

Response ID ANON-JN9Z-F8UN-C

Submitted to P1062 - Defining added sugars for claims
Submitted on 2023-09-12 15:31:39

Complete your submission

Your details

What is your name?

Contact person:

[REDACTED]

What is your email address?

Email address:

[REDACTED]

What is your telephone number?

Telephone:

[REDACTED]

Which one of the following groups do you most affiliate with?

Food industry

If other, please specify:

What is the name of your organisation?

Please write N/A if this does not apply.:

N/A

What is your position title?

Please write N/A if this does not apply.:

N/A

Are you the contact person for your organisation?

No

If you are not the contact person for your organisation, please provide an alternative contact and details. If not applicable, please leave blank.

Contact person's name:

Email address:

Telephone:

Position title:

Have you read the P1062 – Defining added sugars for claims call for submission paper?

Yes

Confidential information

All submissions will be published, including redacted versions of confidential submissions. We will not publish material that we accept as confidential. Does your submission contain confidential information?

No. My submission does not contain confidential information.

Proposed changes to 'no added sugar(s)' claim conditions

1 FSANZ proposes to continue to set 'no added sugar(s)' claim conditions based on the addition of ingredients to foods (see section 5.2 of the Call for submissions document).

Do you have any comments on this approach?:

2 FSANZ proposes a food displaying a 'no added sugar(s)' claim must not contain an 'added sugars' as an added ingredient including an ingredient of a compound ingredient. FSANZ proposes defining 'added sugars' for this claim condition (see section 5.2.1.4 of the Call for submissions document).

Do you have any comments on this approach or the defined added sugars (see below)?:

3 FSANZ proposes 'no added sugar(s)' and 'unsweetened' claims are not permitted on foods containing the hexose monosaccharide D-tagatose, as an ingredient, consistent with existing claim conditions in the Code. As D-tagatose is a hexose monosaccharide, it is captured in the definition of 'added sugars' (see section 5.2.2 of the Call for submissions document).

Do you have any comments on this approach?:

4 FSANZ proposes foods containing low energy sugars (mono- and disaccharides), as ingredients, listed in subsection S11—2(3) of Schedule 11 not be permitted to display 'unsweetened' claims (see section 5.2.2 of the Call for submissions document).

Do you have any comments on this approach?:

5 FSANZ proposes a food displaying a 'no added sugar(s)' claim must not contain the fruit products listed below as an added ingredient (including as an ingredient of a compound ingredient). FSANZ proposes to exempt fruit products which are lemon or lime fruit (see section 5.3 of the Call for submissions document).

Do you have any comments on this approach or the fruit products listed?:

We are removing a commercial reason for fruit additions to processed foods to prevent high sugar consumption levels (obesity), instead of limiting the total food sugar levels themselves? If so, I would suggest to add restrictions on vegetable additions as well. Vegetables like sugar beet, beetroot, tomatoes and many others including concentrates can also be used to sweeten products. If we do remove this claim for fruits and vegetables when used instead of cane sugar, we are also removing a commercial reason to use fruits/vegetables within the food industry. Fruit juice >\$10/kg while cane sugar is \$1/kg. There are many more nutrients in fruits and vegetables than white sugar. I am sure everyone is aware of this. If this public policy continues, I can only see a further reduction of fruit and vegetable consumption in the general population after it's removed from processed shelf stable foods. I expect this will cause further decline in health outcomes (assumption from past research). Probably more pronounced in lower socioeconomic demographics?

I would also like to raise. If a single strength fruit is added to round out flavour instead of sweetening function and the product total sugars are less than a certain level, ie. sugars <5.8g per 100g of product it is unlikely to cause weight gain? These sugar levels are comparable to vegetables. Does this still stop "no added sugar" claim? A product like this could be healthy and not driving obesity, but there is no claim benefit. And no reason not to just make it with white sugar.

