence to justify your response.	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Implementation mechanism - Referring to Table 1 in Section 3 of the Consultation paper "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms", which implementation mechanism would be most appropriate for this policy option?	Regulatory
Implementation mechanism - Please provide pros and cons of your selected implementation mechanism, using evidence to justify your response.	Please see response to question 9. Although, the practicality of this option is questioned, if it was to be implemented, it is considered that the only appropriate implementation mechanism for this option is regulation. The Food Standards Code already mandates the display of warning statements, advisory statements and declarations under Standard 1.2.3. This Standard could be amended to require industry to display warning labels for products high in added sugar.
Implementation mechanism - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Implementation mechanism - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - How effective would this option be in addressing the policy issue and achieving the desired outcome?	Not effective
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	<p>The role of the food label is to (a) facilitate consumers' healthy food choices to enable healthy growth, promote wellbeing, reduce risk of chronic illnesses and manage existing conditions; and (b) provide incentives for food manufacturers to gain a competitive advantage by aligning their product formulations with public health goals.</p> <p>The Health Star Rating system is designed to be a simple front-of-pack labelling system that provides overall 'healthiness' of a product in an easy to read and easily understood star format. Consumers seeking additional information including individual nutrients, can refer to the back of the package. It is considered that the addition of extra pictures to depict one nutrient in a product is likely to detract from the Health Star Rating.</p> <p>Noting the 2013 quantitative research undertaken in the development of the Health Star Rating which suggested that consumers have a desire to have all elements on front-of-pack, rather than specific elements only, it is not considered that pictorial approaches to convey the amount or type of sugar in a product is appropriate.</p> <p>While Queensland Health does not support the progression of pictorial approaches as a mandatory on-label option, industry could develop a standardised picture which is located off-product in a voluntary manner, such as in advertising material or websites which may help to market their product over another.</p>
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Is the description of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed option (compared to the status quo) accurate?	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach evidence here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Are there additional strengths and weaknesses associated with the proposed option (compared with the status quo)?	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please describe what these are?	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Impacts - How would this option impact you?	Somewhat
Impacts - Please provide impacts and cost relevant to you, with evidence to justify your response.	<p>Queensland Health would be impacted via costs of monitoring and enforcement to be undertaken by regulatory officers. While it is considered that enforcement would be undertaken within existing resources as a part of ongoing compliance monitoring and enforcement, it is expected that initially, this additional resource would be required to develop resources and information packs for both industry and consumers to explain the provisions.</p> <p>Pictorial displays of sugar content support the Queensland Government's Our Future State priority of increasing the number of Queenslanders with a healthy body weight. However, it would be important to consider the effectiveness of this approach over the other options proposed.</p>
Impacts - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Impacts - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Impact on existing elements of a food label - How would the proposed option impact existing elements of a food label (both mandatory and voluntary)?	<p>As discussed in question 16, it is considered that the introduction of pictorial approaches could affect the take up of the Health Star Rating which provides an overarching indication of the product. Pictorial approaches may not help consumers to consider a product within a lifestyle and whole-of-diet context.</p> <p>Instead of considering an option which might undermine and reduce impact of the Health Star Rating which has been evaluated as having a positive impact on overweight and obesity, it could be suggested that regulators in consultation with public health advocates and industry develop and implement consumer education on how to read a label and interpret information already available in the context of whole-of-diet and lifestyle.</p>
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Would adopting this option require another element of a food label to be removed from the package?	Maybe
Impact on existing elements of a food label - If so, which labelling elements would be removed?	



Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please provide evidence to justify your response.	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Implementation mechanism - Referring to Table 1 in Section 3 of the Consultation paper "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms", which implementation mechanism would be most appropriate for this policy option?	Regulatory
Implementation mechanism - Please provide pros and cons of your selected implementation mechanism, using evidence to justify your response.	Please see response to question 9. Although, this option is not supported, if it was to be implemented as proposed, it is considered that the only appropriate implementation mechanism for this option is regulation. Consideration of whether pictorial displays could be incorporated within an existing standard in the Food Standards Code, or whether a new standard would need to be developed would be needed.  If as suggested in question 18, industry developed standardised off-product pictorial displays of added sugar content, this could be implemented through an industry-led code of practice or as a voluntary scheme.
Implementation mechanism - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Implementation mechanism - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - How effective would this option be in addressing the policy issue and achieving the desired outcome?	Not effective
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	The policy options paper notes that a strength of this proposed option is that further information about sugar in small packages which do not have NIPs could be provided. Noting these products are sold in small packages demonstrates that these products are not consumed in large amounts compared to other larger packages, therefore, additional information about sugar in these products is unlikely to have a significant impact on overweight and obesity and this is not seen as a strength to promote this option.  Queensland Health considers that consumers are highly unlikely to source off label information when making purchasing decisions as we know that consumers want readily available information at the time of making the decision. In addition, research undertaken during the development of the Health Star Rating around off-label information indicated that internet access when in large shopping centres was at times difficult making this option less viable.  Further consideration of the consumer uptake of other digital linking to off-label information, e.g. the "Track Your Impact" on Thank You water, personal care and baby products, would be needed.
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Is the description of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed option (compared to the status quo) accurate?	Mostly
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Are there additional strengths and weaknesses associated with the proposed option (compared with the status quo)?	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please describe what these are?	
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Impact - How would this option impact you?	Somewhat
Impact - Please provide impacts and cost relevant to you, with evidence to justify your response.	Queensland Health would be impacted via costs of monitoring and enforcement to be undertaken by regulatory officers.  While it is considered that enforcement would likely be undertaken within existing resources as a part of ongoing compliance monitoring and enforcement, it is expected that initially, this additional resource would be required to develop resources and information packs for both industry and consumers to explain the provisions. The enforcement of off-label information does raise enforcement concerns as industry are able to frequently and easily change this information making it extremely difficult for regulators to both keep up with changing information and to gather evidence of breaches.  Off-label web-based information may encourage Queenslanders to purchase and consume fewer products with added sugar, thus supporting the Queensland Government's Our Future State priority of increasing the number of Queenslanders with a healthy body weight. However, it would be important to consider the effectiveness of this approach over the other options proposed.
Impact - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Impact - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Impact on existing elements of a food label - How would the proposed option impact existing elements of a food label (both mandatory and voluntary)?	As with some of the previous options, the inclusion of a QR code, web address or other means of directing consumers for further information will compete for available space on the label. It is therefore expected that the implementation of this option would see the removal of other element/s due to the competition for space. Noting the concept of mandatory requirements, should this option be progressed, it is assumed that industry will forgo voluntary components of the label.
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Would adopting this option require another element of a food label to be removed from the package?	Maybe
Impact on existing elements of a food label - If so, which labelling elements would be removed?	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please provide evidence to justify your response.	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Implementation mechanisms - Referring to Table 1 in Section 3 of the Consultation paper "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms", which implementation mechanism would be most appropriate for this policy option?	Code of practice - industry driven
Implementation mechanisms - Please provide pros and cons of your selected implementation mechanism, using evidence to justify your response.	Although, this option is not supported, if it was to be implemented as proposed, it is considered that the most appropriate implementation mechanism for this option is an industry-led code of practice or a voluntary scheme.

Implementation mechanisms - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Implementation mechanisms - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Are there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome? - re there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome?	No
Are there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome? - If yes, please describe your suggested option and how it addresses the policy issue and would achieve the desired outcome.	Public health issues require multi-strategy approaches to achieve success. (World Health Organization, Interventions on diet and physical activity what works summary report, WHO, Geneva, 2009). Therefore, consideration must be given to the progression of more than one policy option to ensure the problem as articulated in resolved.
Are there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome? - Please provide evidence to justify your response.	As previously suggested, Queensland Health would like to see the progression of a combination of options 3 and 4 underpinned with a comprehensive and sustained education strategy on the total diet/how to read a label. It is viewed that the collective grouping of sugars in the ingredient list with added sugars identified in the NIP will provide context to consumers to allow them to make informed choices in support of dietary guidelines that is easy to interpret and understand.
Are there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Are there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome? - Please also describe the cost of implementing your proposed option.	
Are there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome? - Please provide evidence for costing assumptions.	
Are there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Are there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
If you proposed a different option at question 26, please detail the strengths and weaknesses of your proposed option, compared with the status quo. - If you proposed a different option at question 26, please detail the strengths and weaknesses of your proposed option, compared with the status quo. Please provide evidence to justify your response.	NA
If you proposed a different option at question 26, please detail the strengths and weaknesses of your proposed option, compared with the status quo. - Please attach references here	Not Answered
If you proposed a different option at question 26, please detail the strengths and weaknesses of your proposed option, compared with the status quo. - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Option 3 - Change to statement of ingredients - All packaged foods	All packaged foods
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Option 3 - Change to statement of ingredients - Particular foods or food categories (please specify below)	
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Option 4 - Added sugars quantified in NIP - All packaged foods	All packaged foods
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Option 4 - Added sugars quantified in NIP - Particular foods or food categories (please specify below)	
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Option 5 - Advisory labels for foods high in added sugars - All packaged foods	All packaged foods
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Option 5 - Advisory labels for foods high in added sugars - Particular foods or food categories (please specify below)	

Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Option 6 - Pictorial approaches to convey the amount or types of sugars in a serving of food. - All packaged foods	All packaged foods
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Option 6 - Pictorial approaches to convey the amount or types of sugars in a serving of food. - Particular foods or food categories (please specify below)	
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - If you have selected any particular food categories, please specify which foods or food categories and justify your position provide examples of foods.	Any option considered should be included on all packaged products to allow for all products to be compared equally. In the event, the preferred option is not applied to all products, this may lead to consumer confusion and to believe that products not containing the information do not contain added sugar and are therefore a healthy product
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1 "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Voluntary	Accurate
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1 "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	Yes, the pros and cons accurately reflect different implementation mechanisms. The one exception is that high compliance costs for business for regulatory mechanisms is not necessarily accurate for all options. Based on the recent pregnancy warning labels on alcohol consultation, the cost to change labels was minimal. It is anticipated that regulating options 3 and 4, which involve relatively minor labelling changes, would not result in high compliance costs for business.
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1 "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1 "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Code of Practice - Voluntary	
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1 "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1 "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please attach references here.	Not Answered
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1 "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Code of Practice - Government driven	Accurate
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1 "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1 "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please attach references here.	Not Answered
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1 "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Regulatory	Accurate
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1 "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1 "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please attach references here.	Not Answered
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1 "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Voluntary - are there other pros and cons?	No

Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Voluntary If yes, other pros and cons associated with this mechanism.	
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Code of Practice - Voluntary are there other pros and cons?	No
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Code of Practice - Voluntary If yes, other pros and cons associated with this mechanism.	
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Code of Practice - Government driven are there other pros and cons?	No
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Code of Practice - Government driven If yes, other pros and cons associated with this mechanism.	
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Regulatory are there other pros and cons?	No
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Regulatory If yes, other pros and cons associated with this mechanism	
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Are there any other benefits or costs associated with the proposed labelling options which have not been identified? - Are there any other benefits or costs associated with the proposed labelling options which have not been identified?	Yes
Are there any other benefits or costs associated with the proposed labelling options which have not been identified? - If yes, please provide details here, using evidence to justify your response.	An additional benefit that was not identified in the consultation paper is that added sugar labelling may also assist governments and government agencies to implement and monitor a range of other initiatives and policies, such as the Healthy Food Partnership's proposed reformulation targets for sugar, the Australian Beverages Council commitment to reduce sugar content, or preventing fortification of vitamins and minerals in high-sugar products
Are there any other benefits or costs associated with the proposed labelling options which have not been identified? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Are there any other benefits or costs associated with the proposed labelling options which have not been identified? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Should there be exemptions or other accommodations (such as longer transition periods) made for small businesses, to minimise the regulatory burden? - Should there be exemptions or other accommodations (such as longer transition periods) made for small businesses, to minimise the regulatory burden?	No
Should there be exemptions or other accommodations (such as longer transition periods) made for small businesses, to minimise the regulatory burden? - If so, what exemptions or other accommodations do you suggest? Please justify your response.	No additional exemptions or transitional arrangements should apply to small business. It is considered appropriate for standard transitional provisions to be utilised to guarantee consistency across products and ensure maximum impact with consumers. As uptake of the Health Star Rating has shown, small businesses can and do make labelling changes prior to larger businesses making changes.
Should there be exemptions or other accommodations (such as longer transition periods) made for small businesses, to minimise the regulatory burden? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Should there be exemptions or other accommodations (such as longer transition periods) made for small businesses, to minimise the regulatory burden? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
What would be the cost per year for industry to self-regulate (e.g. voluntary code of practice-industry driven)? - What would be the cost per year for industry to self-regulate. Please justify your response with hours of time, and number of staff required.	Given there is industry concern around the amount of space available on a label and that the Health Star Rating system is voluntary, it is unlikely industry will voluntarily implement more labelling which may reduce sales due to consumers making alternative/healthier choices. It is therefore considered that industry self-regulation would be low as industry do not want to publicise what is seen by many consumers as a 'downside' to their products.
What would be the cost per year for industry to self-regulate (e.g. voluntary code of practice-industry driven)? - Please specify which country (Australia or New Zealand) your evidence is based on.	
What would be the cost per year for industry to self-regulate (e.g. voluntary code of practice-industry driven)? - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	
What would be the cost per year for industry to self-regulate (e.g. voluntary code of practice-industry driven)? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
What would be the cost per year for industry to self-regulate (e.g. voluntary code of practice-industry driven)? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Would industry pass any of the costs associated with implementing the proposed options on to consumers? - Would industry pass any of the costs associated with implementing the proposed options on to consumers?	Depends
Would industry pass any of the costs associated with implementing the proposed options on to consumers? - What is the basis for your view?	Using information gathered as part of progression of pregnancy warning labels on alcohol, for Australia, it is the estimated to cost approximately \$340 AUD per SKU to change labels. When spread across the entire SKU, this amount equates to a cent or less per item. It is considered that industry will merely absorb this minimal cost per item rather than pass it onto consumers.
Would industry pass any of the costs associated with implementing the proposed options on to consumers? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Would industry pass any of the costs associated with implementing the proposed options on to consumers? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Last Modified Date	2018-09-19 14 58 05
Response ID	ANON-V5E5-G41G-P

IP Address	\$ 47F
Created Date	2018-09-19 14 21 20
Citizen Space Version	v3.11.3-v3-frontend
Consultation State	open
Browser Identification	Mozilla/5.0 (Windows NT 6.1; WOW64; rv 45.0) Gecko/20100101 Firefox/45.0
Submitted Date	2018-09-19 14 58 28
Visited Pages - Submitter details	Submitter details
Visited Pages - Have you read the Consultation Regulation Impact Statement?	Have you read the Consultation Regulation Impact Statement?
Visited Pages - Survey Questions 1-4	Survey Questions 1-4
Visited Pages - Option 2 Education on how to read and interpret labelling information about sugars	Option 2 Education on how to read and interpret labelling information about sugars
Visited Pages - Option 3 Change to statement of ingredients	Option 3 Change to statement of ingredients
Visited Pages - Option 4 Added sugars quantified in the NIP	Option 4 Added sugars quantified in the NIP
Visited Pages - Option 5 Advisory labels for foods high in added sugars	Option 5 Advisory labels for foods high in added sugars
Visited Pages - Option 6 Pictorial approaches to convey the amount or types of sugars in a serving of food.	Option 6 Pictorial approaches to convey the amount or types of sugars in a serving of food.
Visited Pages - Option 7 Digital linking to off label web-based information about added sugars content	Option 7 Digital linking to off label web-based information about added sugars content
Visited Pages - Survey Questions 26-30 (on all proposed policy options)	Survey Questions 26-30 (on all proposed policy options)
Visited Pages - Implementation mechanisms	Implementation mechanisms
Visited Pages - Impact analysis (costs and benefits)	Impact analysis (costs and benefits)

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN RELEASED UNDER  
THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 1982 (CTH)  
BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

Privacy and confidential information and permissions - Consent	No
Privacy and confidential information and permissions - If you want all or parts of this submission to be confidential please state why.	
Submitter information - Full name	S 47F
Submitter information - Are you answering on behalf of an organisation?	Yes
Submitter information - If you answered yes to the question above please provide your organisations' name	Dpeartment of Health and Human Services
Submitter information - Sector	Government
Submitter information - Please provide your email address.	S 47F
Submitter information - Phone Number	S 47F
Submitter information - If we require further information in relation to this submission can we contact you?	Yes
Have you read the Public Consultation Regulation Impact Statement: Labelling of sugars on packaged foods and drinks?	
(Please click on the link above to open the document) - Have you read the Public Consultation Regulation Impact Statement: Labelling of sugars on packaged foods and drinks	Yes
"Information about sugar provided on food labels in Australia and New Zealand does not provide adequate contextual information to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of dietary guidelines"? - Do you support the statement of the problem: Information about sugar provided on food labels in Australia and New Zealand does not provide adequate contextual information to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of dietary guidelines.	Not Answered
Do you support the statement of the problem:	<p>The Department supports the intention of the statement presented on page 7. However the 2013 Australian Dietary Guidelines and 2015 New Zealand Eating and Activity Guidelines are explicit about limiting intake of foods containing added sugars' and choosing and/or preparing foods and drinks with little or no added sugar'. Therefore the statement of the problem could be strengthened by referring to added sugars' for example:</p> <p>'Information about added sugars provided on food labels in Australia and New Zealand does not provide adequate contextual information to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of dietary guidelines'.</p> <p>With no internationally agreed upon definition for added sugars' it is imperative that a clear and explicit definition be developed. It is acknowledged that whilst the specifications about which particular types of sugars should be included in this definition are not considered in this paper the Department would like to note the following:</p> <p>The definition of sugars outlined in the Food Standards in Schedule 4 (Nutrition health and related claims) under S4-3 (Conditions for nutrition content claims) states that to make a claim of No Added Sugar a food must contain no added sugars honey malt or malt extracts and ... no added concentrated fruit juice or deionised fruit juice'.</p> <p>The definition of added sugars' used by the United States FDA in the labelling of added sugars' in the Nutrition Facts Label is a useful reference point when defining added sugars' in the Australian and New Zealand context:</p> <p>"Added sugars' are either added during the processing of foods or are packaged as such and include sugars (free mono- and disaccharides) sugars from syrups and honey and sugars from concentrated fruit or vegetable juices that are in excess of what would be expected from the same volume of 100 percent fruit or vegetable juice of the same type" [reference = The Code of Federal Regulations (refer Title 21 Chapter 1 Subchapter B Part101). Available at: www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text id?ID=57331c73d201d4f697a3900d82b38e70&amp;mc=true&amp;node=pt21.2.101&amp;rgn=div5#se21.2.101_19 (accessed 5 September 2018)]</p> <p>The addition of information about added sugars' on food labels may drive reformulation to reduce the amount of added sugars in the food supply however consideration also needs to be given to the potential to increase the use of intense sweeteners. The Department supports the need for ongoing surveillance and dietary modelling to assess intake of intense sweeteners from foods across the food supply.</p>
Do you support the statement of the problem:	
"Information about sugar provided on food labels in Australia and New Zealand does not provide adequate contextual information to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of dietary guidelines"? - If you would like to provide an alternate problem definition please enter it below and justify your statement with evidence	'Information about added sugars provided on food labels in Australia and New Zealand does not provide adequate contextual information to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of dietary guidelines'.
Do you support the statement of the problem:	
"Information about sugar provided on food labels in Australia and New Zealand does not provide adequate contextual information to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of dietary guidelines"? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
"Information about sugar provided on food labels in Australia and New Zealand does not provide adequate contextual information to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of dietary guidelines"? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Are you aware of any form of information about added sugars that is provided on food labels in addition to those identified in section 1.6 of the Consultation paper? - Are you aware of any form of information about added sugars that is provided on food labels in addition to those identified in section 1.5 of the Consultation paper?	No
Are you aware of any form of information about added sugars that is provided on food labels in addition to those identified in section 1.6 of the Consultation paper? - If yes please provide details here and justify with evidence.	
Are you aware of any form of information about added sugars that is provided on food labels in addition to those identified in section 1.6 of the Consultation paper? - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	Not Answered
Are you aware of any form of information about added sugars that is provided on food labels in addition to those identified in section 1.6 of the Consultation paper? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Are you aware of other sources of information (publically available or otherwise) on the added sugars content of foods available in Australia and New Zealand beside those described in section 1.8 of the Consultation paper? - Are you aware of other sources of information (publically or otherwise) on the added sugars content of food available in Australia and New Zealand?	No

