

Appendix 4. Raw data per food category

Appendix 4.1 Dairy Products

In Food Category 1, Dairy Products, 112 labels were assessed and 77 labels (69%) featured nutrition, health or related claims (Table A1).

The 61 Dairy Product labels collected in Australia accounted for 54% of all Category 1 labels, with 74% (n=45) of these carrying a claim. On labels collected in New Zealand, 32 (63%) Dairy Product labels carried claims.

Of the Dairy Product labels collected in Australia that carried a claim, all had nutrition claims, while health claims were present on only 12 (27%) of these labels.

Of the Dairy Product labels collected in New Zealand that carried a claim, all had nutrition claims, while health claims were present on only 9 (28%) of these labels.

Table A1. Summary of Dairy Product labels collected in Australia and New Zealand

	Australia	New Zealand	Total
Number of labels sampled	61	51	112
Labels with Claims	45	32	77
Labels with Nutrition claims only	33	23	56
Labels with Health claims only	0	0	0
Labels with both health & nutrition claims	12	9	21

Of the 45 Dairy Product labels collected in Australia that featured nutrition claims, 42 (93%) displayed general level absolute content claims, while 10 labels (22%) featured comparative content claims (Table A2).

Twelve Dairy Product labels collected in Australia had general level health claims. Eight labels with health claims featured endorsements associated with health, namely the National Heart Foundation Tick. Two labels had function claims and one had an enhanced function claim. One label featured a Lifestage claim.

Of the 32 Dairy Product labels collected in New Zealand that featured nutrition claims, 28 (88%) displayed general level absolute content claims, while only 8 (25%) featured comparative content claims.

Nine Dairy Product labels collected in New Zealand had a total of 10 general level health claims. Three labels with health claims featured endorsements associated with health, namely the National Heart Foundation Tick. Three labels had function claims and three labels had enhanced function claims.

The product name of one New Zealand label was assessed as a general level health claim, with the exact wording as follows:

‘Top Full Bodied Nutritious Fresh Milk’.

Table A2. Summary of number of Dairy Product labels with claims assessed against the proposed classification framework

	Australia	New Zealand	Total
General Level Claims - Nutrition			
Labels with Absolute claims only	35	24	59
Labels with Comparative claims only	3	4	7
Labels with both Absolute & Comparative claims	7	4	11
General Level Claims - Health			
Labels with Function claims	2	3	5
Labels with Enhanced Function claims	1	3	4
Labels with Risk reduction (non-serious) claims	0	0	0
Labels with Whole of Diet claims	0	0	0
Labels with Lifestage claims	1	0	1
Labels with Endorsements (Heart Tick)	8	3	11
Labels with health-related Trade marks & Product Names	0	1	0
Labels with health-related Symbols/Graphics	0	0	0
High Level Claims			
Labels with Biomarker maintenance claims	0	0	0
Labels with Biomarker enhancement claims	0	0	0
Labels with Risk reduction (serious disease) claims	0	0	0

Table A3 shows 6 nutrition claims on Dairy Product labels collected in Australia and New Zealand made claims that were assessed against the provisions of the Food Code for claims relating to certain substances. Two of these were related to lactose content, and four claims related to sodium content.

Table A3. Breakdown of nutrition claims made on Dairy Product labels assessed against Standard 1.2.8 (Division 3)

Food Code Nutrition Claims	Australia	New Zealand	Total
Fat – Poly & Mono Unsaturated Fat	0	0	0
– Omega claims	0	0	0
Joule	0	0	0
Lactose	1	1	2
Gluten	0	0	0
Sodium	3	1	4

Twenty-five nutrition claims on Dairy Product labels collected in Australia were assessed against CoPoNC, with the breakdown of claim types provided in Table A4. The majority of these claims related to fat content, with 6 'X% Fat free' claims, 4 Low fat and 4 Reduced fat claims assessed.

Table A4. Breakdown of CoPoNC claims made on Dairy Product labels collected in Australia

CoPoNC claims	Australia
Fat – Reduced fat	4
– Low fat	4
– X% Fat Free	6
– Low in saturated fat	0
Cholesterol	
– Low cholesterol	0
– Cholesterol free	0
Sugar	
– Reduced sugar	0
– Low sugar	1
– Sugar free	0
– Unsweetened	1
– No added sugar	0
Dietary Fibre	
– Source of fibre	0
– Excellent source of fibre	0
– High fibre	0
– Fibre increased	0
Salt	
– Low salt	0
– Very low salt	0
– Reduced salt	1
– No added salt	2
– Salt free	0
Energy	
– Low energy	0
– Reduced energy	0
Other claims	
– Lite/Light	6
– “Diet”	0
– X% free other than fat	0

Table A5 shows there were 19 claims on Dairy Product labels assessed as inconsistent with the relevant labelling provisions. These were primarily due to the absence of information about the Recommended Daily Intake of nutrients as required by Standard 1.3.2, where a claim is made in relation to the presence of a vitamin or mineral in a food. Thirteen labels collected in Australia and 2 labels collected in New Zealand were missing this information.

The following claim was assessed as a prophylactic claim:

‘Easi-Yo Bio-life actively helps build the natural defence in the intestine against harmful microbes by replenishing and maintaining these essential abc cultures in the body.’