I do have concerns with the proposed changes. As a possible solution they make sense, but doesn't if outcomes are modelled. Ask - how products will change to drive reasons for purchase if no added sugar for fruit juice is gone versus price point. I would sell shares in fruit companies and buy into CSR.

6 FSANZ proposes a fruit product which is the food for sale (e.g. fruit juice) be permitted to make a 'no added sugar(s)' claim. This includes when the food is sold as a singular fruit (e.g. apple juice) or a blend of different fruits (e.g. blend of fruit juices), providing the food contains no 'added sugars' or other products identified in claim conditions, as added ingredients. A blend or combination of different fruit products (e.g. fruit juice and fruit purée) will not be permitted to make the claim. FSANZ also proposes to clarify that fruit does not include legumes, fungi, herbs, nuts and spices for the purpose of the claim conditions (see section 5.3 of the Call for submissions document).

Do you have any comments on this approach?:

7 FSANZ proposes 'no added sugar(s)' claims are not permitted when the concentration of sugars in the food is increased from the hydrolysis of carbohydrates during food manufacture, except when the sugars concentration in cereal-based plant milks made using hydrolysis is ≤ 1.5% (and the product otherwise meets claim conditions) (see section 5.3.2 of the Calls for submissions document).

Do you have any comments on this approach?:

8 FSANZ proposes to maintain the existing condition that a food displaying an 'unsweetened' claim must meet the conditions for a 'no added sugar(s)' claim, noting that the amended 'no added sugar(s)' claim conditions will apply (see section 5.4 of the Call for submissions document).

Do you have any comments on this approach?:

9 FSANZ proposes to maintain the existing condition for intense sweeteners, sorbitol, mannitol, glycerol, xylitol, isomalt, maltitol syrup or lactitol. FSANZ proposes a food containing low energy sugars (mono- and disaccharides) listed in subsection S11—2(3) of schedule 11, as an ingredient (including an ingredient of a compound ingredient), not be permitted to display an 'unsweetened' claim (see section 5.4 of the Call for submissions document).

Do you have any comments on this approach?:

10 FSANZ is proposing a two-year transition period to allow producers, manufacturers and importers time to make any required labelling changes for products carrying 'no added sugar(s)' or 'unsweetened' claims to comply with the new claim conditions (see section 7 of the Call

for submissions document).

Do you have any comments on this approach?:

Data and evidence

11 Do you have any data or are you aware of published data on the number of products with 'no added sugar(s)' or 'unsweetened' claims in Australia and/or New Zealand (see data used for this proposal at section 3.1 of the Call for submissions document)?

No

If yes, please upload your file here.:

No file uploaded

12 Do you have any evidence or are you aware of published literature on consumer understanding of and responses to 'no added sugar(s)' or 'unsweetened' claims on food products (see evidence used for this proposal at section 3.2 of the Call for submissions report and Supporting Document 1)?

No

If yes, please upload your file here.:

No file uploaded

13 Do you have any data or know of any published data on the costs of labelling changes per stock keeping unit or package type (see data used for this proposal at Attachment E to the Call for submissions document)?

No

If yes, please upload your file here:

No file uploaded

Additional comments

Comments and other input

Additional comments and input:

I have worked in food NPD for more than 20 years. In that time I have seen all companies want - a product reason to be; as many sales claims as possible; and a COG as low as possible (profit). This is the basic version for my point of view supplied.
Please feel free to question my reasoning. I really only want the best outcome for consumers. I also think that changing product communication will also create further confusion in industry and consumers. If it's done, it needs to be 100% in my mind.

Please upload additional files here.:

No file uploaded

Feedback

What is your level of satisfaction with using this platform to complete your submission?

Satisfied

Do you have any feedback you would like to provide to FSANZ regarding this new platform?

Yes

If yes, please provide details.:

I would have liked to send an initial overview of my thoughts and concerns as an informal email. See if these were already raised, then refine a concern. Overall the process seems good.