Are you aware of other sources of information (publically available or otherwise) on the added sugars content of foods available in Australia and New Zealand beside those described in section 1.8 of the Consultation paper? - If yes please provide deta is here and justify with evidence.	
Are you aware of other sources of information (publically available or otherwise) on the added sugars content of foods available in Australia and New Zealand beside those described in section 1.8 of the Consultation paper? - Please attach references.	Not Answered
Are you aware of other sources of information (publically available or otherwise) on the added sugars content of foods available in Australia and New Zealand beside those described in section 1.8 of the Consultation paper? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Do you agree with the desired outcome of this work: "Food labels provide adequate contextual information about sugars to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of the dietary guidelines"? - Do you agree with the desired outcome of this work: Food labels provide adequate contextual information about sugars to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of the dietary guidelines?	Yes
Do you agree with the desired outcome of this work: "Food labels provide adequate contextual information about sugars to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of the dietary guidelines"? - If no please suggest an alternate desired outcome and justify your suggestion.	The Department supports the desired outcome of this work and recognises that the addition of information about 'added sugar' on food labels is just one strategy in a suite of activities needed to enable consumers to make informed choices that are consistent with the dietary guidelines. It is unrealistic to expect this work to reduce chronic disease in isolation as all effective interventions require a multi-strategic approach to influence knowledge attitudes and the environment in which people live work play and learn. The Department recognises that across all levels of Government in Australia and New Zealand there are various activities underway to support consumers to limit the consumption of foods containing 'added sugars'. The Department considers the inclusion of 'added sugars' on food labels as an essential component in enabling consumers to make informed choices.
Do you agree with the desired outcome of this work: "Food labels provide adequate contextual information about sugars to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of the dietary guidelines"? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Do you agree with the desired outcome of this work: "Food labels provide adequate contextual information about sugars to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of the dietary guidelines"? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option  - How effective would this option be in addressing the policy issue and achieving the desired outcome?	Effective in combination with another option (please specify below)
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option  - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	Education as a stand-alone option would not be effective in addressing the policy issue as information about 'added sugars' on food labels would still be unavailable to consumers. The Department strongly supports the use of an adequately funded education program when used in conjunction with an option that makes information about 'added sugars' available to the consumer at a minimum option 4 'added sugars quantified in the NIP'. The Department supports a holistic approach to education rather than focusing solely on how to read and interpret labelling information about 'added sugars'. A comprehensive education campaign encompassing all of the food regulatory issues currently being addressed such as the Health Star Rating system alcohol labelling and 'added sugars' labelling would be encouraged.
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option  - Is the description of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed option (compared to the status quo) accurate?	
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option  - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option  - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option  - Are there additional strengths and weaknesses associated with the proposed option (compared with the status quo)?	
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option  - Please describe what these are?	
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option  - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option  - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Impacts - How would this option impact you?	Somewhat
Impacts - Please provide impacts and cost relevant to you with evidence to justify your views.	
Impacts - Please attach evidence to justify your views.	Not Answered
Impacts - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - How effective would this option be in addressing the policy issue and achieving the desired outcome?	
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered

Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Is the description of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed option (compared to the status quo) accurate?	
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Are there additional strengths and weaknesses associated with the proposed option (compared with the status quo)?	
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please describe what these are?	
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Impacts - How would this option impact you?	Somewhat
Impacts - Please provide impacts and cost relevant to you with evidence to justify your view.	
Impacts - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Impacts - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Implementation mechanism - Referring to Table 1 in section 3 in the Consultation paper: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms" which implementation mechanism would be most appropriate for this policy option?	
Implementation mechanism - Please provide the pros and cons of your selected implementation mechanism using evidence to justify your view.	
Implementation mechanism - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Implementation mechanism - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential	Not Answered
would this option be in addressing the policy issue and achieving the desired outcome?	Effective
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	<p>Including information about added sugars' in the Nutrition Information Panel (NIP) is the Departments preferred option to address the policy issue. This approach would be a useful adjunct to the strategies already in place at a state level to provide consumer education on healthy eating. Research indicates that a significant proportion of consumers (72% of Australians and 67% of New Zealanders) use the NIP when purchasing a food for the first time and sugar is the nutrient looked for most frequently (1). This option would be the most effective in enabling consumers to make informed choices in support of the dietary guidelines as it clearly quantifies the amount of added sugars' in a food product enables easy comparison of food products and eliminates the need for consumer skills in identifying sugar based ingredients. This option would be consistent with the United States (US) where the amount of added sugars' in grams and as a percent daily value (%DV) in a serving is included in the Nutrition Facts Label. The US has developed a definition of added sugars' and monitoring and compliance strategies which will provide a useful reference point for Australia and New Zealand.</p> <p>There is some evidence from international research that the inclusion of added sugars' indented below total sugars on a food label can cause some confusion with consumers and effect their comprehension of the total sugar content of a food product(2). Therefore the Department strongly supports an adequately funded education campaign alongside any changes to labelling information about added sugars'. The Department favours a holistic education campaign addressing current food regulatory issues affecting food labels to ensure consumers are able to adequately use and interpret labelling information in order to make informed food choices in support of the dietary guidelines.</p> <p>With international evidence suggesting that consumers are unable to use abstract information such as grams of sugars listed on a label to evaluate whether a food product is high or low in sugars the use of additional contextual information should be considered if this option was to be implemented (3). For example Health Canada requires the % daily reference value for total sugar to be declared in the nutrition facts table which is explained by a footnote that quantifies that 5% or less is a little' and 15% or more is a lot(4). Consideration could be given to using the existing Health Star Rating (HSR) system to provide additional contextual information about added sugars' to avoid adding further complexity to food labels. This will however be dependent on the outcome of the five-year review of the system and whether added sugars' will be integrated into the HSR algorithm. Within the existing HSR system products that meet the requirements of Schedule 4 – Nutrition Health and Related claims for making a low sugar nutrition content claim can identify their product with a low statement and additional cut-offs for products with medium or high added sugars' could be integrated into this system. Additionally contextual information for saturated fat and sodium could be included in the HSR to reduce the overemphasis on added sugars' as the only nutrient of concern. The Department is not supportive of using the %DI labelling to provide additional information about added sugars' as this system has been shown to be difficult to understand and use (5 6).</p> <p>If added sugars' are quantified in the NIP but are not enhanced by additional contextual information on the food label the Department would support the use of digital linking to off label web-based information (option 7). It is essential that added sugars' information is available on the NIP to assist consumers at the point of sale however if additional contextual information cannot be provided through the existing HSR system the Department would support off-label information rather than adding further complexity to food labels. For this to be effective a government driven Code of Practice standardising the way in which this additional contextual information about added sugars' should be provided would be essential.</p> <p>1.Food Standards Australia New Zealand. 2015. Consumer Label Survey Food Labelling Use and Understanding in Australia and New Zealand. Canberra: Food Standards Australia New Zealand. Available at: <a href="http://www.foodstandards.gov.au/publications/Pages/ConsumerLabelSurvey2015.aspx">www.foodstandards.gov.au/publications/Pages/ConsumerLabelSurvey2015.aspx</a> (accessed 5 September 2018).</p> <p>2.Baiguardi I, Solidi K, Smith Edge M et al., 2015. Including "Added Sugars" on the Nutrition Facts Panel: How Consumers Perceive the Proposed Change. Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics 115(11) 1758–1763.</p> <p>3.Mhandpur N, Graham DJ, Roberto CA. 2017. Simplifying mental math: Changing how added sugars are displayed on the nutrition facts label can improve consumer understanding. Appetite 114 38-46.</p> <p>4.Health Canada. 2017. Food Labelling changes. Available at: <a href="http://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/food-labelling-changes.html#a4">www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/food-labelling-changes.html#a4</a> (accessed on 5 September 2018).</p> <p>8.Well B, Hughes C, Chapman K et al. 2009. Consumer testing of the acceptability of effectiveness of front-of-pack food labelling systems for the Australian grocery market. Health Promotion International 24(2) 120–129.</p>
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Is the description of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed option (compared to the status quo) accurate?	
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Are there additional strengths and weaknesses associated with the proposed option (compared with the status quo)?	
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please describe what these are?	
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Impacts - How would this option impact you?	A lot
Impacts - Please provide impacts and cost relevant to you with evidence to justify your view.	This would make it much easier to provide clear messages to the community - i.e cost saving.
Impacts - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Impacts - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Impact on existing elements of a food label - How would the proposed option impact existing elements of a food label (both mandatory and voluntary)?	The Department agrees that information about added sugars' is required on food labels to enable consumers to enact the dietary guidelines. This information is required in addition to the existing mandatory labelling requirements for listing sugar based ingredients in the statement of ingredients and reporting total sugar in the nutrition information panel. The Department does not support the inclusion of information about added sugars' at the expense of existing mandatory labelling requirements.
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Would adopting this option require another element of a food label to be removed from the package?	If the HSR system continues to use total sugar in the algorithm to calculate the star rating of a product but both added sugars' and total sugars are on the NIP the nutrient content declaration on the HSR graphic would need to be modified in order to reduce consumer confusion. The nutrient content declaration concerning sugar would need to clarify that it is referring to the total sugar rather than added sugars'.
Impact on existing elements of a food label - If so which labelling element/s would be removed?	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please provide evidence to justify your response.	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered



Implementation mechanism - Referring to Table 1 in Section 3 of the Consultation paper: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms" which implementation mechanism would be most appropriate for this policy option	
Implementation mechanism - Please provide further comments here	A regulatory approach to this option would be the most appropriate with the Food Standards Code mandating the requirements for declarations about 'added sugars' on the food label. This implementation mechanism will ensure there is a consistent approach to the technical issues associated with defining and declaring 'added sugars' and that there is reliable information provided to consumers in a standardised format. Whilst the Department appreciates that a regulatory approach will come at a cost to business and Australian State and Territory and New Zealand government agencies the potential benefits to achieving improvements in public health should be prioritised.
Implementation mechanism - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Implementation mechanism - Please provide pros and cons of your selected implementation mechanism using evidence to justify your response.	
Implementation mechanism - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Implementation mechanism - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - How effective would this option be in addressing the policy issue and achieving the desired outcome?	
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Is the description of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed option (compared to the status quo) accurate?	
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Are there additional strengths and weaknesses associated with the proposed option (compared with the status quo)?	
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please describe what these are?	
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Impact - How would this option impact you?	Somewhat
Impact - Please provide impacts and cost relevant to you with evidence to justify your response.	
Impact - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Impact - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Impact on existing elements of a food label - How would the proposed option impact existing elements of a food label (both mandatory and voluntary)?	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Would adopting this option require another element of a food label to be removed from the package?	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - If so which labelling elements would be removed?	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please provide evidence to justify your response.	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Implementation mechanism - Referring to Table 1 in Section 3 of the Consultation paper: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms" which implementation mechanism would be most appropriate for this policy option?	
Implementation mechanism - Please provide pros and cons of your selected implementation mechanism using evidence to justify your response.	
Implementation mechanism - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Implementation mechanism - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - How effective would this option be in addressing the policy issue and achieving the desired outcome?	Partially effective
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	The Health Star Rating should be sufficient to convey messages about high vs low added sugar foods - provided the algorithm is adjusted to more negatively impact foods with high added sugar content.
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Is the description of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed option (compared to the status quo) accurate?	

Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach evidence here	Not Answered
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Are there additional strengths and weaknesses associated with the proposed option (compared with the status quo)?	
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please describe what these are?	
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Impacts - How would this option impact you?	Not at all
Impacts - Please provide impacts and cost relevant to you with evidence to justify your response.	
Impacts - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Impacts - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Impact on existing elements of a food label - How would the proposed option impact existing elements of a food label (both mandatory and voluntary)?	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Would adopting this option require another element of a food label to be removed from the package?	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - If so which labelling elements would be removed?	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please provide evidence to justify your response.	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Implementation mechanism - Referring to Table 1 in Section 3 of the Consultation paper: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms" which implementation mechanism would be most appropriate for this policy option?	Regulatory
Implementation mechanism - Please provide pros and cons of your selected implementation mechanism using evidence to justify your response.	
Implementation mechanism - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Implementation mechanism - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - How effective would this option be in addressing the policy issue and achieving the desired outcome?	Not effective
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	Consumers use at a glance information at point of purchase.
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Is the description of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed option (compared to the status quo) accurate?	
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Are there additional strengths and weaknesses associated with the proposed option (compared with the status quo)?	
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please describe what these are?	
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Impact - How would this option impact you?	Somewhat

Impact - Please provide impacts and cost relevant to you with evidence to justify your response.	not as helpful in supporting nutrition education
Impact - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Impact - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Impact on existing elements of a food label - How would the proposed option impact existing elements of a food label (both mandatory and voluntary)?	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Would adopting this option require another element of a food label to be removed from the package?	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - If so which labelling elements would be removed?	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please provide evidence to justify your response.	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Implementation mechanisms - Referring to Table 1 in Section 3 of the Consultation paper: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms" which implementation mechanism would be most appropriate for this policy option?	Regulatory
Implementation mechanisms - Please provide pros and cons of your selected implementation mechanism using evidence to justify your response.	unless the information is available for a l products so consumers can access the information easily it is l kely to be ineffective
Implementation mechanisms - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Implementation mechanisms - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Are there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome? - re there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome?	Not Answered
Are there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome? - If yes please describe your suggested option and how it addresses the policy issue and would achieve the desired outcome.	
Are there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome? - Please provide evidence to justify your response.	
Are there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Are there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome? - Please also describe the cost of implementing your proposed option.	
Are there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome? - Please provide evidence for costing assumptions.	
Are there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Are there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
If you proposed a different option at question 26 please detail the strengths and weaknesses of your proposed option compared with the status quo. - If you proposed a different option at question 26 please detail the strengths and weaknesses of your proposed option compared with the status quo. Please provide evidence to justify your response.	
If you proposed a different option at question 26 please detail the strengths and weaknesses of your proposed option compared with the status quo. - Please attach references here	Not Answered
If you proposed a different option at question 26 please detail the strengths and weaknesses of your proposed option compared with the status quo. - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply or only particular foods or food categories? - Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply or only particular foods or food categories? - Option 3 - Change to statement of ingredients - All packaged foods	All packaged foods
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply or only particular foods or food categories? - Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply or only particular foods or food categories? - Option 3 - Change to statement of ingredients - Particular foods or food categories (please specify below)	

Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply or only particular foods or food categories? - Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply or only particular foods or food categories? - Option 4 - Added sugars quantified in NIP - All packaged foods	All packaged foods
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply or only particular foods or food categories? - Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply or only particular foods or food categories? - Option 4 - Added sugars quantified in NIP - Particular foods or food categories (please specify below)	
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply or only particular foods or food categories? - Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply or only particular foods or food categories? - Option 5 - Advisory labels for foods high in added sugars - All packaged foods	All packaged foods
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply or only particular foods or food categories? - Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply or only particular foods or food categories? - Option 5 - Advisory labels for foods high in added sugars - Particular foods or food categories (please specify below)	
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply or only particular foods or food categories? - Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply or only particular foods or food categories? - Option 6 - Pictorial approaches to convey the amount or types of sugars in a serving of food - All packaged foods	All packaged foods
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply or only particular foods or food categories? - Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply or only particular foods or food categories? - Option 6 - Pictorial approaches to convey the amount or types of sugars in a serving of food - Particular foods or food categories (please specify below)	
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply or only particular foods or food categories? - If you have selected any particular food categories please specify which foods or food categories and justify your position provide examples of foods.	The Department strongly supports the proposed options applying to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply. Applying the proposed options to particular foods or food categories would prove problematic due to difficulties in classifying and categorising foods into food groups. With only a broad definition of discretionary foods described in the 2013 Australian Dietary Guidelines there is debate in practice about what constitutes a discretionary food versus a core food that fits into one of the five food groups. This is further complicated by the ever changing food supply with new and novel foods continually being produced challenging predetermined definitions of discretionary and core foods that align with the dietary guidelines.
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply or only particular foods or food categories? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply or only particular foods or food categories? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Voluntary	
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Code of Practice - Voluntary	
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Code of Practice - Government driven	
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please attach references here	Not Answered

Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Regulatory	
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1: "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Voluntary - are there other pros and cons?	
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Voluntary: If yes other pros and cons associated with this mechanism.	
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Code of Practice - Voluntary: are there other pros and cons?	
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Code of Practice - Voluntary: If yes other pros and cons associated with this mechanism.	
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Code of Practice - Government driven: are there other pros and cons?	
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Code of Practice - Government driven: If yes other pros and cons associated with this mechanism.	
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Regulatory: are there other pros and cons?	
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Regulatory: If yes other pros and cons associated with this mechanism	
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Are there any other benefits or costs associated with the proposed labelling options which have not been identified? - Are there any other benefits or costs associated with the proposed labelling options which have not been identified?	Not Answered
Are there any other benefits or costs associated with the proposed labelling options which have not been identified? - If yes please provide details here using evidence to justify your response.	
Are there any other benefits or costs associated with the proposed labelling options which have not been identified? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Are there any other benefits or costs associated with the proposed labelling options which have not been identified? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Should there be exemptions or other accommodations (such as longer transition periods) made for small businesses to minimise the regulatory burden? - Should there be exemptions or other accommodations (such as longer transition periods) made for small businesses to minimise the regulatory burden?	Not Answered
Should there be exemptions or other accommodations (such as longer transition periods) made for small businesses to minimise the regulatory burden? - If so what exemptions or other accommodations do you suggest? Please justify your response.	
Should there be exemptions or other accommodations (such as longer transition periods) made for small businesses to minimise the regulatory burden? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Should there be exemptions or other accommodations (such as longer transition periods) made for small businesses to minimise the regulatory burden? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
What would be the cost per year for industry to self-regulate (e.g. voluntary code of practice-industry driven)? - What would be the cost per year for industry to self-regulate. Please justify your response with hours of time and number of staff required.	
What would be the cost per year for industry to self-regulate (e.g. voluntary code of practice-industry driven)? - Please specify which country (Australia or New Zealand) your evidence is based on.	
What would be the cost per year for industry to self-regulate (e.g. voluntary code of practice-industry driven)? - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	
What would be the cost per year for industry to self-regulate (e.g. voluntary code of practice-industry driven)? - Please attach references here	Not Answered

What would be the cost per year for industry to self-regulate (e.g. voluntary code of practice-industry driven)? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Would industry pass any of the costs associated with implementing the proposed options on to consumers? - Would industry pass any of the costs associated with implementing the proposed options on to consumers?	
Would industry pass any of the costs associated with implementing the proposed options on to consumers? - What is the basis for your view?	
Would industry pass any of the costs associated with implementing the proposed options on to consumers? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Would industry pass any of the costs associated with implementing the proposed options on to consumers? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Last Modified Date	2018-09-18 15:22:08
Response ID	ANON-V5ES-G4PZ-8
IP Address	\$ 47F
Created Date	2018-09-18 11:53:20
Citizen Space Version	v3.11.3-v3-frontend
Consultation State	open
Browser Identification	Mozilla/5.0 (Windows NT 6.1; Trident/7.0; rv:11.0) like Gecko
Submitted Date	2018-09-18 15:22:37
Visited Pages - Submitter details	Submitter details
Visited Pages - Have you read the Consultation Regulation Impact Statement?	Have you read the Consultation Regulation Impact Statement?
Visited Pages - Survey Questions 1-4	Survey Questions 1-4
Visited Pages - Option 2: Education on how to read and interpret labelling information about sugars	Option 2: Education on how to read and interpret labelling information about sugars
Visited Pages - Option 3: Change to statement of ingredients	Option 3: Change to statement of ingredients
Visited Pages - Option 4: Added sugars quantified in the NIP	Option 4: Added sugars quantified in the NIP
Visited Pages - Option 5: Advisory labels for foods high in added sugars	Option 5: Advisory labels for foods high in added sugars
Visited Pages - Option 6: Pictorial approaches to convey the amount or types of sugars in a serving of food.	Option 6: Pictorial approaches to convey the amount or types of sugars in a serving of food.
Visited Pages - Option 7: Digital linking to off label web-based information about added sugars content	Option 7: Digital linking to off label web-based information about added sugars content
Visited Pages - Survey Questions 26-30 (on all proposed policy options)	Survey Questions 26-30 (on all proposed policy options)
Visited Pages - Implementation mechanisms	Implementation mechanisms
Visited Pages - Impact analysis (costs and benefits)	Impact analysis (costs and benefits)

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN RELEASED UNDER  
THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 1982 (CTH)  
BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

Privacy and confidential information and permissions - Consent	No
Privacy and confidential information and permissions - If you want all or parts of this submission to be confidential, please state why.	Note Please redact brand names in Question 7.
Submitter information - Full name	s 47F
Submitter information - Are you answering on behalf of an organisation?	Yes
Submitter information - If you answered yes to the question above, please provide your organisations' name	Victorian Department of Health and Human Services
Submitter information - Sector	Government
Submitter information - Please provide your email address.	s 47F
Submitter information - Phone Number	s 47F
Submitter information - If we require further information in relation to this submission, can we contact you?	Yes
Have you read the Public Consultation Regulation Impact Statement Labelling of sugars on packaged foods and drinks?  (Please click on the link above to open the document) - Have you read the Public Consultation Regulation Impact Statement Labelling of sugars on packaged foods and drinks	Yes
Do you support the statement of the problem  "Information about sugar provided on food labels in Australia and New Zealand does not provide adequate contextual information to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of dietary guidelines"? - Do you support the statement of the problem Information about sugar provided on food labels in Australia and New Zealand does not provide adequate contextual information to enable consumers to make informed	Yes
Do you support the statement of the problem  "Information about sugar provided on food labels in Australia and New Zealand does not provide adequate contextual information to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of dietary guidelines"? - If you do not support this statement, please justify why not with your reasons.	<p>The department supports the statement of the problem presented in the consultation paper 'Information about sugar provided on labels in Australia and New Zealand does not provide adequate contextual information to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of dietary guidelines'.</p> <p>The Australian Dietary Guidelines (1) recommend limiting foods containing added sugar, and the New Zealand Eating and Activity Guidelines (2) suggest choosing foods and drinks with little or no added sugar. The World Health Organization also specifically recommends limiting the intake of free sugars to less than 10% of total energy intake (3), based on evidence of the relationship between free sugar intake and both body weight and dental caries.</p> <p>The Australia New Zealand Food Standards Code (the Code) currently requires total but not added sugar information to be provided on food labels bearing a nutrition information panel (NIP). As a result, consumers do not have readily accessible information to enable them to make food choices in consideration of the dietary guidelines to reduce added sugar.</p> <p>Even when nutrition information is provided on food labels, some evidence suggests that many consumers may struggle to interpret the nutritional significance based on these absolute values. For example, in a survey of young Canadians, only half the respondents were able to correctly identify a product as high or low in sugar based on the absolute values provided in the Nutrition Facts table (4). Both the absence of requirement to provide added sugar information on food labels, and evidence of difficulty in interpreting nutritional information among many consumers supports the statement of the problem.</p> <p>(1) National Health and Medical Research Council, 2013. Eat for Health Australian Dietary Guidelines, Canberra Australian Government (2) Ministry of Health, 2015. Eating and Activity Guidelines for New Zealand Adults, Ministry of Health, Wellington. (3) World Health Organization, 2015. Guideline Sugars intake for adults and children, WHO Press, Geneva. (4) Vanderlee, L., White, C. M., Bordes, I., Hobin, E. P. and Hammond, D. (2015), The efficacy of sugar labelling formats Implications for labelling policy. Obesity, 23 p2406-2413.</p>
Do you support the statement of the problem  "Information about sugar provided on food labels in Australia and New Zealand does not provide adequate contextual information to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of dietary guidelines"? - If you would like to provide an alternate problem definition, please enter it below and justify your statement with evidence	No alternative definition to provide
Do you support the statement of the problem  "Information about sugar provided on food labels in Australia and New Zealand does not provide adequate contextual information to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of dietary guidelines"? Please attach references here	<a href="https://consultations.health.gov.au/chronic-disease-and-food-policy-branch/consultation-labelling-of-sugars-on-foods-drinks/consultation/download_file?squid_question.2018-06-27.9542832590-filesubquestion&amp;user_ANON-V5ES-G4PR-Z">https://consultations.health.gov.au/chronic-disease-and-food-policy-branch/consultation-labelling-of-sugars-on-foods-drinks/consultation/download_file?squid_question.2018-06-27.9542832590-filesubquestion&amp;user_ANON-V5ES-G4PR-Z</a>
Do you support the statement of the problem  "Information about sugar provided on food labels in Australia and New Zealand does not provide adequate contextual information to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of dietary guidelines"? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Are you aware of any form of information about added sugars that is provided on food labels in addition to those identified in section 1.6 of the Consultation paper? - Are you aware of any form of information about added sugars that is provided on food labels in addition to those identified - in section 1.5 of the Consultation paper?	No
Are you aware of any form of information about added sugars that is provided on food labels in addition to those identified in section 1.6 of the Consultation paper? - If yes, please provide details here and justify with evidence.	No further information to provide.
Are you aware of any form of information about added sugars that is provided on food labels in addition to those identified in section 1.6 of the Consultation paper? - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	Not Answered

Are you aware of any form of information about added sugars that is provided on food labels in addition to those identified in section 1.6 of the Consultation paper? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Are you aware of other sources of information (publically available or otherwise) on the added sugars content of foods available in Australia and New Zealand beside those described in section 1.8 of the Consultation paper? - Are you aware of other sources of information (publically or otherwise) on the added sugars content of food available in Australia and New Zealand?	No
Are you aware of other sources of information (publically available or otherwise) on the added sugars content of foods available in Australia and New Zealand beside those described in section 1.8 of the Consultation paper? - If yes, please provide details here and justify with evidence.	No further information to provide.
Are you aware of other sources of information (publically available or otherwise) on the added sugars content of foods available in Australia and New Zealand beside those described in section 1.8 of the Consultation paper? - Please attach references.	Not Answered
Are you aware of other sources of information (publically available or otherwise) on the added sugars content of foods available in Australia and New Zealand beside those described in section 1.8 of the Consultation paper? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Do you agree with the desired outcome of this work "Food labels provide adequate contextual information about sugars to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of the dietary guidelines"? - Do you agree with the desired outcome of this work Food labels provide adequate contextual information about sugars to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of the dietary guidelines?	Yes
Do you agree with the desired outcome of this work "Food labels provide adequate contextual information about sugars to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of the dietary guidelines"? - If no, please suggest an alternate desired outcome and justify your suggestion.	The department supports the desired outcome which recognises that consumer food choice is complex and influenced by multiple factors including and beyond food labelling. As such, a desired outcome which aims to provide information to support informed choices is the most appropriate outcome measure.
Do you agree with the desired outcome of this work "Food labels provide adequate contextual information about sugars to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of the dietary guidelines"? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Do you agree with the desired outcome of this work "Food labels provide adequate contextual information about sugars to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of the dietary guidelines"? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option  - How effective would this option be in addressing the policy issue and achieving the desired outcome?	Effective in combination with another option (please specify below)
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option  - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	<p>The department recognises that the impact of any sugar labelling policy option will be greatly improved if accompanied by a supporting education campaign. However, as a standalone intervention, the impact of education on achieving the desired outcome is likely to be limited. Since food labels would continue to only be required to identify total sugars in the NIP, consumers would not have access to the information required to put the education into practice. The minimal impact of education campaigns on a consumer's ability to read and interpret sugar information on food labels is evident in the fact that, despite availability of several education resources targeted at improving consumer interpretation of food labels such as the 'Eat for Health'(5) and 'Australia's Healthy Weight Week'(6) websites, research has demonstrated that many Australian and New Zealand consumers struggle to identify whether products are high or low in sugars based on the current information available on labels(7).</p> <p>Without the ability to reference the specific amounts of added sugars in foods or food label guidance, education campaigns would continue to be limited to generic messages. These include those that appear on the Eat for Health website(6) which states 'If sugar content per 100g is more than 15g, check that sugar (or alternative names for added sugar) is not listed high on the ingredient list', or on the Better Health Channel website (8) which provides guidance that 30g of sugars is a large amount per 100g and 2g of sugars is a small amount per 100g. Broad messages such as these may be difficult for consumers to follow as they would require some further subjective interpretation.</p> <p>(5) Department of Health and Aging and National Health and Medical Research Council 2017, How to understand food labels, Australian Government, viewed 2 August 2018, &lt;<a href="https://www.eatforhealth.gov.au/eating-well/how-understand-food-labels">https://www.eatforhealth.gov.au/eating-well/how-understand-food-labels</a>&gt;.</p> <p>(6) Dieticians Association of Australia, 2016. Understanding Food labels, viewed 16 Aug 2018 &lt;<a href="http://healthyweightweek.com.au/understanding-food-labels/">http://healthyweightweek.com.au/understanding-food-labels/</a>&gt;.</p> <p>(7) Food Standards Australia New Zealand, 2017. Consumer Label Survey 2015 – Food labelling Use and Understanding in Australia and New Zealand, Food Standards Australia New Zealand.</p> <p>(8) Department of Health and Human Services 2018, Food Labels, State Government of Victoria, Melbourne, viewed 2 August 2018 &lt;<a href="https://www.betterhealth.vic.gov.au/health/healthyliving/food-labels">https://www.betterhealth.vic.gov.au/health/healthyliving/food-labels</a>&gt;</p>
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option  - Is the description of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed option (compared to the status quo) accurate?	Yes



Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	No further information to provide.
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Are there additional strengths and weaknesses associated with the proposed option (compared with the status quo)?	No
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please describe what these are?	No further information to provide.
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Impacts - How would this option impact you?	Somewhat
Impacts - Please provide impacts and cost relevant to you, with evidence to justify your views.	The department may be financially impacted, with unclear benefit, if the education program is implemented and required to be funded by jurisdictions. This may also divert funds from other consumer education needs.
Impacts - Please attach evidence to justify your views.	Not Answered
Impacts - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - How effective would this option be in addressing the policy issue and achieving the desired outcome?	Not effective
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	<p>[Please redact brand names if making these comments public]</p> <p>The number of different names for sugar ingredients was an issue raised in both the Labelling Logic: Review of Food Labelling Law and Policy (2011) report and recent consumer campaigns. While there is evidence that consumers have a poor ability to identify whether sugars are naturally present or added based on their name in the ingredient list (9) the department is not aware of any research that has tested the impact of grouping or identifying added sugars in the ingredients list on consumer understanding of added sugars on food labels.</p> <p>The department notes that this option would require consumers to make a determination of whether a food is considered high in added sugar based either on how many added sugar ingredients are included in the ingredient list or how close to start of the ingredient list the bracketed collated added sugar ingredients are located. Ingredient lists are only required to list ingredients by descending order of ingoing weight not the corresponding quantity of ingredients. This only provides qualitative and ratio-type information about ingredients. As a result of the limited information in the ingredient list this approach could result in consumers mistakenly choosing a product higher in added sugar. For example 'Be Natural' 'Nut Delight' 'Deluxe Nut Bars' contain four different added sugars in the ingredient list while 'Golden Days' 'Sesame Snaps' contain only two added sugars in the ingredient list. Under this option consumers may believe the 'Sesame Snaps' contain less added sugar as there are fewer types of added sugars in the ingredient list. The 'Sesame Snaps' actually contain a higher sugar content with 36.1g of sugar per 100g compared with the 'Nut Delight' bar which contains 20.2g of sugar per 100g. Based on the ingredients list both these products contain only added sugars and thus the 'Sesame Snaps' would also contain a higher added sugar content.</p> <p>This approach may also lack sensitivity to determine differences in quantity of added sugar between products requiring consumers to interpret both the ingredients list and quantity of total sugars in the NIP simultaneously. For example 'Kelloggs Crunchy Nut Corn Flakes' and 'Dorset Cereals Simply Nuts Granola' both contain two added sugar ingredients. Under the bracketed approach these would be listed second in the ingredient list. Under this option consumers would be provided with guidance to either inspect the number or position of sugars in the ingredient list. Based on this guidance the two cereals would appear equivalent in added sugar as they both contain two added sugar ingredients which are located second in the ingredient list. However the 'Crunchy Nut' cereal contains a total of 31.7g per 100g while the 'Simply Nuts Granola' contains only 12.5g per 100g. Noting again that both these products contain only added sugar.</p> <p>The department also notes that this option if implemented on its own would not completely address the desired outcome. This option does not provide contextual information. Consumers may be able to broadly estimate the amount of added sugar relative to other ingredients but may not be able to discern whether it is high or low in added sugar or how the product contributes to their total dietary added sugar intake.</p> <p>(9) Tierney M. Gallagher A. M. Giotis E. S. &amp; Pentieva K. (2017). An Online Survey on Consumer Knowledge and Understanding of Added Sugars. Nutrients 9(1) 37.</p>
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	<a href="https://consultations.health.gov.au/chronic-disease-and-food-policy-branch/consultation-labelling-of-sugars-on-foods-drinks/consultation/download_file?sqid=question.2018-06-29.9417069861-filesubquestion&amp;user=ANON-V5F5-G4PRZ">https://consultations.health.gov.au/chronic-disease-and-food-policy-branch/consultation-labelling-of-sugars-on-foods-drinks/consultation/download_file?sqid=question.2018-06-29.9417069861-filesubquestion&amp;user=ANON-V5F5-G4PRZ</a>
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Is the description of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed option (compared to the status quo) accurate?	Mostly
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	The department disagrees that "Technical issues of defining sugars-based ingredients/added sugar" should be considered as a weakness. Free sugars and added sugars have been defined by other agencies including the World Health Organization and the US FDA. This suggests a definition of added sugars is technically feasible, and determining this definition is a matter of implementation design. The department also notes that this point applies to all options, apart from the status quo.
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Are there additional strengths and weaknesses associated with the proposed option (compared with the status quo)?	No
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please describe what these are?	No further information to provide.
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Do not publish
Impacts - How would this option impact you?	Somewhat
Impacts - Please provide impacts and cost relevant to you, with evidence to justify your view.	If implemented through a regulatory approach, the department may be impacted by increased compliance and enforcement activities. The degree of impact of these compliance and enforcement activities could be minimised if a clear definition or list of added sugars in developed as part of the option implementation.
Impacts - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Impacts - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Implementation mechanism - Referring to Table 1 in section 3 in the Consultation paper "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms", which implementation mechanism would be most appropriate for this policy option?	Regulatory

Implementation mechanism - Please provide the pros and cons of your selected implementation mechanism, using evidence to justify your view.	<p>If this option were implemented, a full regulatory approach would be the most suitable implementation mechanism to avoid introducing variability in ingredients lists and associated confusion. Noting, any regulatory approach would be subject to analysis of the associated costs and benefits as required by the Office of Best Practice Regulation (OBPR).</p> <p>The Code already includes provisions for the regulation of ingredient declarations in Standard 1.2.5 – Information requirements – statement of ingredients. Incorporating the requirements of this option into the existing standard would provide a single point of guidance on ingredient labelling and would minimise confusion that may occur if industry were required to consult multiple regulatory and non-regulatory codes. A voluntary approach would result in multiple variations of ingredients lists, which likely serve to add to consumer confusion, and would not meet the desired outcome.</p> <p>The department notes the pros and cons provided for a regulatory approach provided in table 1 of the paper would be relevant to the implementation of this option. Additional comments regarding pros and cons are provided in response to question 31.</p>
Implementation mechanism - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Implementation mechanism - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
would this option be in addressing the policy issue and achieving the desired outcome?	Effective
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	<p>The quantification of added sugars in the NIP with or without additional contextual information is the most likely of the options presented in the paper to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome. This option would provide information that is currently not available and enable consumers with basic numeracy skills to more precisely compare and choose foods that are lower in added sugars. The NIP is one of the most commonly used sources of nutritional information on food labels by Australian and New Zealand consumers (10) and is where other nutrient subgroups such as saturated fat are located. It is therefore a logical position for added sugar information.</p> <p>Evidence for the effectiveness of this option is supported in a number of recent studies. A consumer label survey in Canada found participants were significantly more likely to identify foods containing added sugars and correctly identify foods as containing "a lot" of added sugar when presented with a nutrition facts table with both total and added sugar (either with or without %Daily Value information) compared with total sugar only (11). This study also suggested that additional contextual information could further strengthen useability of the added sugar information. Only 55% of participants correctly identified a product containing "a lot" of added sugar when added sugar information was provided in grams only compared with 72% able to correctly identify when added sugar information was presented in grams and %Daily Value (%DV). Khandapur et. al (2017) (12) also demonstrated that added sugar understanding was improved when provided with added sugar information in grams and %DV (78.4%) or grams and high/medium/low text (83.5%) compared with grams only (73.6%).</p> <p>The department recognises that while this option provides the greatest potential for supporting informed consumer choice regarding added sugar there are a number of challenges that would need to be addressed prior to implementation of this option. For example some evidence suggested there is a risk of consumers misinterpreting total and added sugar information in the nutrition facts table (13). However this has been addressed by the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) by indenting "includes Xg Added Sugars" under Total Sugars.</p> <p>The enforcement aspects of this option would also need to be resolved. An accurate standardised analytical method for quantifying added sugars is not currently available to support monitoring, compliance and enforcement and consideration of alternative means of verifying added sugar content would need to be undertaken as part of the policy option design. The department notes that these enforcement challenges would not be unique to this option and similar challenges exist with current regulations. For example currently products which contain a mixture of naturally occurring and added sugars may carry a 'no added sugar' claim and the enforcement of such claims may be conducted using non-analytical methods such as recipe verification.</p> <p>The department notes that the paper identified a possible weakness of this option which is the dietary overemphasis on sugar. If additional contextual information was only applied to sugar, the department suggests consideration should be given to whether this contextual information could be mandated for a number of nutrients for which the dietary guidelines recommend moderating intake. This approach has been taken in a number of countries for example %DV is required to be included in the nutrition facts table for total fat, saturated fat, sugars and sodium in Canada. The US FDA has similar requirements with %DV for cholesterol required in addition to the Canadian nutrient requirements. Requirement for additional contextual information on a number of nutrients may reduce the risk of overemphasis on sugars while providing consumers with additional information to support food choices in line with dietary guidelines. This would also be in line with the desire of the Australia and New Zealand Ministerial Forum on Food Regulation to take a whole-of-diet, holistic approach to food labelling (14).</p> <p>(10) Food Standards Australia New Zealand. 2017. Consumer Label Survey 2015 – Food labelling Use and Understanding in Australia and New Zealand. Food Standards Australia New Zealand.</p> <p>(11) Vanderlee L, White C, M, Borden I, Hobin E, P, and Hammond D. (2015) The efficacy of sugar labelling formats: Implications for labeling policy. Obesity 23: p2406-2413.</p> <p>(12) Khandapur N, Graham D, Roberto C. 2017. Simplifying mental math: Changing how added sugars are displayed on the nutrition facts label can improve consumer understanding. Appetite. Vol. 114 p38-46.</p> <p>(13) Laquatra I, Solid K, Edge M, S, Petzel J, and Turner J. 2015. Including "added sugars" on the Nutrition Facts panel: how consumers perceive the proposed change. Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics 115(11) pp.1758-1763.</p> <p>(14) The Australia and New Zealand Ministerial Forum on Food Regulation Communiqué 24 November 2017 &lt;<a href="http://foodregulation.gov.au/sites/default/files/publishing.nsf/Content/ministerial-forum-communications">http://foodregulation.gov.au/sites/default/files/publishing.nsf/Content/ministerial-forum-communications</a>&gt; Accessed 15 August 2018.</p>
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Is the description of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed option (compared to the status quo) accurate?	Mostly
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	<p>The department disagrees that "Technical issues of defining sugars-based ingredients/added sugar" should be considered as a weakness. Free sugars and added sugars have been defined by other agencies including the World Health Organization and the US FDA. This suggests a definition of added sugars is technically feasible, and determining this definition is a matter of implementation design. The department also notes that this point applies to all options, apart from the status quo.</p>
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Are there additional strengths and weaknesses associated with the proposed option (compared with the status quo)?	Yes
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please describe what these are?	<p>The additional strengths of this option relate to the possibility to support informed consumer food choices through complementary programs and labelling initiatives including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorporation of added sugar into the Health Star Rating (HSR) algorithm, which has been demonstrated to improve alignment of HSR scores with the Australian Dietary Guidelines core and discretionary foods (15, 16).</li> <li>• Improvement of the algorithm underpinning the Nutrient Profiling Scoring Criteria for the determination of foods that qualify for health claims, similar to that for the HSR.</li> <li>• May correct misconceptions of high sugar content of core foods which contain naturally occurring sugars and could promote consumption of these food groups such as fruit and dairy products, of which Australian and New Zealand dietary intakes are currently below recommendations.</li> <li>• Support health professionals in providing more specific dietary assessment and advice regarding added sugar.</li> <li>• Support government and non-government preventative health resources and education. For example, the Victorian Governments' "Better Health Channel" website currently provides broad advice that "A 'moderate' intake of refined sugar can be an acceptable part of a healthy diet". This option could support the provision of more practical advice and actual targets for added sugar consumption.</li> <li>• Support accurate classification of foods containing added and naturally occurring sugars under government healthy food supply schemes such as Healthy Choices food and drink classification guide in Victoria. This may include reclassification of foods which contain both added and naturally occurring sugars to a 'healthier' category if they have been wrongly classified due to poorly estimated naturally occurring sugar content. This may have positive outcomes for both dietary consumption and manufacturers, for example improved classification and availability of dairy products.</li> <li>• Support other prevention programs such as Healthy Families Healthy Smiles, Smiles for Miles and Rethink Sugary Drinks.</li> <li>• At a national level inclusion of added sugar labelling could support National Health and Medical Research Council to develop a clear definition of unhealthy food and drinks (discretionary) that aligns with the Australian Dietary Guidelines and can be used in a range of policy contexts. An accurate definition, that took into account natural and added sugars, would further support the classification of unhealthy food and drinks for voluntary use by jurisdictions to reduce exposure of children to unhealthy food and drink marketing in settings under government control. It would also support COAG Health Council and Education Council healthy eating in schools initiatives and COAG Health Council and Sport and Recreation Ministers joint statement on healthy eating in children's sport and recreation.</li> <li>• May assist the Healthy Food Partnership Reformulation Working Group establish targets for added sugar as opposed to total sugars, to align with the Australian Dietary Guidelines.</li> </ul> <p>(15) Peters, S. A. E., Dunford, E., Jones, A., Ni Mhurchu, C., Crino, M., Taylor, F., Neal, B. 2017. Incorporating Added Sugar Improves the Performance of the Health Star Rating Front-of-Pack Labelling System in Australia. Nutrients, 9(7), p701.</p> <p>(16) Menday, H., Neal, B., Wu, J.H., Crino, M., Baines, S. and Petersen, K.S., 2017. Use of added sugars instead of total sugars may improve the capacity of the health star rating system to discriminate between core and discretionary foods. Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, 117(12), pp.1921-1930.</p>
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Impacts - How would this option impact you?	Somewhat

Impacts - Please provide impacts and cost relevant to you, with evidence to justify your view.	<p>If implemented through a regulatory approach, the department may be impacted by increased compliance and enforcement activities. Depending on how compliance was to be established, these activities may consume more department time and resources than other standard activities as enforcement of this option may require request for manufacturer formulations through the powers of an authorized officer due to the absence of an accepted analytical test method for added sugar.</p> <p>Currently, department guidance on added sugar to assist individuals in following the dietary guidelines is general in nature due to the limited information on food labels. This option would enable development of more practical resources to assist consumers and strengthen program resources to support initiatives such as Healthy Families Healthy Smiles, Smiles for Miles and Rethink Sugary Drinks.</p> <p>Additionally, quantification of added sugars on the label may support and strengthen Victorian government healthy eating policies and programs. For example, the Healthy choices food and drink classification guide uses nutritional information to classify products as green, amber or red, and can be used to assist schools, health services and sport and recreational facilities in making available and promoting healthier food choices. These classification guidelines also underpin the departments' Healthy Food Procurement Policy. However, currently the classification criteria for foods which contain both naturally and added sugar are based on estimated quantities of naturally occurring sugar in different food categories. Using added sugar to classify foods may increase accuracy of classification, especially among foods containing both added and naturally occurring sugars.</p>
Impacts - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Impacts - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Impact on existing elements of a food label - How would the proposed option impact existing elements of a food label (both mandatory and voluntary)?	The department notes that decisions about label design and voluntary labelling elements are predominantly determined by food manufacturers. However, the department is of the view that existing labelling elements would be minimally impacted by this option.
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Would adopting this option require another element of a food label to be removed from the package?	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - If so, which labelling element/s would be removed?	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please provide evidence to justify your response.	An additional line for added sugar in the NIP would occupy minimal additional label space, and most food labels could accommodate this additional requirement. This would be similar to current requirements to include any nutrient or biologically active substance in the NIP when a nutrient content claim is made about the substance.
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Implementation mechanism - Referring to Table 1 in Section 3 of the Consultation paper "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms", which implementation mechanism would be most appropriate for this policy option	Regulatory
Implementation mechanism - Please provide further comments here	<p>If this option were implemented, a regulatory approach would enable all products containing adding sugar to be identifiable and would ensure a consistent definition of added sugar is employed. Noting, any regulatory approach would be subject to analysis of the associated costs and benefits as required by the OBPR.</p> <p>The Code already includes provisions for the regulation of nutrition information in Standard 1.2.8 – Nutrition information requirements. Incorporating the requirements of this option into the existing standard would provide a single point of guidance on NIP labelling and would minimise any confusion that may occur if industry were required to consult multiple regulatory and non-regulatory codes. It would align with the provision of information on sub-groups of other nutrients. The department notes that a voluntary implementation mechanism for this option would be the status quo.</p>
Implementation mechanism - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Implementation mechanism - Please provide pros and cons of your selected implementation mechanism, using evidence to justify your response.	The advantages and disadvantages of this option, if implemented through a regulatory mechanism, are accurately described in table 1 of Section 3.1. Additional comments regarding pros and cons are provided in response to question 31.
Implementation mechanism - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Implementation mechanism - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - How effective would this option be in addressing the policy issue and achieving the desired outcome?	Partially effective
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	<p>There is a growing body of evidence for the impact of advisory labels on the perception and consumption of sugar sweetened beverages (SSBs). A number of studies, including one with Australian consumers (17), found SSBs carrying various formats of warning labels resulted in reduced SSB purchase intention (18, 19, 20) and perceived healthfulness (17, 18, 19) and increased perceived sugar content compared to SSBs with no Front-of-Pack (FoP) label (17). However, as these interventions only compared beverage choice in an isolated setting, it is not clear how such advisory labels would influence perception and understanding of sugar content in other food groups, or how the labels would influence choice in the context of the whole diet. For example, it is possible in a simple beverage choice task that consumers will modify their behaviour in response to the advisory label. However, in a real world setting where many products may carry the advisory label, consumers may find it overwhelming or 'too hard' to avoid products carrying advisory labels. In such a case, consumers will not have access to any further information to enable them to choose products lower in added sugar among those carrying the advisory label.</p> <p>Products which fall below the cut off will not carry an advisory label and could mistakenly signal to consumers that these products are a healthy choice, when in fact many of these foods may still contain added sugar and therefore consumption should be limited in line with dietary guidelines. This option would therefore not achieve the desired outcome. Additionally, this option may be less effectual in food categories that are already well known to contain high amounts of sugar, for example sugary confectionary.</p>
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Is the description of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed option (compared to the status quo) accurate?	Mostly
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	The department disagrees that "Technical issues of defining sugars-based ingredients/added sugar" should be considered as a weakness. Free sugars and added sugars have been defined by other agencies including the World Health Organization and the US FDA. This suggests a definition of added sugars is technically feasible, and determining this definition is a matter of implementation design. The department also notes that this point applies to all options, apart from the status quo.

Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Are there additional strengths and weaknesses associated with the proposed option (compared with the status quo)?	Yes
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please describe what these are?	<p>Strength</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May provide motivation for manufacturers to reformulate and reduce added sugar in food products to avoid carrying the warning label.</li> </ul> <p>Weakness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consumers may mistakenly believe foods not carrying the warning label are healthy when in fact they may still contain added sugar.</li> <li>Could dilute the effect of other advisory warnings related to acute risks such as allergies.</li> </ul>
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Impact - How would this option impact you?	Somewhat
Impact - Please provide impacts and cost relevant to you, with evidence to justify your response.	If implemented through a regulatory approach, the department may be impacted by increased compliance and enforcement activities. Depending on how compliance was to be established, these activities may consume more department time and resources than other standard activities. This is because enforcement of this option may require request for manufacturer formulations through the powers of an authorized officer due to the absence of an accepted analytical test method for added sugar.
Impact - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Impact - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Impact on existing elements of a food label - How would the proposed option impact existing elements of a food label (both mandatory and voluntary)?	<p>The department recognises that decisions about label design and voluntary labelling elements are predominantly determined by food manufacturers. However, the department is of the view that this labelling option may pose a risk that voluntary label elements such as the Health Star Rating (HSR) could be removed. It may also detract from other advisory labels such as allergen warnings.</p> <p>If implemented, this option may offer the greatest net benefit if it was limited to categories not designed to carry the HSR logo and unlikely to carry other advisory statements, such as SSBs. While a large proportion of these products carry a FoP energy thumbnail, which also would be at risk of removal if this option was mandated, there is some evidence that this energy information is not adequate to enable consumers to make informed choices regarding sugary drinks. For example, a study by VanEpps et.al (2016) (21) demonstrating that energy labelling did not change perceived healthfulness of sugary drinks, but that warning labels did.</p> <p>(21) VanEpps, E.M., Roberto, C.A. and Han, E., 2016. The influence of sugar-sweetened beverage warnings. Am J Prev Med, 51, p.664-72</p>
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Would adopting this option require another element of a food label to be removed from the package?	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - If so, which labelling elements would be removed?	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please provide evidence to justify your response.	No further information to provide.
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Implementation mechanism - Referring to Table 1 in Section 3 of the Consultation paper "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms", which implementation mechanism would be most appropriate for this policy option?	Regulatory
Implementation mechanism - Please provide pros and cons of your selected implementation mechanism, using evidence to justify your response.	<p>Warning and advisory labels are likely to reflect poorly on food products and as such the food industry is unlikely to be supportive or have a significant voluntary level of uptake of this option. As such, sufficient coverage of this option to support consumers to make informed choices would likely require a regulatory approach. Similar to the previous options, a voluntary implementation mechanism for this option would be the same as the status quo. The impact this option would have on consumers' use and awareness of warning and advisory statements about an acute safety risk would also need to be taken into account.</p> <p>The advantages and disadvantages of this option, if implemented through a regulatory mechanism, are accurately described in table 1 of Section 3.1. Additional comments regarding pros and cons is provided in response to question 31.</p>
Implementation mechanism - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Implementation mechanism - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - How effective would this option be in addressing the policy issue and achieving the desired outcome?	Partially effective
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	<p>Pictorial approaches may be easier for consumers to understand and interpret due to the visual cues which can be related to common practices. For example, most individuals can relate that one or two teaspoons of sugar added to coffee may be common but three or four may be considered high. Additionally, as one teaspoon is equivalent to four grams of sugar, the smaller values when using teaspoons may be easier for consumers to calculate and interpret. For example, interpreting the magnitude of four teaspoons of added sugar against the recommendation of 12 teaspoons may be easier than interpreting 12g of added sugar against the recommendation of 48g.</p> <p>This option would provide information about added sugars on food labels that may be more easily understood by consumers due to the use of familiar or easily interpretable pictorials or simplified numerical values associated with teaspoons. However, this option would not completely meet the desired outcome unless additional guidance on recommended consumption of added sugars in teaspoons (or other contextual information) was provided.</p> <p>To avoid misrepresenting the sugar content to consumers, this option would need to be limited to the representation of added sugars only.</p>
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Is the description of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed option (compared to the status quo) accurate?	Mostly
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	The department disagrees that "Technical issues of defining sugars-based ingredients/added sugar" should be considered as a weakness. Free sugars and added sugars have been defined by other agencies including the World Health Organization and the US FDA. This suggests a definition of added sugars is technically feasible, and determining this definition is a matter of implementation design. The department also notes that this point applies to all options, apart from the status quo.
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach evidence here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Are there additional strengths and weaknesses associated with the proposed option (compared with the status quo)?	Yes
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please describe what these are?	<p>Strength</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May provide motivation for manufacturers to reformulate and reduce added sugar in food products to reduce undesired quantity of teaspoons of sugar displayed on label.</li> </ul>

Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Impacts - How would this option impact you?	Somewhat
Impacts - Please provide impacts and cost relevant to you, with evidence to justify your response.	If implemented through a government code of practice, the department may need to provide resources and/or funding to support the development of the code of practice framework.
Impacts - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Impacts - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Impact on existing elements of a food label - How would the proposed option impact existing elements of a food label (both mandatory and voluntary)?	The department recognises that decisions about label design and voluntary labelling elements are predominantly determined by food manufacturers. However, the department is of the view that this labelling option would pose a risk for removal of voluntary label elements such as the Health Star Rating. Similar to option 5, this option may offer the greatest net benefit if limited to food categories not designed to carry the HSR logo, such as SSBs.
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Would adopting this option require another element of a food label to be removed from the package?	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - If so, which labelling elements would be removed?	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please provide evidence to justify your response.	No further information to provide.
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Implementation mechanism - Referring to Table 1 in Section 3 of the Consultation paper "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms", which implementation mechanism would be most appropriate for this policy option?	Code of practice - government driven
Implementation mechanism - Please provide pros and cons of your selected implementation mechanism, using evidence to justify your response.	To ensure information was provided consistently, this option would require an agreed method of calculating added sugar, particularly given current variations in how the food industry is calculating it. A code of practice would be better suited to incorporate relevant requirements of pictorial approaches such as style guide requirements. A government driven code of practice would be likely to best achieve both of these elements. However, a code of practice, unless incorporated into a regulatory framework is not enforceable. Without an element of enforceability, there is the possibility that varying interpretations of the code will be applied by manufacturers. Regulators will have little recourse to address these variations, except in situations that are misleading or deceptive.  The advantages and disadvantages of this option, if implemented through a code of practice mechanism, are accurately described in table 1 of Section 3.1. Additional comments regarding pros and cons is provided in response to question 31 and 32.
Implementation mechanism - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Implementation mechanism - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - How effective would this option be in addressing the policy issue and achieving the desired outcome?	Partially effective
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	Digital linking could enable provision of nutritional and contextual information to support consumers to make informed food choices regarding added sugars. As digital solutions are less restricted by physical space capacity, this option could provide added sugar information in a number of formats, including pictorial approaches to assist consumer understanding. This option could also provide further benefit by providing information and enabling informed choice regarding other nutrients or other consumer interest areas, such as sustainable palm oil.  Utilisation of nutritional information on food labels requires consumers to be motivated to read the provided information. However, given this option would require consumers to perform an additional action of scanning the digital link prior to reading the information, this digital information could be expected to be accessed by only the most highly motivated individuals. A qualitative study by Kalnikaite et. al (2011) (22) supported this and found consumers perceived smart phone apps that provided additional information about products while shopping as cumbersome and time consuming.  Further, the impact of this option may be compromised due to technical issues associated with digital-based solutions. A 'smart' nutrition labelling trial conducted by Volkova et.al (2016) (23) identified a number of technical issues during the intervention including connectivity issues, which are common in large buildings such as supermarkets and shopping centres, incompatibility with some devices due to the large number of available smart phone models and software, trouble focusing smartphone camera of scannable codes and issues viewing nutritional information on the mobile phone screen.  While digital linking to nutritional information may provide a platform to communicate additional information to support consumer food choices without the traditional space constraints on food labels, the technical and motivational challenges associated with digital solutions are likely to reduce consumer utilisation and consequently effectiveness of this option.  (22) Kalnikaite, V., Bird, J. and Rogers, Y., 2013. Decision-making in the aisles informing, overwhelming or nudging supermarket shoppers?. Personal and Ubiquitous Computing, 17(6), p.1247-1259. (23) Volkova, E., Li, N., Dunford, E., Eyles, H., Crino, M., Michie, J., & Ni Mhurchu, C. 2016., "Smart" RCTs Development of a Smartphone App for Fully Automated Nutrition-Labeling Intervention Trials. JMIR mHealth and uHealth, 4(1), e23.
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Is the description of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed option (compared to the status quo) accurate?	Mostly
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	As noted in previous comments, the department disagrees that "Technical issues of defining sugars-based ingredients/added sugar". However, if this weakness was considered, it should also apply to this option.  The department suggests the weakness in the paper regarding challenges in monitoring, compliance and enforcement should also be applied to option 7. This is because jurisdictions will be responsible for enforcing compliance and accuracy of added sugar information on labels and in advertising, of which digital information could be considered a form of advertising.
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Are there additional strengths and weaknesses associated with the proposed option (compared with the status quo)?	Yes
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please describe what these are?	Weakness •Food companies will be required to maintain and update two locations of nutrition information (one for label and one for web). •Non-access to information due to connectivity issues and reliance on external factors such as service providers.
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of this option - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Impact - How would this option impact you?	Somewhat

Impact - Please provide impacts and cost relevant to you, with evidence to justify your response.	If implemented through a regulatory approach, the department may be impacted by increased compliance and enforcement activities. These compliance and enforcement activities may consume more department time and resources than other standard activities. Enforcement of this option may require requests for manufacturer formulations through the powers of an authorized officer, depending on how compliance is to be determined.
Impact - Please attach references here	If implemented through a government code of practice, the department may need to provide resources and/or funding to support the development of the code of practice framework. Additionally, as previously discussed, the department may encounter enforcement challenges if the code is not linked to a regulatory framework.
Impact - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	If implemented through a food industry driven code of practice, the department would not be directly impacted. However, if the system was seen as misleading or insufficient, the department but could receive correspondence or negative media coverage regarding insufficient government action to promote healthy eating. In addition, as the regulator, the department may need to take enforcement action against any manufacturers engaging in misleading or deceptive conduct.
	Not Answered
	Not Answered
Impact on existing elements of a food label - How would the proposed option impact existing elements of a food label (both mandatory and voluntary)?	No information to provide.
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Would adopting this option require another element of a food label to be removed from the package?	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - If so, which labelling elements would be removed?	
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please provide evidence to justify your response.	No information to provide.
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Impact on existing elements of a food label - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Implementation mechanisms - Referring to Table 1 in Section 3 of the Consultation paper "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms", which implementation mechanism would be most appropriate for this policy option?	Code of practice - government driven
Implementation mechanisms - Please provide pros and cons of your selected implementation mechanism, using evidence to justify your response.	An industry or government driven code of practice would facilitate a more consistent application of smart labelling and definitions for added sugar. However, only a government driven code of practice, if linked to a regulatory framework, would provide an opportunity for recourse in response to added sugar information that is not consistent with the code. A government Code of Practice, linked to a regulatory framework, is therefore the most likely to support consistent calculation and application of added sugar labelling in such digital mediums.  Although a regulatory approach would provide the most consistency, this would be the first significant regulation of digital information in relation to food products and therefore would require wider consideration of the policy issues related to digital information regulation. The department notes that similar to other options, a voluntary implementation mechanism for this option would be the status quo.  The advantages and disadvantages of this option, if implemented through a code of practice mechanism, are accurately described in table 1 of Section 3.1. Additional comments regarding pros and cons is provided in response to question 31 and 32.
Implementation mechanisms - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Implementation mechanisms - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Are there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome? - re there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome?	No
Are there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome? - If yes, please describe your suggested option and how it addresses the policy issue and would achieve the desired outcome.	No further information to provide.
Are there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome? - Please provide evidence to justify your response.	No further information to provide.
Are there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Are there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome? - Please also describe the cost of implementing your proposed option.	No further information to provide.
Are there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome? - Please provide evidence for costing assumptions.	No further information to provide.
Are there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Are there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
If you proposed a different option at question 26, please detail the strengths and weaknesses of your proposed option, compared with the status quo. - If you proposed a different option at question 26, please detail the strengths and weaknesses of your proposed option, compared with the status quo. Please provide evidence to justify your response.	No further information to provide.
If you proposed a different option at question 26, please detail the strengths and weaknesses of your proposed option, compared with the status quo. - Please attach references here	Not Answered
If you proposed a different option at question 26, please detail the strengths and weaknesses of your proposed option, compared with the status quo. - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered

Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Option 3 - Change to statement of ingredients - All packaged foods	All packaged foods
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Option 3 - Change to statement of ingredients - Particular foods or food categories (please specify below)	
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Option 4 - Added sugars quantified in NIP - All packaged foods	All packaged foods
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Option 4 - Added sugars quantified in NIP - Particular foods or food categories (please specify below)	
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Option 5 - Advisory labels for foods high in added sugars - All packaged foods	
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Option 5 - Advisory labels for foods high in added sugars - Particular foods or food categories (please specify below)	Particular foods or food categories (please specify below)
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Option 6 - Pictorial approaches to convey the amount or types of sugars in a serving of food. - All packaged foods	
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Option 6 - Pictorial approaches to convey the amount or types of sugars in a serving of food. - Particular foods or food categories (please specify below)	Particular foods or food categories (please specify below)
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - If you have selected any particular food categories, please specify which foods or food categories and justify your position provide examples of foods.	more likely to support informed consumer choice. However, consideration should be given to whether some options may result in a greater net benefit to dietary choices if applied to only selected food categories. For example, option 5 and 6 are the most likely to compete with non-mandatory nutrition label elements such as the HSR and consequently the benefit of applying these options to all products may be negated by the loss of HSR information.  Consideration could be given to applying these options to only foods not designed to carry HSR such as SSBs and confectionary. Most of these products instead carry an energy icon, which some evidence suggests is not easily understood by consumers (26). Additionally, as almost all energy in SSBs and sugar based confectionary is derived from sugar. Replacement of this icon with either option 5 or 6 may result in more easily interpretable information for consumers in this category. Noting that these options are unlikely to meet the desired outcome unless implemented in addition to another option which is applied more broadly across foods.  (26) VanEpps, E.M., Roberto, C.A. and Han, E., 2016. The influence of sugar-sweetened beverage warnings. Am J Prev Med, 51, p.664-72
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1 "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Voluntary	
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1 "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	The department notes that voluntary implementation of any of the options would be equivalent to the status quo, as currently manufacturers are permitted to include additional information regarding added sugars on food labels and websites.
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1 "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1 "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Code of Practice - Voluntary	

Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1 "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	The department considers "inclusion of a new label element may compete with other non-mandatory food labelling element" is a weakness of some of the proposed options but is not related to the implementation mechanism as this is a risk for all implementation approaches. For example, a product which does not receive a particularly high HSR score due to negative nutrients other than sugar (eg. high fat and/or high salt foods) may choose to voluntarily display a FoP teaspoon logo instead of a HSR under either a voluntary or code of practice mechanism, which could provide misleading information for consumers. The department suggests removing this point from the implementation mechanisms, as it is covered under the specific options strengths and weaknesses.
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1 "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1 "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Code of Practice - Government driven	
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1 "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	Similar to a Voluntary/Industry driven Code of Practice, the department considers "inclusion of a new label element may compete with other non-mandatory food labelling element" is a weakness of some of the proposed options but is not related to the implementation mechanism.
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1 "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1 "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Regulatory	
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1 "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	It should be noted that the higher cost to industry associated with a regulatory approach could be reduced significantly if an appropriate transition period was considered.
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1 "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? (Table 1 "Characteristics of the proposed implementation mechanisms"). - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Voluntary - are there other pros and cons?	No
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Voluntary If yes, other pros and cons associated with this mechanism.	No further information to provide.
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Code of Practice - Voluntary are there other pros and cons?	No
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Code of Practice - Voluntary If yes, other pros and cons associated with this mechanism.	No further information to provide.
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Code of Practice - Government driven are there other pros and cons?	Yes
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Code of Practice - Government driven If yes, other pros and cons associated with this mechanism.	Similar to a voluntary Code of Practice, a weakness of a government driven code is ineffective sanctions for non-compliance, unless the government driven code was linked to a regulatory framework.
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Regulatory are there other pros and cons?	No
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Regulatory If yes, other pros and cons associated with this mechanism	No further information to provide.
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Are there any other benefits or costs associated with the proposed labelling options which have not been identified? - Are there any other benefits or costs associated with the proposed labelling options which have not been identified?	Yes
Are there any other benefits or costs associated with the proposed labelling options which have not been identified? - If yes, please provide details here, using evidence to justify your response.	The department does not have further suggestions of costs associated with the proposed labelling options but would like to make the following comments in regards to the costs and benefits highlighted in the paper  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The potential for a proposed labelling option to 'push-off' other voluntary labelling elements will be more likely for some policy options than others, and as such the assigned cost should be adjusted accordingly for the various options.</li> <li>•The cost of labelling changes to businesses will vary according to the labelling option and the transition period applied, and the assigned cost should be adjusted accordingly for the various options.</li> <li>•The assigned costs and benefits should be forward looking and consider the possible synergistic benefits of prospective food regulation activities. Evidence has demonstrated that population dietary benefit is enhanced beyond the sum of its parts when multiple initiatives are implemented (27). Other food regulation activities which support informed consumer choices, such as energy labelling on alcoholic beverages and fats and oils labelling, may provide multiple opportunities to assist consumers in using and interpreting food labels in the future, which may have a greater effect on informed dietary choices than if sugar labelling was implemented in isolation.</li> </ul>
Are there any other benefits or costs associated with the proposed labelling options which have not been identified? - Please attach references here	(27) Hysemi, L., Elliot-Green, A., Lloyd-Williams, F., Kypridemos, C., O'Flaherty, M., McGill, R., Orton, L., Bromley, H., Cappuccio, F.P. and Capewell, S., 2017. Systematic review of dietary salt reduction policies Evidence for an effectiveness hierarchy?. PloS one, 12(5), p.e0177535.
Are there any other benefits or costs associated with the proposed labelling options which have not been identified? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Should there be exemptions or other accommodations (such as longer transition periods) made for small businesses, to minimise the regulatory burden? - Should there be exemptions or other accommodations (such as longer transition periods) made for small businesses, to minimise the regulatory burden?	Not Answered



Should there be exemptions or other accommodations (such as longer transition periods) made for small businesses, to minimise the regulatory burden? - If so, what exemptions or other accommodations do you suggest? Please justify your response.	The department recognises changes to food labelling requirements are a cost to food manufacturers and currently a number of food regulation activities which may impose labelling changes are currently in progress. The department supports a transition period that considers the associated regulatory costs to food business, while also mindful of the benefits of providing information to consumers in a timely manner. The ideal transition period, and whether or not different transition periods should apply for different size businesses, should be based on achieving the greatest net benefit.  Effectiveness of any labelling option will be dependent on the pervasiveness of the labelling solution on food products, with greater exposure and multiple points of information more likely to support informed consumer choice. As such, the department do not support exemptions, which would reduce coverage of the labelling solution and may reduce effectiveness.
Should there be exemptions or other accommodations (such as longer transition periods) made for small businesses, to minimise the regulatory burden? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Should there be exemptions or other accommodations (such as longer transition periods) made for small businesses, to minimise the regulatory burden? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
What would be the cost per year for industry to self-regulate (e.g. voluntary code of practice-industry driven)? - What would be the cost per year for industry to self-regulate. Please justify your response with hours of time, and number of staff required.	No information to provide.
What would be the cost per year for industry to self-regulate (e.g. voluntary code of practice-industry driven)? - Please specify which country (Australia or New Zealand) your evidence is based on.	
What would be the cost per year for industry to self-regulate (e.g. voluntary code of practice-industry driven)? - Please provide evidence to justify your views.	No information to provide.
What would be the cost per year for industry to self-regulate (e.g. voluntary code of practice-industry driven)? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
What would be the cost per year for industry to self-regulate (e.g. voluntary code of practice-industry driven)? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Would industry pass any of the costs associated with implementing the proposed options on to consumers? - Would industry pass any of the costs associated with implementing the proposed options on to consumers?	
Would industry pass any of the costs associated with implementing the proposed options on to consumers? - What is the basis for your view?	No information to provide.
Would industry pass any of the costs associated with implementing the proposed options on to consumers? - Please attach references here	Not Answered
Would industry pass any of the costs associated with implementing the proposed options on to consumers? - Please select radio button below if you wish to keep the response to this question confidential.	Not Answered
Last Modified Date	2018-09-19 11 51 28
Response ID	ANON-VSES-G4PR-Z
IP Address	s 47F
Created Date	2018-09-18 14 37 17
Citizen Space Version	v3.11.3-v3-frontend
Consultation State	open
Browser Identification	Mozilla/5.0 (Windows NT 6.3 WOW64) AppleWebKit/537.36 (KHTML, like Gecko) Chrome/64.0.3282.119 Safari/537.36
Submitted Date	2018-09-19 11 51 53
Visited Pages - Submitter details	Submitter details
Visited Pages - Have you read the Consultation Regulation Impact Statement?	Have you read the Consultation Regulation Impact Statement?
Visited Pages - Survey Questions 1-4	Survey Questions 1-4
Visited Pages - Option 2 Education on how to read and interpret labelling information about sugars	Option 2 Education on how to read and interpret labelling information about sugars
Visited Pages - Option 3 Change to statement of ingredients	Option 3 Change to statement of ingredients
Visited Pages - Option 4 Added sugars quantified in the NIP	Option 4 Added sugars quantified in the NIP
Visited Pages - Option 5 Advisory labels for foods high in added sugars	Option 5 Advisory labels for foods high in added sugars
Visited Pages - Option 6 Pictorial approaches to convey the amount or types of sugars in a serving of food.	Option 6 Pictorial approaches to convey the amount or types of sugars in a serving of food.
Visited Pages - Option 7 Digital linking to off label web-based information about added sugars content	Option 7 Digital linking to off label web-based information about added sugars content
Visited Pages - Survey Questions 26-30 (on all proposed policy options)	Survey Questions 26-30 (on all proposed policy options)
Visited Pages - Implementation mechanisms	Implementation mechanisms
Visited Pages - Impact analysis (costs and benefits)	Impact analysis (costs and benefits)

Your Ref:  
Our Ref:  
Enquiries:

Food Regulation Secretariat  
Email: [FoodRegulationSecretariat@health.gov.au](mailto:FoodRegulationSecretariat@health.gov.au)

**Department of Health Western Australia submission on  
Consultation – Labelling of sugars on packaged foods and drinks**

**Submissions close on 19 September 2018**

The Department of Health Western Australia would like to thank the Australia and New Zealand Ministerial Forum on Food Regulation for seeking comment on the Consultation Regulatory Impact Statement – Labelling of sugars on packaged foods and drinks (Consultation RIS). This submission has been prepared by Food, Environmental Health Directorate; with input from Chronic Disease Prevention Directorate and the Office of the Chief Dental Officer. Please find the Department of Health Western Australia's responses to each of the questions as contained in the Consultation RIS below.

**Consultation question 1-** Do you support the statement of the problem presented on page 7? If you do not support this statement, please justify your reasons. If you would like to provide an alternate problem definition, please justify your statement with evidence.

The Department of Health Western Australia supports the statement of the problem presented in the Consultation Regulatory Impact Statement – Labelling of sugars on packaged foods and drinks (Consultation RIS)

**Consultation question 2:** Are you aware of any form of information about added sugars that is provided on food labels in addition to those identified above?

No comment

**Consultation question 3:** Are you aware of other sources of information (publically available or otherwise) on the added sugars content of foods available in Australia and New Zealand, beside those described above?

No comment

**Consultation question 4:** Do you agree with the desired outcome of this work proposed above? If not, please suggest an alternate desired outcome and justify your suggestion.

The Department of Health Western Australia supports the desired outcome of this work as stated in the Consultation RIS.

**Consultation question 5:** How effective would this option be in addressing the policy issue and achieving the desired outcome? Please provide evidence to justify your views.

The Department of Health Western Australia (DOH) does not support this option as a standalone measure, as current labelling does not provide sufficient information on sugars added to packaged food and drinks (refer to Consultation RIS problem definition). The DOH does not consider that an education campaign, in the absence of any contextual information on the label about added sugar, is designed to achieve the desired outcome. As such, a standalone education campaign to assist consumers on how to read and interpret current labels is unlikely to be successful in meeting the desired outcome of this work, which is to ensure that: *'food labels provide adequate contextual information about sugars to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of the dietary guidelines'*, given these include the guideline 3c) to limit intake of foods and drinks containing added sugar.

The DOH supports the approach that any labelling change should be implemented in conjunction with a national education campaign to assist consumers to understand the change and interpret the labels correctly. The appropriate content of this education campaign would depend on the option(s) implemented. The literature review conducted by FSANZ discovered important findings regarding consumers' knowledge and behaviours regarding nutrition labelling (Food Standards Australia New Zealand 2017). Specifically, the literature review identified four studies that reported consumers were confused between 'added' and 'total' sugars. These factors should be addressed in any education that accompanies new labelling initiatives. Nutrition knowledge has been found to be supportive of consumers' use of nutrition labels (Miller and Cassidy 2015).

References:

Food Standards Australia New Zealand. 2017. Literature review on consumer knowledge, attitudes and behaviours relating to sugars and food labelling. Available from: <http://www.foodstandards.gov.au/publications/Documents/Literature%20review%20on%20consumer%20knowledge,%20attitudes%20and%20behaviours%20relating%20to%20sugars%20and%20food%20labelling.pdf>. Accessed 20 August 2018.

Miller LMS, Cassidy DL. The effects of nutrition knowledge on food label use. A review of the literature. *Appetite*. 2015;92:207-16.

**Consultation question 6:** How would this option impact you? Please provide impacts and cost relevant to you.

Increasing the knowledge and skills necessary to choose a healthy diet and curbing the rise in overweight and obesity are critical priorities in our state and are key objectives of the Department of Health Western Australia WA Health Promotion Strategic Framework 2017-2021 (HPSF) and the State Oral Health Plan 2016-2020. A national education campaign on nutrition labelling to accompany any labelling changes would support these objectives.

**Consultation question 7:** How effective would this option be in addressing the policy issue and achieving the desired outcome? Please provide evidence to justify your views.

The Department of Health Western Australia supports this option of the grouping of sugars-based ingredients (added sugars) in a bracketed list, in line with new labelling measures introduced in Canada in December 2016.

This option is likely to be effective in addressing the policy issue by enabling consumers to readily identify added sugars in foods without necessarily having the technical knowledge of alternative names for sugars. The design of the option and the choice of implementation will impact on whether the policy option will be effective in achieving the desired outcome. A national education campaign accompanying such a labelling change would support this initiative in assisting consumers to interpret packaged food and drink labelling.

Health Canada (2016) found that grouping sugars-based ingredients together may help consumers to:

- identify that sugars have been added to the food;
- understand how much sugars are added compared to other ingredients; and quickly find the sources of sugars added.

In addition to improving transparency, this option may have a secondary benefit in educating consumers regarding the different names used for added sugars. Currently in Australia and New Zealand, sugar may be listed in the ingredients list under a variety of names such as agave syrup, barley malt extract, maltose, sucrose, dextrose, fancy molasses or fructose.

Implementation of this option may have an additional benefit of manufacturers reformulating foods that contain large amounts of added sugars. There is evidence that has found that the Health Star Rating (HSR) system encourages manufacturers to reformulate their products to obtain a higher star rating (Health Star Rating Advisory Committee 2017).

#### References:

Health Canada. 2016. Food labelling changes. Government of Canada. Available from: <https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/food-labelling-changes.html>  
Accessed 20 August 2018.

Health Star Rating Advisory Committee. 2017. Two year progress review report on the implementation of the Health Star Rating System June 2014 – June 2016. Available from:

<http://healthstarrating.gov.au/internet/healthstarrating/publishing.nsf/Content/news-20170428>. Accessed 20 August 2018.

**Consultation question 8:** How would this option impact you? Please provide impacts and cost relevant to you.

Increasing the knowledge and skills necessary to choose a healthy diet and curbing the rise in overweight and obesity are critical priorities in our state and are key objectives of the Department of Health Western Australia WA Health Promotion Strategic Framework 2017-2021 and the State Oral Health Plan 2016-2020. This option would support these objectives.

**Consultation question 9:** Referring to Table 1 in Section 3.1, which implementation mechanism would be most appropriate for this policy option? Please provide the pros and cons of your selected implementation mechanism.

Grouping of sugars-based ingredients (added sugars) in a bracketed list should be mandated through the Code and enforced by the existing food enforcement authorities. The Department of Health Western Australia considers that the best way forward, and to maximise the benefit, the preferred option should be a combination of options 3 and 4 detailed in the Consultation RIS, along with an accompanying national education campaign to increase consumer knowledge about added sugars and how to identify sugars in the label of packaged food and drink.

The following comments are in relation to the nutrition labelling implementation mechanisms in Table 1 in section 3.1:

- There is evidence that food manufacturers are selectively applying the Health Star Rating (HSR) to their products, primarily as a marketing tool, due to it being a voluntary initiative (Jones et al. 2018). The authors found that manufacturers are using the HSR rating more often on products that have a higher HSR rating and using it less often on products that rate poorly.
- The Codex Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling (international food standards) were amended in 2012 to recommend that nutrition labelling should be mandatory even in the absence of health claims (Codex Alimentarius Commission 2012).
- According to the 2018 Global Update on Nutrition labelling, there has been a global trend in recent years towards mandatory nutrition labelling regardless of whether a health or nutrition claim is made (European Food Information Council 2018). The report highlighted that government backing is needed to support a scheme's credibility, and that the EU, China, Japan, Indonesia, the Philippines, Vietnam, Nigeria and Saudi Arabia have all adopted mandatory nutrition labelling, after previously having had voluntary schemes (European Food Information Council 2018). Canada and the United States have also implemented regulatory amendments to nutrition labelling and ingredient listing which includes specific added sugar

labelling requirements (Canadian Food Inspection Agency 2018; Food and Drug Administration 2018).

Pros:

- Consistent information provided to consumers
- High compliance and coverage
- Sanctions for business for non-compliance
- Utilises existing compliance and enforcement mechanisms for regulators
- Provides for a joint approach to labelling of sugar between Australia and New Zealand
- Lack of confusion amongst consumers as all labels would look the same
- Agreement on technical challenges mentioned above in the impact analysis
- Would require both domestic and imported products to comply with new label changes.
- Does not impact ability to modify to allow for future changes in guidelines, research and evidence.

Cons:

- Compliance cost for business to implement a label change. It is noted that a cost to change labels would also be incurred for those food businesses that choose to implement a label change under a code of practice.
- Would require imported products to comply with new label change.
- Cost and work for Government to introduce mandatory labelling into the Code.

References:

Canadian Food Inspection Agency. 2018. Notice to Industry - Regulatory amendments related to nutrition labelling, list of ingredient and food colours. Government of Canada. Available from: <http://www.inspection.gc.ca/food/labelling/food-labelling-for-industry/amendments/2018-05-11/eng/1481726710075/1481726780595>. Accessed 9 September 2018.

Codex Alimentarius Commission. 2012. Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling. Available from: [http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/sh-proxy/en/?lnk=1&url=https%253A%252F%252Fworkspace.fao.org%252Fsites%252Fcodex%252FStandards%252FCAC%2BGL%2B2-1985%252FCXG\\_002e.pdf](http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/sh-proxy/en/?lnk=1&url=https%253A%252F%252Fworkspace.fao.org%252Fsites%252Fcodex%252FStandards%252FCAC%2BGL%2B2-1985%252FCXG_002e.pdf). Accessed 23 August 2018.

European Food Information Council. 2018. 2018 Global update on nutrition labelling. Available from: <https://www.eufic.org/en/healthy-living/article/global-update-on-nutrition-labelling>. Accessed 23 August 2018.

Food and Drug Administration. 2018. Available from:

<https://www.fda.gov/Food/GuidanceRegulation/GuidanceDocumentsRegulatoryInformation/LabelingNutrition/ucm385663.htm>. Accessed 9 September 2018.

Jones, A., Radholm, K., Neal, B. 2018. Defining unhealthy: A systematic analysis of alignment between the Australian Dietary Guidelines and the Health Star Rating System. *Nutrients*, 10(4).

**Consultation question 10:** How effective would this option be in addressing the policy issue and achieving the desired outcome? Please provide evidence to justify your views.

The Department of Health Western Australia (DOH) supports this option. Quantifying added sugars in the NIP would provide information to assist consumers to better understand the amounts of added sugars in foods and make informed choices in support of dietary guidelines to reduce or limit foods containing added sugars. This is consistent with the way total fats and saturated fats are currently displayed in the NIP. This option will provide quantitative information, which supports the option 3 outcome, which allows for a *relative* assessment of ingredient quantities.

The DOH considers this option is likely to be effective in addressing the policy issue. The design of the option and the choice of implementation will impact on whether the policy option will be effective in achieving the desired outcome. A national education campaign accompanying such a labelling change would support this initiative in assisting consumers to interpret packaged food and drink labelling.

Implementation of this option may have the additional benefit of encouraging manufacturers to reformulating foods that contain large amounts of added sugars. This is in line with research that has found that the Health Star Rating (HSR) system has encouraged manufacturers to reformulate their products to obtain a higher star rating (Health Star Rating Advisory Committee 2017).

This option would support, and be supported by, the existing HSR; and provides for a stronger national education campaign with clear and simple messaging. Focussing on one interpretive labelling scheme (the HSR system) will minimise consumer confusion as research has found that the clarity of the system is one of its key strengths, with the majority of consumers agreeing that it is easy to understand (Parker 2017). One identified change to improve the current HSR system is to specify added sugars from total sugars in the algorithm used to calculate the HSR (Carrad et al. 2016; Peters et al. 2017).

The DOH is not supportive of incorporating % daily intake values alongside the added sugar amount in the NIP for packaged products. Some issues with the daily intake guide labelling scheme have previously been identified, such as people having varying energy and nutrition needs, labels based on variable serving sizes, and research suggesting that the scheme is confusing for consumers (Commonwealth of Australia 2011). Also, given the early stage of

the HSR system implementation, the DOH is not supportive of enhancing the policy option with the HIGH/MEDIUM/LOW advice, at this time. However, there may be merit in considering the incorporation of HIGH/MEDIUM/LOW advice in the event of HSR not being provided on eligible food products.

#### References:

Canadian Food Inspection Agency. 2018. Notice to Industry - Regulatory amendments related to nutrition labelling, list of ingredient and food colours. Government of Canada. Available from: <http://www.inspection.gc.ca/food/labelling/food-labelling-for-industry/amendments/2018-05-11/eng/1481726710075/1481726780595>. Accessed 9 September 2018.

Carrad, AM., et al. A nutrient profiling assessment of packaged foods using two star-based front-of-pack labels. Public Health Nutrition 19.12 (2016): 2165-2174.

Commonwealth of Australia. 2011. Labelling logic: review of food labelling law and policy, Canberra.

Government UK. 2018. Soft Drinks Industry Levy comes into effect. Available from: [\[https://www.gov.uk/government/news/soft-drinks-industry-levy-comes-into-effect\]](https://www.gov.uk/government/news/soft-drinks-industry-levy-comes-into-effect). Accessed 20 August 2018

Parker G. 2017. Health Star Rating System – Campaign Evaluation Report. Available from: <http://healthstarrating.gov.au/internet/healthstarrating/publishing.nsf/Content/formativ-e-research>. Accessed 20 August 2018.

Peters SA, Dunford E, Jones A, Ni Mhurchu C, Crino M, Taylor F, et al. Incorporating Added Sugar Improves the Performance of the Health Star Rating Front-of-Pack Labelling System in Australia. Nutrients. 2017;9(7):701.

**Consultation question 11:** How would this option impact you? Please provide impacts and cost relevant to you.

Increasing the knowledge and skills necessary to choose a healthy diet and curbing the rise in overweight and obesity are critical priorities in our state and are key objectives of the Department of Health Western Australia WA Health Promotion Strategic Framework 2017-2021 and the State Oral Health Plan 2016-2020. This option would support these objectives.

**Consultation question 12:** How would the proposed option impact existing elements of a food label (both mandatory and voluntary)? Would adopting this option require another element of a food label to be removed from the package? If so, which labelling elements would be removed?

The NIP is already an existing mandatory food labelling element.



It is unclear that included one additional line in the NIP for added sugar will lead to removing other existing elements of a food label. Currently, the food label has may include nutrients other than those required to be present on the NIP. It is evident in the market that many food businesses choose to voluntarily include additional nutrients in the NIP; or are required to include them in the event of making a claim. For example: trans fat, polyunsaturated fat, monounsaturated fat, DHA or EPA; gluten; vitamins and minerals. The Department of Health Western Australia notes there are already exemptions for small packages (surface area less than 100 cm<sup>2</sup>) from the requirement to include a NIP on the label, unless a claim requiring nutrition information is made.

**Consultation question 13:** Referring to Table 1 in Section 3.1, which implementation mechanism would be most appropriate for this policy option? Please provide the pros and cons of your selected implementation mechanism.

It is the Department of Health Western Australia (DOH) view that this option should be implemented as a mandatory requirement regulated by the Code. The DOH considers that the best way forward, and to maximise the benefit, the preferred option should be a combination of options 3 and 4 detailed in the Consultation RIS, along with an accompanying national education campaign to increase consumer knowledge about added sugars and how to identify sugars in the label of packaged food and drink.

The following comments are in relation to the nutrition labelling implementation mechanisms in Table 1 in section 3.1:

-There is evidence that food manufacturers are selectively applying the Health Star Rating (HSR) to their products, primarily as a marketing tool, due to it being a voluntary initiative (Jones et al. 2018). The authors found that manufacturers are using the HSR rating more often on products that have a higher HSR rating and using it less often on products that rate poorly. Manufacturers are likely to behave similarly if the grouping of sugars-based ingredients is not mandatory.

-The Codex Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling (international food standards) were amended in 2012 to recommend that nutrition labelling should be mandatory even in the absence of health claims (Codex Alimentarius Commission 2012).

-According to the 2018 Global Update on Nutrition labelling, there has been a global trend in recent years towards mandatory nutrition labelling regardless of whether a health or nutrition claim is made (European Food Information Council 2018). The report highlighted that government backing is needed to support a scheme's credibility, and that the EU, China, Japan, Indonesia, the Philippines, Vietnam, Nigeria and Saudi Arabia have all adopted mandatory nutrition labelling, after previously having had voluntary schemes (European Food Information Council 2018). Canada and the United States have also implemented regulatory amendments to nutrition labelling and ingredient listing which includes specific added sugar labelling requirements (Canadian Food Inspection Agency 2018; Food and Drug Administration 2018).

Pros:

- Given the ingredients list is already a mandatory food labelling requirement in Australia, this option may be achievable in a shorter timeframe than in comparison to introducing a new labelling initiative (such as Options 5, 6, and 7).
- Consistent information provided to consumers
- High compliance and coverage
- Sanctions for business for non-compliance
- Utilises existing compliance and enforcement mechanisms for regulators
- Provides for a joint approach to labelling of sugar between Australia and New Zealand
- Lack of confusion amongst consumers as all labels would look the same
- Agreement on technical challenges mentioned above in the impact analysis
- Would require both domestic and imported products to comply with new label changes.
- Not likely to be impacted by potential future changes in the guidelines, research or evidence, if policy option does not include % DI or Low/Medium/HIGH approach.

Cons:

- Compliance cost for business to implement a label change. It is noted that a cost to change labels would also be incurred for those food businesses that choose to implement a label change under a code of practice.
- Would require imported products to comply with new label change.
- May not be easy to modify to allow for future changes in guidelines, research and evidence where policy option includes % DI or Low/Medium/HIGH approach.
- Cost and work for Government to introduce mandatory labelling into the Code.

References:

Canadian Food Inspection Agency. 2018. Notice to Industry - Regulatory amendments related to nutrition labelling, list of ingredient and food colours. Government of Canada. Available from: <http://www.inspection.gc.ca/food/labelling/food-labelling-for-industry/amendments/2018-05-11/eng/1481726710075/1481726780595>. Accessed 9 September 2018.

Codex Alimentarius Commission. 2012. Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling. Available from: [http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/sh-proxy/en/?lnk=1&url=https%253A%252F%252Fworkspace.fao.org%252Fsites%252Fcodex%252FStandards%252FCAC%2BGL%2B2-1985%252FCXG\\_002e.pdf](http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/sh-proxy/en/?lnk=1&url=https%253A%252F%252Fworkspace.fao.org%252Fsites%252Fcodex%252FStandards%252FCAC%2BGL%2B2-1985%252FCXG_002e.pdf). Accessed 23 August 2018.

European Food Information Council. 2018. 2018 Global update on nutrition labelling. Available from: <https://www.eufic.org/en/healthy-living/article/global-update-on-nutrition-labelling>. Accessed 23 August 2018.

Food and Drug Administration. 2018. Available from: <https://www.fda.gov/Food/GuidanceRegulation/GuidanceDocumentsRegulatoryInformation/LabelingNutrition/ucm385663.htm>. Accessed 9 September 2018.

Jones, A., Radholm, K., Neal, B. 2018. Defining unhealthy: A systematic analysis of alignment between the Australian Dietary Guidelines and the Health Star Rating System. *Nutrients*, 10(4).

**Consultation question 14:** How effective would this option be in addressing the policy issue and achieving the desired outcome? Please provide evidence to justify your views.

The Department of Health Western Australia (DOH) does not support this option.

The DOH notes the Consultation RIS points to examples from countries that are implementing new front of pack labelling initiatives. In Australia, there has been significant Government investment in the development and implementation of the Health Star Rating (HSR) system, and introducing an addition labelling system risks confusion and criticism from consumers.

Consumer food purchasing decisions should consider all of the Australian dietary guidelines and a range of key nutrients (e.g. fibre, fat, salt), as well as added sugars. As stated in this consultation paper, advisory labels for foods high in sugar may lead to excessive emphasis on sugar at the expense of other key nutrients, and less accurate evaluations of a food's overall healthiness.

It is not clear how this advisory label would work in conjunction with the other voluntary nutrition elements on the label. The HSR system includes simple 'at a glance' nutritional information for consumers, on the content of packaged food and drinks. The existing HSR system review is considering potential improvements, such as the separation of added sugars from total sugars in the algorithm used to calculate the HSR. Focussing on the HSR system will minimise consumer confusion, as research has found that the clarity of the system is one of its key strengths, with the majority of consumers agreeing that it is easy to understand (Parker 2017). One identified change to improve the current HSR system is to specify added sugars from total sugars in the algorithm used to calculate the HSR (Carrad et al. 2016; Peters et al. 2017).

Given the early stage of the HSR system implementation, the DOH is not supportive of this policy option at this time. However, there may be merit in considering the use of an advisory label, in addition to policy options 3 and 4, in the event of HSR not being provided on eligible food products.

References:

Carrad, AM., et al. A nutrient profiling assessment of packaged foods using two star-based front-of-pack labels. Public Health Nutrition 19.12 (2016): 2165-2174.

Parker G. 2017. Health Star Rating System – Campaign Evaluation Report. Available from: <http://healthstarrating.gov.au/internet/healthstarrating/publishing.nsf/Content/formativ-e-research>. Accessed 20 August 2018.

Peters SA, Dunford E, Jones A, Ni Mhurchu C, Crino M, Taylor F, et al. Incorporating Added Sugar Improves the Performance of the Health Star Rating Front-of-Pack Labelling System in Australia. Nutrients. 2017;9(7):701.

**Consultation question 15:** How would this option impact you? Please provide impacts and cost relevant to you.

The Department of Health Western Australia does not support this option, given the stage of the Health Star Rating (HSR) implementation in Australia and New Zealand. However, if this option was to be implemented, it would be important to ensure that sufficient resources were provided at a national level, to support consumers in understanding of the label changes and to assist them to interpret the new labelling in conjunction with the existing front of pack (HSR) and back of pack labelling.

**Consultation question 16:** How would the proposed option impact existing elements of a food label (both mandatory and voluntary)? Would adopting this option require another element of a food label to be removed from the package? If so, which labelling elements would be removed?

No comment

**Consultation question 17:** Referring to Table 1 in Section 3.1, which implementation mechanism would be most appropriate for this policy option? Please provide the pros and cons of your selected implementation mechanism.

The Department of Health Western Australia does not support this option, given the stage of the Health Star Rating (HSR) implementation in Australia and New Zealand.

The following comments are in relation to the nutrition labelling implementation mechanisms in Table 1 in section 3.1, in general:

-There is evidence that food manufacturers are selectively applying the HSR to their products, primarily as a marketing tool, due to it being a voluntary initiative (Jones et al. 2018). The authors found that manufacturers are using the HSR rating more often on products that have a higher HSR rating and using it less often on products that rate poorly.

-The Codex Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling (international food standards) were amended in 2012 to recommend that nutrition labelling should be mandatory even in the absence of health claims (Codex Alimentarius Commission 2012).

-According to the 2018 Global Update on Nutrition labelling, there has been a global trend in recent years towards mandatory nutrition labelling regardless of whether a health or nutrition claim is made (European Food Information Council 2018). The report highlighted that government backing is needed to support a scheme's credibility, and that the EU, China, Japan, Indonesia, the Philippines, Vietnam, Nigeria and Saudi Arabia have all adopted mandatory nutrition labelling, after previously having had voluntary schemes (European Food Information Council 2018). Canada and the United States have also implemented regulatory amendments to nutrition labelling and ingredient listing which includes specific added sugar labelling requirements (Canadian Food Inspection Agency 2018; Food and Drug Administration 2018).

#### References:

Canadian Food Inspection Agency. 2018. Notice to Industry - Regulatory amendments related to nutrition labelling, list of ingredient and food colours. Government of Canada. Available from: <http://www.inspection.gc.ca/food/labelling/food-labelling-for-industry/amendments/2018-05-11/eng/1481726710075/1481726780595>. Accessed 9 September 2018.

Codex Alimentarius Commission. 2012. Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling. Available from: [http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/sh-proxy/en/?lnk=1&url=https%253A%252F%252Fworkspace.fao.org%252Fsites%252Fcodex%252FStandards%252FCAC%2BGL%2B2-1985%252FCXG\\_002e.pdf](http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/sh-proxy/en/?lnk=1&url=https%253A%252F%252Fworkspace.fao.org%252Fsites%252Fcodex%252FStandards%252FCAC%2BGL%2B2-1985%252FCXG_002e.pdf). Accessed 23 August 2018.

European Food Information Council. 2018. 2018 Global update on nutrition labelling. Available from: <https://www.eufic.org/en/healthy-living/article/global-update-on-nutrition-labelling>. Accessed 23 August 2018.

Food and Drug Administration. 2018. Available from: <https://www.fda.gov/Food/GuidanceRegulation/GuidanceDocumentsRegulatoryInformation/LabelingNutrition/ucm385663.htm>. Accessed 9 September 2018.

Jones, A., Radholm, K., Neal, B. 2018. Defining unhealthy: A systematic analysis of alignment between the Australian Dietary Guidelines and the Health Star Rating System. *Nutrients*, 10(4).

**Consultation question 18:** How effective would this option be addressing the policy issue and achieving the desired outcome? Please provide evidence to justify your views.

The Department of Health Western Australia (DOH) does not support this option.

In Australia, there has been significant Government investment in the development and implementation of the Health Star Rating (HSR) system, and introducing an additional labelling system risks confusion and criticism from consumers.

Consumer food purchasing decisions should consider all of the Australian dietary guidelines and a range of key nutrients (e.g. fibre, fat, salt), as well as added sugars. As stated in this consultation paper, an additional pictorial format for foods high in sugar may lead to excessive emphasis on sugar at the expense of other key nutrients, and less accurate evaluations of a food's overall healthiness.

It is not clear how this advisory label would work in conjunction with the other voluntary nutrition elements on the label. The HSR system includes simple 'at a glance' nutritional information for consumers, on the content of packaged food and drinks. The existing HSR system review is considering potential improvements, such as the separation of added sugars from total sugars in the algorithm used to calculate the HSR. Focussing on the HSR system will minimise consumer confusion, as research has found that the clarity of the system is one of its key strengths, with the majority of consumers agreeing that it is easy to understand (Parker 2017). One identified change to improve the current HSR system is to specify added sugars from total sugars in the algorithm used to calculate the HSR (Carrad et al. 2016; Peters et al. 2017).

Given the early stage of the HSR system implementation, the DOH is not supportive of this policy option at this time. However, there may be merit in considering the use of a pictorial label, in addition to policy options 3 and 4, in the event of HSR not being provided on eligible food products. The DOH notes that displaying sugar content pictorially could also be useful as part of national education campaign material.

**Consultation question 19:** How would this option impact you? Please provide impacts and cost relevant to you.

The Department of Health Western Australia does not support this option, given the stage of the Health Star Rating (HSR) implementation in Australia and New Zealand. However, if this option was to be implemented, it would be important to ensure that sufficient resources were provided at a national level, to support consumers in understanding of the label changes and to assist them to interpret the new labelling in conjunction with the existing front of pack (HSR) and back of pack labelling.

**Consultation question 20:** How would the proposed option impact existing elements of a food label (both mandatory and voluntary)? Would adopting this option require another element of a food label to be removed from the package? If so, which labelling elements would be removed?

No comment

**Consultation question 21:** Referring to Table 1 in Section 3.1, which implementation mechanism would be most appropriate for this policy option? Please provide the pros and cons of your selected implementation mechanism.

The Department of Health Western Australia does not support this option, given the stage of the Health Star Rating (HSR) implementation in Australia and New Zealand.

The following comments are in relation to the nutrition labelling implementation mechanisms in Table 1 in section 3.1, in general:

-There is evidence that food manufacturers are selectively applying the HSR to their products, primarily as a marketing tool, due to it being a voluntary initiative (Jones et al. 2018). The authors found that manufacturers are using the HSR rating more often on products that have a higher HSR rating and using it less often on products that rate poorly.

-The Codex Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling (international food standards) were amended in 2012 to recommend that nutrition labelling should be mandatory even in the absence of health claims (*Codex Alimentarius Commission 2012*).

-According to the 2018 Global Update on Nutrition labelling, there has been a global trend in recent years towards mandatory nutrition labelling regardless of whether a health or nutrition claim is made (European Food Information Council 2018). The report highlighted that government backing is needed to support a scheme's credibility, and that the EU, China, Japan, Indonesia, the Philippines, Vietnam, Nigeria and Saudi Arabia have all adopted mandatory nutrition labelling, after previously having had voluntary schemes (European Food Information Council 2018). Canada and the United States have also implemented regulatory amendments to nutrition labelling and ingredient listing which includes specific added sugar labelling requirements (Canadian Food Inspection Agency 2018; Food and Drug Administration 2018).

#### References:

Canadian Food Inspection Agency. 2018. Notice to Industry - Regulatory amendments related to nutrition labelling, list of ingredient and food colours. Government of Canada. Available from: <http://www.inspection.gc.ca/food/labelling/food-labelling-for-industry/amendments/2018-05-11/eng/1481726710075/1481726780595>. Accessed 9 September 2018.

Codex Alimentarius Commission. 2012. Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling. Available from: [http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/sh-proxy/en/?lnk=1&url=https%253A%252F%252Fworkspace.fao.org%252Fsites%252Fcodex%252Fstandards%252FCAC%2BGL%2B2-1985%252FCXG\\_002e.pdf](http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/sh-proxy/en/?lnk=1&url=https%253A%252F%252Fworkspace.fao.org%252Fsites%252Fcodex%252Fstandards%252FCAC%2BGL%2B2-1985%252FCXG_002e.pdf). Accessed 23 August 2018.

European Food Information Council. 2018. 2018 Global update on nutrition labelling. Available from: <https://www.eufic.org/en/healthy-living/article/global-update-on-nutrition-labelling>. Accessed 23 August 2018.

Food and Drug Administration. 2018. Available from: <https://www.fda.gov/Food/GuidanceRegulation/GuidanceDocumentsRegulatoryInformation/LabelingNutrition/ucm385663.htm>. Accessed 9 September 2018.

Jones, A., Radholm, K., Neal, B. 2018. Defining unhealthy: A systematic analysis of alignment between the Australian Dietary Guidelines and the Health Star Rating System. *Nutrients*, 10(4).

**Consultation question 22:** How effective would this option be in addressing the policy issue and achieving the desired outcome? Please provide evidence to justify your views.

The Department of Health Western Australia (DOH) does not support this option.

The DOH is of the view that nutrition information must be visible and freely accessible at the point-of-sale in order to “provide adequate contextual information to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of dietary guidelines” (the desired outcome of this work).

The ability of point-of-sale information to influence consumer choice is well recognised and has long been exploited in food retail and marketing, for example through supermarket choice architecture e.g. store layout, product positioning and promotion (*Thorndike and Sunstein 2017*). There is also evidence that point of sale information for example, calorie labelling on menus and restrictions on the placement of tobacco products for sale, lead to healthier consumer choices (*Thorndike and Sunstein 2017*). Therefore, it is important that labels placed on packaged food and drink provide adequate contextual information to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of dietary guidelines.

Evidence has not been provided to show that all consumers would be motivated to take additional steps to seek labelling information in digital/online format. Moreover, this option relies on consumers having access to the internet and/or smart phones and is therefore unlikely to be accessible by everyone. Consumers without access to these devices will be unable to access information on the added sugar content of packaged food and drink.

We need to take a holistic approach to consider factors such as “socio-demographic, cultural, social structure, economic conditions, taxation, trade, marketing etc.” which can influence the determinants of adult’s knowledge and attitudes on sugar intake (Gupta et al. 2018, 193). Lower-income and socially disadvantaged consumers may not have access to the internet and smart phones to source this information. Socially disadvantaged people and young people are also the highest consumers of sugar-sweetened beverages in Australia (*Australian Bureau of Statistics (2015). Australian Health Survey: First Results - Food and Nutrients 2011-12 – Consumption of Sweetened Beverages. Canberra: ABS*) and would therefore benefit from



freely accessible point-of-sale information regarding sugar content of packaged food and drinks. Furthermore, poor oral health is strongly associated with low socio-economic status. Research has shown that adults who are social disadvantaged or on a low income have more than double the rate of poor oral health than those on higher incomes (Slade et al. 2007). Additionally, children from low socio-economic areas are 70% more likely to have poor oral health than children in higher socio-economic areas (AIHW 2011) In the US, the Affordable Care Act requires calorie information to be provided at the point of purchase rather than on alternative sources such as pamphlets or on a web site (*Thorndike and Sunstein 2017*).

The DOH acknowledges the importance of partnership and that industry may play an important role in meeting consumer demand for healthier products and supporting governments in the implementation of policies and legislation. However, whilst recognising innovation is also important for the future, the DOH notes for consideration some key comments and questions below, in regard to using industry designed and managed websites as a primary public health policy option.

It is unclear in the description and rationale whether this option would enable consumers to easily access this information through a linkage to smart phones apps and websites. As this option relates only to the requirement for the provision of a digital linking, it is unclear the nature and extent of variation that consumers are going to experience on the various industry based digital app and web-based platforms. It follows, that it is unclear how this variation in off-label information and presentation provision, will have of consumer awareness, understanding, use and behaviour change. Potential questions related to this may include:

- Is this a population based measure? Who is the target for this intervention?
- How will the multiple off pack information version of this approach impact a consumers understanding of the current on pack labelling, sugar labelling, and nutrition labelling overall?
- Does this option provide consumers with the ability to directly compare products easily at point of selection, use or consumption?
- What is the search time impact on consumers in comparison to point of sale on pack labelling, including at point of product selection, use or consumption per product?

The DOH notes that, depending on the design (including from a governance perspective) this policy option may have the potential to increase the opportunity for food businesses to market or advertise their products. The DOH also notes that children and adolescents will use these links. Key health professionals are currently calling for a ban on advertising and marketing of unhealthy foods and drinks to children has been identified as a key public health measure, including the Australian Medical Association Limited (AMA 2018). Digital marketing is known to be a cheap and effective way for businesses to increase brand awareness/ new product launches and build brand loyalty.

- Will access be direct to the single product information or via other web pages?

-Will there be co-located marketing material with the added sugar content information/message? What is the impact of other co-located content such as marketing and/or advertising content on consumer decision making about added sugar, other nutrients of public health significance and/or product selection and consumption? What impact does this have on the primary role of supporting public health objectives?

- Does this option design provide food business with the opportunity for consumer shopper data collection, and additional brand marketing, including targeting marketing to individual shoppers? Does this option provide opportunity for increasing a food businesses website clicks and conversions? What impact does this have on the primary role of supporting public health objectives?

-What would happen to this public health measure should changes be made to restrictions on regulation of advertising and marketing of food products in Australia and/or New Zealand?

Given the information provided in the Consultation RIS, it is also unclear how this option could be supported by a government funded (i.e. publically funded) education campaign.

In summary, it is unclear whether this option is likely to be effective to “provide adequate contextual information to enable consumers to make informed choices in support of dietary guidelines”. Further information is required to understand how this policy option will satisfy the overarching rationale from the perspective of supporting public health objectives.

#### Reference:

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. Dental decay among Australian children. AIHW; 2011.

Australian Medical Association Limited. Ban advertising and marketing of junk food, sugary drinks to children. AMA Position Statement on Nutrition 2018. [Internet]. [cited 2018 August 30]. Available from: <https://ama.com.au/media/ban-junk-food-marketing-children>.

Gupta A, Smithers LG, Harford J, Merlin T, Braunack-Mayer A. Determinants of knowledge and attitudes about sugar and the association of knowledge and attitudes with sugar intake among adults: A systematic review. *Appetite*. 2018;126:185-94.

Mozaffarian D, Angell SY, Lang T, Rivera JA. Role of government policy in nutrition—barriers to and opportunities for healthier eating. *BMJ*. 2018;361:k2426.

Slade GD, Spencer AJ, Roberts-Thomson KF, editors. Australia's Dental Generations: The National Survey of Adult Oral Health, 2004-06. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare; 2007.

Thorndike AN, Sunstein CR. 2017. Obesity Prevention in the Supermarket- Choice Architecture and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. *American Journal of Public Health*. 107. 1582-1583.

**Consultation question 23:** How would this option impact you? Please provide impacts and cost relevant to you.

The Department of Health Western Australia does not support this as a primary public health policy option. However, if this option was to be implemented, it would be important to ensure that sufficient resources were provided at a national level, to support consumers in understanding of the label changes and to assist them to interpret the new labelling in conjunction with the existing front of pack Health Star Rating (HSR) and back of pack labelling.

**Consultation question 24:** How would the proposed option impact existing elements of a food label (both mandatory and voluntary)? Would adopting this option require another element of a food label to be removed from the package? If so, which labelling elements would be removed?

No comment

**Consultation question 25:** Referring to Table 1 in Section 3.1, which implementation mechanism would be most appropriate for this policy option? Please provide the pros and cons of your selected implementation mechanism.

The Department of Health Western Australia does not support this as a primary public health policy option.

The following comments are in relation to the nutrition labelling implementation mechanisms in Table 1 in section 3.1, in general:

There is evidence that food manufacturers are selectively applying the Health Star Rating (HSR) to their products, primarily as a marketing tool, due to it being a voluntary initiative (Jones et al. 2018). The authors found that manufacturers are using the HSR rating more often on products that have a higher HSR rating and using it less often on products that rate poorly.

The Codex Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling (international food standards) were amended in 2012 to recommend that nutrition labelling should be mandatory even in the absence of health claims (*Codex Alimentarius Commission 2012*).

According to the 2018 Global Update on Nutrition labelling, there has been a global trend in recent years towards mandatory nutrition labelling regardless of whether a health or nutrition claim is made (European Food Information Council 2018). The report highlighted that government backing is needed to support a scheme's credibility, and that the EU, China, Japan, Indonesia, the Philippines, Vietnam, Nigeria and Saudi Arabia have all adopted mandatory nutrition labelling, after previously having had voluntary schemes (European Food Information Council 2018). Canada and the United States have also implemented regulatory amendments to nutrition labelling and ingredient listing which includes specific added sugar labelling requirements (Canadian Food Inspection Agency 2018; Food and Drug Administration 2018).

## References:

- Canadian Food Inspection Agency. 2018. Notice to Industry - Regulatory amendments related to nutrition labelling, list of ingredient and food colours. Government of Canada. Available from: <http://www.inspection.gc.ca/food/labelling/food-labelling-for-industry/amendments/2018-05-11/eng/1481726710075/1481726780595>. Accessed 9 September 2018.
- Codex Alimentarius Commission. 2012. Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling. Available from: [http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/sh-proxy/en/?lnk=1&url=https%253A%252F%252Fworkspace.fao.org%252Fsites%252Fcodex%252FStandards%252FCAC%2BGL%2B2-1985%252FCXG\\_002e.pdf](http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/sh-proxy/en/?lnk=1&url=https%253A%252F%252Fworkspace.fao.org%252Fsites%252Fcodex%252FStandards%252FCAC%2BGL%2B2-1985%252FCXG_002e.pdf). Accessed 23 August 2018.
- European Food Information Council. 2018. 2018 Global update on nutrition labelling. Available from: <https://www.eufic.org/en/healthy-living/article/global-update-on-nutrition-labelling>. Accessed 23 August 2018.
- Food and Drug Administration. 2018. Available from: <https://www.fda.gov/Food/GuidanceRegulation/GuidanceDocumentsRegulatoryInformation/LabelingNutrition/ucm385663.htm>. Accessed 9 September 2018.
- Jones, A., Radholm, K., Neal, B. 2018. Defining unhealthy: A systematic analysis of alignment between the Australian Dietary Guidelines and the Health Star Rating System. *Nutrients*, 10(4).

**Consultation question 26:** Are there additional options that should be considered to address the policy issue and achieve the desired outcome? If so, please describe your suggested option and how it addresses the policy issue and would achieve the desired outcome? Please also describe the cost of implementing your proposed option.

No comment.

**Consultation question 27:** Is the description of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed options (compared to the status quo) accurate? Please justify your response with evidence.

No comment.

**Consultation question 28:** Are there additional strengths and weaknesses associated with the proposed options (compared to the status quo)? Please describe what these are?

No comment.

**Consultation question 29:** If you proposed a different option at question 26, please detail the strengths and weaknesses of you proposed option, compared to the status quo.

No comment.

**Consultation question 30:** Should the proposed options apply to all packaged foods in the Australian and New Zealand food supply, or only particular foods or food categories? If so, which option(s) should apply to particular foods or food categories and what would these foods or food categories be?

The Department of Health Western Australia (DOH) acknowledges the importance of a consumer being able to compare across products. The DOH is of the view that the proposed policy option(s) should apply to all packaged food and drink to create a level playing field, and assist consumers to make informed, and healthier, purchasing and consumption decisions. Labelling all packaged food and drinks will lead to policy options being more likely to achieve the desired objectives. It is also noted that targeting an added sugar labelling requirements to a specific food or food category may require additional justification from a trade restriction perspective.

References:

Thow AM, Jones A, Hawkes C, Ali I, Labonté R. Nutrition labelling is a trade policy issue: lessons from an analysis of specific trade concerns at the World Trade Organization. Health Promotion International. 2017:daw109-daw.

World Cancer Research Fund International. Comments on Health Canada's Regulations Amending Certain Regulations Made Under the Food and Drugs Act (Nutrition Symbols, Other Labelling Provisions, Partially Hydrogenated Oils and Vitamin D). [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2018 September 7]. Available from: <https://www.wcrf.org/sites/default/files/WCRFI-Consultation-response-to-Health-Canada-FDR-Amendments-FINAL-180426.pdf>.

World Trade Organization. Committee on Technical Barriers to Trade. Notification [Internet]. 2015 [cited 2018 September 6]. Available from: <file:///C:/Users/he105442/Downloads/can451.pdf>.

**Consultation question 31:** Is the description of the pros and cons of the different implementation mechanisms in Table 1 accurate? Please justify your response with evidence.

The Department of Health Western Australia (DOH) notes that the pros and cons of each of different implementation mechanisms, along with the options effectiveness, will vary depending on each policy option, and the design of each individual option. Given the number of permutations resulting from the number of policy options multiplied by the number of implementation mechanisms, it has not been practicable in the timeframe of the consultation, to consider each permutation. It is also not clear which implementation mechanisms are feasible for each policy option. For example: voluntary code of practice-industry driven implementation of option 7 may have completely different list of pros and cons compared to voluntary industry COP implementation of the ingredient list or added sugars in the NIP. Conversely, regulatory (mandatory) implementation of option 7 may have different pros and cons to regulatory (mandatory) implementation of the ingredient list or added sugars in the

NIP. Some or all, plus others may or may not apply. In addition, it would seem that voluntary implementation of options 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 are already be permitted, so it is unclear how these differ from status quo.

The DOH considers it is unclear from the Consultation RIS as to how the process of notifying the WTO a 'con' for mandatory implementation mechanisms i.e. the process of notifying the WTO Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) where there are clear public health reasons for having this modification to nutrition labelling; and there is a precedence (some countries have implemented modifications to their food labels to include added sugar in the NIP and/or grouping of ingredients. It is also difficult to identify which of the potential options (Options 3-7) in the Consultation RIS implemented on a mandatory basis would lead to an issue if the option has been designed with consideration of international trade obligations, and Australia and New Zealand rights to take measures necessary for the protection of human health. For example, against which commitment would the proposed regulation be judged as a technical barrier to trade following the notification to the WTO i.e. an issue in relation to the policy objectives, discrimination, trade restrictiveness, and/or international standards and guidelines?

#### References:

Mozaffarian D, Angell SY, Lang T, Rivera JA. Role of government policy in nutrition—barriers to and opportunities for healthier eating. *BMJ*. 2018;361:k2426.

Thow AM, Jones A, Hawkes C, Ali I, Labonté R. Nutrition labelling is a trade policy issue: lessons from an analysis of specific trade concerns at the World Trade Organization. *Health Promotion International*. 2017:daw109-daw.

World Cancer Research Fund International. Comments on Health Canada's Regulations Amending Certain Regulations Made Under the Food and Drugs Act (Nutrition Symbols, Other Labelling Provisions, Partially Hydrogenated Oils and Vitamin D). [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2018 September 7]. Available from: <https://www.wcrf.org/sites/default/files/WCRFI-Consultation-response-to-Health-Canada-FDR-Amendments-FINAL-180426.pdf>.

World Trade Organization. Committee on Technical Barriers to Trade. Notification [Internet]. 2015 [cited 2018 September 6]. Available from: <file:///C:/Users/he105442/Downloads/can451.pdf>.

**Consultation question 32:** Are there other pros and cons associated with the different implementation mechanisms? Please describe what these are.

The Department of Health Western Australia (DOH) notes the following may be additional cons:

- The cost to industry to change label is a 'con' for the voluntary and the voluntary code of practice-industry driven implementation mechanism.

-Voluntary option and the voluntary code of practice-industry driven implementation options lack a monitoring or evaluation element.

-Having multiple labelling implementation mechanisms may increase the complexity of labelling requirements for industry i.e in addition to regulations, having multiple codes of practice that they need to comply with, such as the Health Star Rating (HSR) System requirements plus a separate added sugar labelling code of practice. This may be further exacerbated for future public health labelling initiatives, if there is to be voluntary or code of practice approach for each nutrition related policy issue.

-The Consultation RIS indicates education about the chosen option would be a standard element of any implementation option. The DOH notes that some of the policy options combined with implementation mechanism options, may lead to use publically funded nutrition/health education to support and promote consumers accessing food industry based websites. It is unclear whether these websites will contain other advertising and marketing content; or whether there will be limits on content and how this will be controlled. For example, voluntary or voluntary code of practice-industry driven implementation of option 7.

- Voluntary code of practice –industry driven and voluntary code of practice -government driven implementation options may mean that any cost burden is only applied to Australian and/or New Zealand food producers/manufactures. According to the Council of Australian Government Best Practice Regulation- A guide for Ministerial Councils and national standard setting bodies, a voluntary code of practice for which there is reasonable expectation of widespread compliance are considered regulatory. This means that there is potential for imported foods to have a financial advantage in the Australian and New Zealand markets.

-Voluntary code of practice implementation mechanisms may have the potential for creating confusion as all labels will not look the same. Differences in on-label information will also occur between domestic and imported foods. There may also be large variation in the provision of information via off-label digital platforms (apps and web sites), including issues relating to access, location and format. It is unclear what impact these variations would have on consumer awareness, use, understanding and behaviour change.

- Government driven code of practices have government workload and costs. For example costs associated with developing and administrating the HSR system.

**Consultation question 33:** Are there any other benefits or costs associated with the proposed labelling options which have not been identified above?

No comment

**Consultation question 34:** Should there be exemptions or other accommodations (such as longer transition periods) made for small businesses, to minimise the regulatory burden? If so, what exemptions or other accommodations do you suggest?

No comment

**Consultation question 35:** What would be the cost per year for the industry to self-regulate (e.g. voluntary code of practice- industry driven)? Please justify your response with hours of time, and number of staff required. Please specify which country (Australia or New Zealand) your evidence is based on.

No comment

**Consultation question 36:** Would industry pass any of the costs associated with implementing the proposed options on to consumers? What is the basis for your view?

No comment

Thank you for considering the above responses. Should you wish to discuss any of these comments please do not hesitate to contact <sup>s 47F</sup> or e-mail <sup>s 47F</sup>

Yours sincerely

<sup>s 47F</sup>

**A/MANAGER - FOOD  
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH DIRECTORATE  
PUBLIC AND ABORIGINAL HEALTH DIVISION  
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH WESTERN AUSTRALIA**

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN RELEASED UNDER  
THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 1982 (CTH)  
BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH



**Consultation paper: Review of fast food menu labelling schemes**

***Please Note: At the time of making this submission, the South Australian Government is in caretaker and cannot propose or support any change in policy or legislation that relates to this scheme. The comments made in this submission are therefore only in relation to our experience/ challenges with the current scheme operating in SA.***

**Evaluation :**

**Consultation question 1:** Are you aware of any other pending or completed evaluations that have relevance to the Australian experience? If yes, please provide results and references with your response where possible.

As part of the SA evaluation, SA Health had conducted a compliance check survey in 2013-14. Initial compliance was found to be low (73%) which can be attributed to the lack of knowledge and understanding of implementing the legislation by the captured businesses. However regular follow-up and education to businesses resulted in significant improvement in compliance and all business that were noncompliant during the initial assessment were found to be compliant at the follow-up inspections. Issues observed during inspections were minor in nature. Issues identified included partial missing energy values, missing reference statement or not displayed at the right location. The report of survey was published in Annual Food Act report and is available on our SA Health website. SA has not conducted any consumer interviews or online surveys as part of evaluation process.

**Part A**

**Legislation consistency:**

**Consultation question 2:** Are there any other issues in relation to exempt businesses that should be considered?

In Table1 of the consultation paper, mobile food vendors are currently captured under SA legislation for menu labelling. SA legislation specifies the types of businesses that are captured and those which are exempted but do not specifically mention static businesses or mobile food vans. Instead it uses the term 'all multisite food chains' therefore mobile food vans are automatically captured. At this stage, there are no multisite mobile businesses operating in SA which has threshold numbers of stores or vans to be captured by legislation.

**Consultation question 3:** What could be done to ensure kilojoule information is available in as many outlets as possible? What are the pros and cons of your suggested approach?

**Legibility:**

**Consultation question 4:** Are there any other issues in relation to legibility that should be considered?

Dynamic menu boards are providing a challenging environment for legibility of energy values on sliding menu pages. SA legislation specifies that energy values should be displayed in the same font, and at least the same font size, as the price, or if no price is displayed as the name of the item. Same font requirement negate the possibility of diminishing the visibility of energy value. No legibility issue was identified during monitoring on static menu boards. However in rolling menu boards there is a time factor which plays an important role i.e. how long a rolling menu should remain on screen to enable consumer read the complete information. There is a concern that, by the time consumer selects a specific food item for purchase, the display menu rolls over making it hard for the customer to read energy information or wait for the slide to appear again to read the kilojoule values.

**Consultation question 5:** What can be done to ensure kilojoule information is as easy to use as possible by the consume

Recommend consistent support information to consumer that explains the system. Use social media or other media campaigns to educate consumer on ongoing basis and evaluate the impact of these campaigns.

**Consultation question 6:** What can be done to facilitate businesses to address legibility issues?  
What are the pros and cons of your suggested approach?

## **Part B**

### **Menu customization**

**Consultation question 7:** Are there any other issues in relation to menu customisation that should be considered?

**Consultation question 8:** What could be done to enable healthier choices when customising menu items? What are the pros and cons of your suggested approach?

### **Rolling menu boards**

**Consultation question 9:** Are there any other issues in relation to rolling menu boards that should be considered?

Please note the challenges with the rolling menu highlighted above in Q4 response..

**Consultation question 10:** What could be done to ensure kilojoule information is easy to access and that consumers can compare products easily? What are the pros and cons of your suggested approach?

### **Online ordering**

**Consultation question 11:** Are there any other issues in relation to on-line ordering that should be considered?

**Consultation question 12:** What could be done to ensure kilojoule information is included on all web-based ordering platforms? What are the pros and cons of your suggested approach?

## Combination meals with pre-packaged food

**Consultation question 13:** Are there any other issues in relation to combination meals that should be considered?

**Consultation question 14:** What could be done to ensure kilojoule information is provided for the whole meal? What are the pros and cons of your suggested approach?

## Part C

### Additional and interpretive information

**Consultation question 15:** Are there any other issues in relation to additional and interpretive information that should be considered?

**Consultation question 16:** What could be done to ensure kilojoule information is as easy to interpret as possible? What are the pros and cons of your suggested approach?

### Kilojoule display variations

**Consultation questions 17:** Are there any other issues in relation to kilojoule display that should be considered?

**Consultation question 18:** What could be done to ensure kilojoule information is as easy to use and interpret as possible? What are the pros and cons of your suggested approach?

### Other issues

**Consultation question 19:** Are there any other issues with current menu labelling schemes that should be considered during this review? Please provide information to support your response.

#### Feedback from a multisite food chain operating in SA has highlighted following

“This is the only retailer in Australia that has products with 5 digits of kilojoule values due to basic intrinsic product composition. From a marketing perspective requirement of displaying kJ values in the same font size as the font size for price is affecting creative work. They now tend not to promote the product name or price to simply avoid the use of displaying KJ at a large level. If there was a minimum font size for A1, A2 etc. this would allow the retailer to have a larger and more relevant price point and a somewhat smaller kJ.”

## Submission: Review of fast food menu labelling schemes

DHHS Tasmania

March 2018

Contact officer: s 47F

Principal Public Health Nutritionist s 47F

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the *Review of fast food menu labelling schemes*.

Tasmania does not have much to offer given we have not introduced a fast food menu labelling scheme. Our analysis of the situation in Tasmania was that potentially only one additional food business (a bakery chain) would be captured should legislation be progressed at State level. Many of the large national fast food outlets are already using kJ labelling due to the influence of interstate legislation. Due to the resources required to progress legislation at state level, this has not been seen as a good investment especially given the limited number of additional businesses that would be captured.

Tasmania considers it would be more efficient if this sort of initiative was progressed nationally and captured under the Model Food Act. This would enable jurisdictions to simply adopt by reference and provide a clear level playing field for industry across jurisdictions.

<b>Consultation question 1:</b> Are you aware of any other pending or completed evaluations that have relevance to the Australian experience? If yes, please provide results and references with your response where possible.	No.
<b>Consultation question 2:</b> Are there any other issues in relation to exempt businesses that should be considered?	Lower thresholds for the number of outlets food businesses have to be captured, such as introduced in the ACT, is potentially discriminatory against businesses operating in smaller jurisdictions. A level playing field for food businesses across jurisdictions would be fairer. The national threshold captures the large enterprises that may only have a small number of outlets in any particular jurisdictions.
<b>Consultation question 3:</b> What could be done to ensure kilojoule information is available in as many outlets as possible? What are the pros and cons of your suggested approach?	Not convinced the aim should be to get as many outlets as possible. This initiative should be aimed at capturing the large enterprises (major players) that have the capacity to 'get it right' and where there is sufficient capacity to regulate. It would be unrealistic to expect the 'local fish and chippy' to be able to accurately determine the kJ content of the food they serve, or standardise their meals. Capturing the smaller players could lead to widespread inaccurate information being available to consumers and significant regulatory challenges. It is likely there are better initiatives to engage local level outlets in promoting healthy eating – for example focussing on

	seasonal and, where possible, local produce.
<b>Consultation question 4:</b> Are there any other issues in relation to legibility that should be considered?	Customer legibility should drive this from a policy perspective. The information needs to be consistent and clear to ensure consumers can easily understand the information at-a-glance.
<b>Consultation question 5:</b> What can be done to ensure kilojoule information is as easy to use as possible by the consumer?	No comment
<b>Consultation question 6:</b> What can be done to facilitate businesses to address legibility issues?	Standardised approach nationally based on the best available information about consumer legibility.
What are the pros and cons of your suggested approach?	
<b>Consultation question 7:</b> Are there any other issues in relation to menu customisation that should be considered?	No comment.
<b>Consultation question 8:</b> What could be done to enable healthier choices when customising menu items? What are the pros and cons of your suggested approach?	No comment.
<b>Consultation question 9:</b> Are there any other issues in relation to rolling menu boards that should be considered?	No comment
<b>Consultation question 10:</b> What could be done to ensure kilojoule information is easy to access and that consumers can compare products easily? What are the pros and cons of your suggested approach?	No comment
<b>Consultation question 11:</b> Are there any other issues in relation to on-line ordering that should be considered?	No comment
<b>Consultation question 12:</b> What could be done to ensure kilojoule information is included on all web-based ordering platforms? What are the pros and cons of your suggested approach?	No comment
<b>Consultation question 13:</b> Are there any other issues in relation to combination meals that should be considered?	No comment
<b>Consultation question 14:</b> What could be done to ensure kilojoule information is provided for the whole meal? What are the pros and cons of your suggested approach?	No comment
<b>Consultation question 15:</b> Are there any other issues in relation to additional and interpretive information that should be considered?	No comment
<b>Consultation question 16:</b> What could be done to ensure kilojoule information is as easy to interpret as possible? What are the pros and cons of your suggested approach?	No comment

<b>Consultation questions 17:</b> Are there any other issues in relation to kilojoule display that should be considered?	
<b>Consultation question 18:</b> What could be done to ensure kilojoule information is as easy to use and interpret as possible? What are the pros and cons of your suggested approach?	
<b>Consultation question 19:</b> Are there any other issues with current menu labelling schemes that should be considered during this review? Please provide information to support your response.	In Tasmania we are encouraging food retailers to focus on seasonal and local food. Hence a move away from standardised food items. For this reason fast food menu labelling really is only relevant to the big national chains that want customers to have the same experience throughout their stores. If menu labelling lead to increased standardisation of food items in smaller fast food outlet chains this could lead to reduced reliance on seasonal and local food produce which may have unintended consequences for health.

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN RELEASED UNDER  
THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 1992 (Cth)  
BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH





Food Regulation Secretariat  
C/- MDP707, GPO Box 9848  
Canberra ACT 2601  
Email: [FoodRegulationSecretariat@health.gov.au](mailto:FoodRegulationSecretariat@health.gov.au)

**Department of Health Western Australia submission on  
Consultation – Menu labelling**

**Submission close: 16 March 2018**

The Department of Health Western Australia (DOH) would like to thank the Australia and New Zealand Ministerial Forum on Food Regulation for seeking comment on the review of fast food menu labelling schemes consultation paper. The DOH acknowledges the importance of public health nutrition based initiatives which aim to reduce the burden and impact of the conditions of obesity and overweight. The fast food kilojoule menu labelling schemes implemented in jurisdictions in Australia provides a key example of a food regulation public health measure targeting improving consumer awareness and understanding of the high kilojoule content of fast foods (including beverages) and their own energy requirements. This initiative also encourages consumer use of the kilojoule menu information to make healthier purchasing and consumption decisions.

The DOH acknowledges that although kilojoule menu labelling is not currently legislated in Western Australia, the legislation in other jurisdictions captures national chains which have decided to implement this menu labelling across Australia. In light of the obesity epidemic in Australia, the DOH sees merit in these schemes. The DOH notes that there is now both Australian and international evidence that kilojoule menu labelling is effective in reducing the amount of energy consumed per meal and assists consumers to make healthy choices. Such schemes align with other nutrition related public health policy and health promotion activities at local and state and national levels. These labelling initiatives provide one component of a wider suite of measures that are necessary to help create healthy food environments, support and encourage consumers and parents/carers in their purchasing and consumption decision making, and reduce diet related diseases.

Given that obesity has been identified as a priority public health issue in Western Australia, the DOH is committed to exploring potential public health measures to reduce obesity levels and the impact of obesity on the Western Australian community. Inquiries are now underway into identifying what needs to change, and what are the potential policy actions and solutions. As part of this commitment, the DOH has initiated an investigation into the legislative requirements that are needed



for the implementation of a fast food kilojoule menu labelling scheme in Western Australia.

This DOH submission has been prepared by the Environmental Health Directorate, with input from Chronic Disease Prevention Directorate and South Metropolitan Health Service. Comments in response to specific questions raised in the consultation paper are detailed below.

### Section: Evaluation

#### Consultation question 1:

Are you aware of any other pending or completed evaluations that have relevance to the Australian experience? If yes, please provide results and references with your response where possible.

The DOH is aware of the following recent publications (including from an international context) that may inform the Australian review:

- Crockett R, King S, Marteau T, Prevost A, Bignardi G, Roberts N, et al. Nutritional labelling for healthier food or non-alcoholic drink purchasing and consumption. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2018.
- Wellard-Cole L, Goldsbury D, Havill M, Hughes C, Watson WL, Dunford EK, et al. Monitoring the changes to the nutrient composition of fast foods following the introduction of menu labelling in New South Wales, Australia: an observational study. Public Health Nutrition. 2017;1-6.
- Bleich SN, Moran AJ, Jarlenski MP, Wolfson JA. Higher-Calorie Menu Items Eliminated in Large Chain Restaurants. American Journal of Preventive Medicine. 2018;54(2):214-20.
- Bleich SN, Economos CD, Spiker ML, Vercammen KA, VanEpps EM, Block JP, et al. A systematic review of calorie labeling and modified calorie labeling interventions: impact on consumer and restaurant behavior. Obesity. 2017.

### PART A - Inconsistency in legislation between jurisdictions

#### Consultation question 2:

Are there any other issues in relation to exempt businesses that should be considered?

#### Section: Voluntary display

The DOH considers that where an individual outlet decides to display kilojoule information on a voluntary basis, providing this information in a manner consistent with the prescribed requirements of the existing state or territory legislation is likely to assist with consistency of messaging to consumers.

#### Consultation question 3:

What could be done to ensure kilojoule information is available in as many outlets as possible? What are the pros and cons of your suggested approach?

The DOH considers it is important to strike an appropriate balance between maximising the provision of kilojoule information to consumers and minimising the



impact on smaller food businesses. There may be potential for jurisdictions to consider amendments to their respective Food Acts to improve consistency in the types of outlets that are included and excluded from the schemes.

#### Pros

- potential to create a more level playing field across food businesses

#### Cons

- may not achieve consistency in approach across jurisdictions
- these labelling schemes are relatively new – changes at this early phase may impact implementation and review of these schemes across the jurisdictions.

It is noted that this current position will be informed during the Western Australian state based kilojoule menu labelling scoping work.

### Section: Legibility

#### **Consultation question 4:**

Are there any other issues in relation to legibility that should be considered?

No comments.

#### **Consultation question 5:**

What can be done to ensure kilojoule information is as easy to use as possible by the consumer?

One of the key issues for 'ease of use' relates to consistency of the information being provided to consumers. It is important to ensure that the information provided is as consistent as possible, whilst maintaining scope for jurisdictions to deal with emerging issues, such as rolling menu boards and legibility issues.

#### **Consultation question 6:**

What can be done to facilitate businesses to address legibility issues? What are the pros and cons of your suggested approach?

At this stage, the DOH considers that given the issues raised by jurisdictions with legibility, it is important to prescribe that the kilojoule information be displayed in the same size, colour and font as the price and or name of the menu item. It is noted that this current position will be informed during the Western Australian state based kilojoule menu labelling scoping work.

## PART B - Changing trends in the fast food industry

### Section: Menu customisation

#### **Consultation question 7:**

Are there any other issues in relation to menu customisation that should be considered?

No comments.

**Consultation question 8:**

What could be done to enable healthier choices when customising menu items? What are the pros and cons of your suggested approach?

No comments.

### Section: Rolling menu boards

**Consultation question 9:**

Are there any other issues in relation to rolling menu boards that should be considered?

No comments.

**Consultation question 10:**

What could be done to ensure kilojoule information is easy to access and that consumers can compare products easily? What are the pros and cons of your suggested approach?

### Section: Online ordering

No comments.

**Consultation question 11:**

Are there any other issues in relation to on-line ordering that should be considered?

No comments.

**Consultation question 12:**

What could be done to ensure kilojoule information is included on all web-based ordering platforms? What are the pros and cons of your suggested approach?

Given the fast growing web-based ordering platforms, the DOH considers exploration of potential for capturing web-based ordering platforms and the issue of the exclusion of catalogues as menus, from the perspective of the intent of the legislation is warranted.

There may be potential for jurisdictions to consider amendments to their respective Food Acts and/or interpretation guides to capture these new ordering platforms.

#### Pros

- may create a more level playing field across food businesses ordering platforms

#### Cons

- may not achieve consistency in approach across jurisdictions  
these labelling schemes are relatively new – changes at this early phase may impact implementation and review of these schemes across the jurisdictions.

It is noted that this current position will be informed during the Western Australian state based kilojoule menu labelling scoping work.



## Section: Combination meals with pre-packaged food

### Consultation question 13:

Are there any other issues in relation to combination meals that should be considered?

No comments.

### Consultation question 14:

What could be done to ensure kilojoule information is provided for the whole meal?  
What are the pros and cons of your suggested approach?

There is potential for jurisdictions to consider amendments to their interpretations contained in user guides, to achieve consistency in how food businesses can satisfy the requirement to provide the kilojoule information across the whole meal.

#### Pros

- may create a more consistency in interpretation of requirements.

#### Cons

- may not achieve consistency in approach across jurisdictions, and across food businesses where consensus is not possible, or not agreed, on implementation of the jurisdiction's respective legislation.

## PART C. DIFFICULTIES OF INTERPRETATION

### Section: Additional and interpretive information

### Consultation question 15:

Are there any other issues in relation to additional and interpretive information that should be considered?

Interpreting nutrient-level information and its impact on one's diet requires a level of literacy, numeracy, and food literacy/knowledge. Therefore, the level of food literacy as well as general numeracy and literacy should be considered should other nutrients (salt and sugar) be added to the labelling.

### Consultation question 16:

What could be done to ensure kilojoule information is as easy to interpret as possible? What are the pros and cons of your suggested approach?

Although improving, the consultation paper highlights that consumer knowledge and understanding remains a key issue. The State and Territory schemes are new initiatives. The DOH considers it is important to allow appropriate time for their implementation and review, before making changes to the legislation, such as amending their scope to include additional nutrients of public health significance such as sugar and salt. Including these additional nutrients may complicate the schemes and confuse consumers. The DOH agrees that kilojoule labelling should be simple,

unambiguous and meaningful to aid consumer connection and maximise the impact on consumers.

Improving consumer knowledge and understanding of kilojoules content and how this information relates to their personal energy requirements (i.e. food literacy) needs to be prioritised. Information on kilojoules and energy, how they relate to an individual's energy requirements and the display of kilojoule content on fast food outlet's menus needs to be imbedded in health education in schools and public health campaigns, within the context of the healthy diet messages of the Australian Dietary Guidelines. For kilojoule labelling to be meaningful and impact on food choice, consumer education should be presented in the context of healthy dietary guidelines and food-based messages such as choosing more vegetables and drinking water instead. A clear path to the healthier alternatives and the desired behaviour would facilitate a healthier food choice.

The DOH notes that the evaluation of the recent Queensland Health's 'Kilojoules on the menu' campaign launched in February 2017 may further inform how education materials and campaigns support the implementation of these schemes.

### Section: Kilojoule display variation

#### Consultation question 17:

Are there any other issues in relation to kilojoule display that should be considered?

No comments.

#### Consultation question 18:

What could be done to ensure kilojoule information is as easy to use and interpret as possible? What are the pros and cons of your suggested approach?

No comments.

### Section: Other issues

#### Consultation question 19:

Are there any other issues with current menu labelling schemes that should be considered during this review? Please provide information to support your response.

No comments.

Thank you for considering the above comments. Should you wish to discuss any of these comments please do not hesitate to contact me on <sup>s 47F</sup> or email [EnvironmentalHealth.PA@health.wa.gov.au](mailto:EnvironmentalHealth.PA@health.wa.gov.au)

Yours sincerely

<sup>s 47F</sup>

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH DIRECTORATE**

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN RELEASED UNDER  
THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 1982 (CTH)  
BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH





**Department of Health**

Enquiries to: **s 47F**  
Director  
Preventive Health Branch  
Telephone: **s 47F**  
File Ref: QCHO/009302

Food Regulation Secretariat  
Food Regulation Standing Committee  
C/- MDP707, GPO Box 9848  
CANBERRA ACT 2601

Email: [FoodRegulationSecretariat@health.gov.au](mailto:FoodRegulationSecretariat@health.gov.au)

Dear Sir / Madam

**Submission – Consultation paper – Review of fast food menu labelling schemes**

Thank you for the opportunity to provide a submission regarding the review of fast food menu labelling schemes.

This submission provides advice and comments related to this issue. The submission does not represent a Queensland Government position, which will be a matter for the Queensland Government at the Australia and New Zealand Ministerial Forum on Food Regulation.

The consultation paper identifies inconsistencies between existing menu labelling schemes, emerging trends in the fast-food sector and interpretation difficulties experienced by customers. Queensland Department of Health has not identified any further issues and therefore our submission focuses on potential solutions.

Some issues could be addressed via clarification of the intent of menu labelling and its specific elements in user guides. However, it is acknowledged that to address a number of the identified issues, amendments to jurisdictions' existing legislation would be required and that this may not be feasible in the short-term, particularly as Queensland's mandatory provisions have only been in force for 12 months and the evaluation of the scheme is currently in progress.

A stepped approach may be more appropriate. A first step would be to consider the findings from completed and pending evaluations, as well as commission further research on issues where necessary. The next step would be to review and amend the National Principles to address inconsistencies, emerging trends and interpretation issues that have become apparent since the National Principles were developed in 2011. The final step would be for individual jurisdictions to determine what, if any, revisions may be required to their schemes to better align with the revised National Principles. For some jurisdictions, changes to legislation may be required, while other jurisdictions may be able to amend user guides. This approach should be within a defined timeframe, for example within the next 3 to 5 years, to provide certainty for both businesses and consumers; and to ensure national consistency is delivered in a reasonable timeframe.

Below are responses to selected consultation questions.

**Consultation question 1:** Are you aware of any other pending or completed evaluations that have relevance to the Australian experience? If yes, please provide results and references with your response where possible.

The Cochrane Collaboration recently published a systematic review on nutritional labelling in fast-food outlets, grocery stores and vending machines. The review included 11 studies which assessed the impact of labelling on purchasing behaviours, and 17 studies that assessed the impact on food consumption. None of the included studies were based on Australian menu labelling legislation, with 21 of the studies coming from the USA. Based on 3 randomised control trials, the authors found that menu labelling reduced the amount of energy purchased by 47 calories (approx. nearly 200 kilojoules). However, overall the evidence is of low-quality and more high-quality, real-world research is required. The paper is open access and the full citation is: Crockett RA, King SE, Marteau TM, Prevost AT, Bignardi G, Roberts NW, Stubbs B, Hollands GJ, Jebb SA. Nutritional labelling for healthier food or non-alcoholic drink purchasing and consumption. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2018, Issue 2. Art. No.: CD009315. <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD009315.pub2>

The Cancer Council NSW-led analysis of the NSW menu labelling scheme was published in December 2017. This evaluation focused on whether five large businesses reduced the energy content of menu items after the NSW legislation was introduced. The authors found that there was no significant reduction in energy content. The full citation is: Wellard-Cole L, Goldsbury D, Havill M, Hughes C, Watson WL, Dunford EK, Chapman K. Monitoring the changes to the nutrient composition of fast foods following the introduction of menu labelling in New South Wales, Australia: an observational study. *Public Health Nutrition* 2017, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980017003706>

An Australian analysis on menu labelling was published in the Journal of Retailing in late-2017. This paper concluded that consumers purchased 27 less calories (approx. 115 kilojoules) and retailers' overall menu offerings were 15 calories (nearly 65 kilojoules) less after menu labelling was voluntarily implemented in the USA. The paper is available for purchase and the full citation is: Zlatevska N, Neumann N, Dubelaar C. Mandatory Calorie Disclosure: A Comprehensive Analysis of Its Effect on Consumers and Retailers. *Journal of Retailing* 2017, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.retail.2017.09.007>

**Consultation question 3:** What could be done to ensure kilojoule information is available in as many outlets as possible? What are the pros and cons of your suggested approach?

To extend the reach of menu labelling to more consumers, there are several approaches focusing on business type, business size and voluntary display that warrant further consideration.

#### Business type

##### Option 1:

The intent of menu labelling is to assist consumers make informed choices by the provision of kilojoule information at the point-of-sale. Therefore, it is suggested the requirement to implement menu labelling is determined by whether a business sells standard food items, rather than by business type. A food-based approach aligns with the National Principle that "point-of-sale

nutrition information should contribute to improving public health outcomes". With no discrimination between businesses, all customers regardless of where they purchase ready-to-eat, standardised food would have access to kilojoule information.

This approach would remove the current inconsistency of business exemptions, and create a level playing field for all businesses. It would mean that convenience stores, dine-in restaurant chains, service stations, supermarkets, cinemas and mobile vendors, all of which are currently exempt in one or more jurisdictions, which sold standard food items, would need to display kilojoule information.

While this change would require legislative amendments to remove current exemptions, it would not require a change to the definition of standard food outlet. It would also aid to future-proof menu labelling schemes, as other business types, such as catering companies, could be captured if they meet the definition of standard food outlet. The disadvantage of this approach is that it does not allow for jurisdictional flexibility.

#### *Option 2:*

If on the other hand, menu labelling continued to be determined by business type and current exemptions applied, the definitions of convenience stores and supermarkets could be changed. Rather than defining a convenience store as "not being a supermarket", it could be defined by its floor area for retail sale, for example less than 200m<sup>2</sup>. Subsequently, supermarkets could be defined as 200m<sup>2</sup> or greater than (rather than the current 1000m<sup>2</sup>) floor area for retail sale. This change would result in smaller supermarkets, like those in regional and rural communities and in the CBD of larger centres, no longer being exempt from menu labelling. Although, all jurisdictions use the same definitions of supermarkets and convenience stores, and therefore do not capture these smaller supermarkets, this is a growth area and further consideration is warranted. Customers of these businesses would then have access to kilojoule content of standard food items. This is important because our regional and rural communities, where smaller supermarkets are typically located, generally experience worse health status.

#### Business size

Currently most jurisdictions have adopted the 50 national, 20 state thresholds for the number of outlets, established by the NSW legislation. There would be advantages in States and Territories tailoring thresholds to suit their local context. Due to variances in size and population, the National Principles do not currently provide a threshold for number of outlets that should be captured by menu labelling requirements. The Principles could be amended to clarify that jurisdictions assess the appropriate threshold for standard food outlets before provisions apply. States and Territories could then set their own threshold to better deal with varying geographical sizes, as has already been done by the ACT. The national threshold for 50 or more outlets could be maintained, unless there came a time where the evidence supported lowering the threshold.

One important consideration in setting thresholds is businesses' ability to absorb the cost of menu labelling requirements rather than place the burden on customers through price increases. Business size is one factor in whether a business can absorb costs; however, other influencing factors include customer numbers, meals served, and revenue. An advantage of the current system of number of outlets is its simplicity, while a more complex determination that captures businesses on a range of elements could result in a more targeted approach.



### Voluntary display

For a variety of reasons a business may voluntarily choose to display kilojoule content of their products. To avoid consumer confusion through a proliferation of different systems and minimise regulatory burden while also providing a level playing field for businesses, all businesses that do not meet the outlet threshold, should be allowed to display kilojoules; however should do so in the same way. Most jurisdictions regulate voluntary display of chain stores so are consistent with the National Principles that state “ensure food outlets that are not captured by the initiative but choose to provide nutrition information voluntarily, do so in a consistent manner”. However, non-chain stores are not defined as standard food outlets and so the voluntary display provisions are not applicable. To ensure any business can display kilojoules and for national consistency, some jurisdictions would need to amend legislation, while user guides could be amended.

**Consultation question 6:** What can be done to facilitate businesses to address legibility issues? What are the pros and cons of your suggested approach?

To address issues of legibility (such as pale grey kilojoule information on a white background) that became apparent after the implementation of the NSW legislation, the Queensland Government prescribed that the kilojoule information must be in the same colour as the item price or name. It is acknowledged that this approach has not entirely solved the legibility issue, and has added to inconsistencies between schemes. Some businesses have advised that they produce different menu boards for Queensland due to this colour requirement.

Legibility provisions related to colour, background colour, boldness and capitalisation could be introduced through the National Principles and subsequently by each jurisdiction. However, some businesses have reported that such specifications stifle their creativity and this requirement could be deemed as anti-competition. An alternative approach would be providing more detailed guidance on the “be clearly legible” provision which is open to interpretation and has not prevented issues of poor legibility. This guidance could be included in the guideline definitions of the National Principles and jurisdictions’ user guides.

**Consultation question 8:** What could be done to enable healthier choices when customising menu items? What are the pros and cons of your suggested approach?

With the reported growth in menu customisation, it is important that all customers have access to kilojoule information to make healthier choices. Although some businesses already provide kilojoule content for standard ingredients in-store or online, it is not a universal practice.

The definition of a standard food item includes that it is a ready-to-eat food, standardised for content and portion. Individual ingredients that businesses allow customers to choose to customise base items are typically standardised for portion and content (e.g. adding cheese to a burger, adding an extra topping to a pizza, adding confectionery to an ice-cream, or adding condiments to a sandwich). The contention is whether these ingredients are ‘ready-to-eat’ in their own right. The easiest option would be for jurisdictions to interpret the existing standard food item definition to include individual ingredients. Alternatively, the definition could be amended; however, it would be important to ensure that any revision did not capture foods not intended to be included.

Businesses would have access to the kilojoule information needed to comply with this approach, given that it is needed to determine the kilojoule content of other menu items. For example, to calculate the kilojoules of a burger, a business would have information on the kilojoules in a meat patty; therefore if customers could add an extra meat patty to a burger, the business would be able to display the kilojoules in a meat patty.

The key consideration for businesses would be how they display information for individual ingredients. Electronic ordering systems, whether in-store or online, more easily facilitate the display of kilojoules for individual ingredients. Such systems could also be designed to display the total kilojoules for the final customised product. While static menus would not be able to provide the total kilojoules for a customised product, they can be designed to display the kilojoule content of individual ingredients. Where space constraints on static menus exist, businesses could display all standardised ingredients as a list on a separate menu, such as a poster board.

Another issue with customisation is self-service takeaway outlets that standardise ingredients for content, yet the portion is controlled by the customer. Based largely on the definition of a standard food item, these outlets are not required to display kilojoule information. Given the issue of obesity and that overconsumption is a key determinant, supporting customers to choose a healthier portion size is necessary. Therefore, it is important that the kilojoule content is displayed.

Changing the definition of a standard food item to include these outlets is not recommended. However, additional provisions specific to self-service businesses could be drafted. These could define standardised foods in a self-service setting and the unit in which displayed. In this scenario, per 100 grams would be appropriate, as kilojoule content per 100 grams should only be used for product portions that change, such as when the customer controls the portion. A first step may be to work with self-service businesses to encourage and support uptake of menu labelling, before legislative changes are considered.

**Consultation question 10:** What could be done to ensure kilojoule information is easy to access and that consumers can compare products easily? What are the pros and cons of your suggested approach?

As has already been prescribed in Queensland's legislation, simultaneous display provisions for rolling and online menus could be included in all states and territories. However, the Queensland provisions could be expanded to ensure that similar food types are displayed together, for example, all burgers are displayed at the same time. To prevent industry creativity being stifled, time-limited promotions could be exempt from this requirement. Simultaneous display requirements are applicable to electronic, static and online menus.

**Consultation question 12:** What could be done to ensure kilojoule information is included on all web-based ordering platforms? What are the pros and cons of your suggested approach?

There are several issues related to web-based ordering. Electronic catalogues offer the opportunity to order food and drinks directly from the catalogue, and so in essence have become menus. Although previously excluded from menu labelling schemes, further consideration of capturing electronic catalogues as well as any future web-based ordering platforms in menu labelling schemes is warranted.

There is a growing trend for fast-food businesses to use third-party agents for their delivery service. However, customers of services, such as Menulog, Uber Eats and Deliveroo, do not always have the same access to kilojoule information on these web-based platforms, compared to in-store customers. For equity among customers, it is important that all third party delivery websites display kilojoules for standard food outlets. However, there are a number of issues that would need to be overcome, including labelling responsibility (food business versus delivery agent) and enforcement responsibility (based on physical location of website operators versus location of food business). Recent industry consultation has indicated that businesses have control of what is listed on third-party websites. To address these issues, the definition of 'menu' could be amended to ensure that information provided by a standard food outlet to a third-party delivery agent must contain kilojoule information.

**Consultation question 14:** What could be done to ensure kilojoule information is provided for the whole meal? What are the pros and cons of your suggested approach?

The intent of menu labelling is to provide consumers with kilojoule information to inform purchasing decisions. As stated in the Nutritional Principles, a meal combination is to be treated as a single standard food item and therefore the kilojoule information displayed should be for the whole meal. However, as current legislation excludes pre-packaged products with a nutritional information panel from the definition of standard food item, businesses are not required to display the kilojoule content of meal deals which include items such as bottled/canned beverages. This has led to inconsistencies between businesses, as well as customer confusion.

Menu labelling schemes could be amended so that meals deals including pre-packaged items are required to display kilojoules for the entire meal. This may require changes to the definition of a standard food item; removal of the pre-packaged item exemption; and/or changes to user guides.

**Consultation question 16:** What could be done to ensure kilojoule information is as easy to interpret as possible? What are the pros and cons of your suggested approach?

Further investigation of the likely impact of additional and interpretive information is warranted. Interpretive information has the potential for greater impact than kilojoules alone, especially for groups with lower health literacy. There is consistency with the National Principles which do not preclude expanding nutritional information; however, any additional information would increase the regulatory burden, and may be difficult for businesses if the available space on menus is limited.

**Consultation question 18:** What could be done to ensure kilojoule information is as easy to use and interpret as possible? What are the pros and cons of your suggested approach?

Supermarkets are allowed to display kilojoule information per 100 grams. All other businesses are required to display information per standard food item (that is, the whole item). To reduce consumer confusion and to provide equity among businesses, it is suggested that this variation be removed and that all businesses display kilojoule information for the entire item. As for other labelling changes, supermarkets may require a transition period to adjust ticketing systems.

It is acknowledged that this does create its own problems in that multi-serve products (for example fruit loaves, whole cakes, whole chickens) are required to display kilojoules for the entire item. As such items are not intended to be consumed as a single serve; it does require consumers to calculate the kilojoules per serve. This could be addressed by allowing multi-serve items to display the number of recommended serves and the number of kilojoules per serve. Serving sizes would need to be clear and understandable for the consumer.

**Consultation question 19:** Are there any other issues with current menu labelling schemes that should be considered during this review? Please provide information to support your response.

It is timely to consider kilojoule labelling for vending machines. Some vending machine operators are already displaying kilojoules for pre-packaged beverages on the front panel of machines. Other operators are now supplying unpackaged food, or packaged food that does not require a nutrition information panel. The USA menu labelling provisions apply to vending machine operators with 20 or more machines. Rather than capture vending machines within menu labelling schemes, an alternative approach could be for Government to work with industry to develop a code, which not only includes aspects of kilojoule information provision, but also facilitates healthier choices from vending machines.

If you require any further information in relation to this matter, please contact <sup>s 47F</sup>  
Director, Preventive Health Branch on telephone <sup>s 47F</sup> or via email at <sup>s 47F</sup>

Yours sincerely

<sup>s 47F</sup>

Executive Director  
Health Protection Branch  
Queensland Department of Health

13/3/18