Table A5. Summary of claims on labels collected in Dairy Product labels that were assessed as inconsistent with the relevant labelling provisions

Australia			New Zealand	
Label Provision	Number of inconsistent claims	Reason	Number of inconsistent claims	Reason
CoPoNC	0	X% Fat Free	n/a	X% Fat Free
	0	Reference to whole of class absent	n/a	Reference to whole of class absent
Std 1.2.8	1	No Expanded fats	0	No Expanded fats
	0	Fibre, not Dietary Fibre	0	Fibre, not Dietary Fibre
	0	Dietary Fibre not in Panel	0	Dietary Fibre not in Panel
	0	Nutrient not in Panel	0	Nutrient not in Panel
Std 1.3.2	13	RDI Missing	2	RDI Missing
	0	Nutrient not in Panel	0	Nutrient not in Panel
	0	% RDI too low	0	% RDI too low
	0	Non-specific reference to nutrient	1	Non-specific reference to nutrient
	0	Comparison of Vitamin content	0	Comparison of Vitamin content
Std 1.1A.2	0	Reference to a disease or condition	1	Reference to a disease or condition
	0	Medical advice	0	Medical advice
	0	Prophylactic claim	1	Prophylactic claim
	0	Weight loss claim	0	Weight loss claim
NZDSR	n/a	Treating or preventing a disease	0	Treating or preventing a disease
Total	14		5	

n/a = not applicable

Appendix 4.2 Edible oils and emulsions

In Food Category 2, Edible oils and emulsions, 30 labels were assessed and 21 labels (70%) featured nutrition, health or related claims (Table A6).

The 19 Edible oils and emulsions labels collected in Australia accounted for 63% of all Category 2 labels, with 79% (n=15) of these carrying a claim. On labels collected in New Zealand, 55% (n=6) Edible oils and emulsions labels carried claims.

Of the Edible oils and emulsions labels collected in Australia that carried a claim, all had nutrition claims, while health claims were present on 6 (40%) of these labels.

Of the Edible oils and emulsions labels collected in New Zealand that carried a claim, all had nutrition claims, while health claims were present on 3 (50%) of these labels.

Table A6. Summary of labels from Edible oils and emulsions collected in Australia and New Zealand

	Australia	New Zealand	Total
Number of labels sampled	19	11	30
Labels with Claims	15	6	21
Labels with Nutrition claims only	9	3	12
Labels with Health claims only	0	0	0
Labels with both health & nutrition claims	6	3	9

Of the 15 Edible oils and emulsions labels collected in Australia that featured nutrition claims, all displayed general level absolute content claims, while only 1 label featured comparative content claims (Table A7).

Four Edible oils and emulsions labels collected in Australia had general level health claims, which were all endorsements associated with health, namely the National Heart Foundation Tick. Two labels had high level claims; one was a biomarker maintenance claim and one was a biomarker enhancement claim.

Of the 6 Edible oils and emulsions labels collected in New Zealand that featured nutrition claims, all had general level absolute content claims, and none had comparative content claims.

Three Edible oils and emulsions labels collected in New Zealand featured a total of 4 general level health claims. Three labels with health claims featured endorsements associated with health, namely the National Heart Foundation Tick. One label also had a function claim.

Table A7. Summary of number of labels from Edible oils and emulsions with claims assessed against the proposed classification framework

	Australia	New Zealand	Total
General Level Claims - Nutrition			
Labels with Absolute claims only	14	6	20
Labels with Comparative claims only	0	0	0
Labels with both Absolute & Comparative claims	1	0	1
General Level Claims - Health			
Labels with Function claims	0	1	1
Labels with Enhanced Function claims	0	0	0
Labels with Risk reduction (non-serious) claims	0	0	0
Labels with Whole of Diet claims	0	0	0
Labels with Lifestage claims	0	0	0
Labels with Endorsements (Heart Tick)	4	3	7
Labels with health-related Trade marks & Product Names	0	0	0
Labels with health-related Symbols/Graphics	0	0	0
High Level Claims			
Labels with Biomarker maintenance claims	1	0	1
Labels with Biomarker enhancement claims	1	0	1
Labels with Risk reduction (serious disease) claims	0	0	0

Table A8 shows 9 nutrition claims on Edible oils and emulsions labels collected in Australia and New Zealand made claims that were assessed against the provisions of the Food Code for claims relating to certain substances. Five of these were related to omega fatty acid content, 3 related to poly, mono or unsaturated fat content and one claim related to sodium content.

Table A8. Breakdown of nutrition claims made on labels from Edible oils and emulsions assessed against Standard 1.2.8 (Division 3)

Food Code Nutrition Claims	Australia	New Zealand	Total
Fat – Poly & Mono Unsaturated Fat	1	2	3
– Omega claims	4	1	5
Joule	0	0	0
Lactose	0	0	0
Gluten	0	0	0
Sodium	1	0	1

Eleven nutrition claims on Edible oils and emulsions labels collected in Australia were assessed against CoPoNC, with the breakdown of claim types provided in Table A9. Nearly all of these (81%, n=9) were Cholesterol free claims. One label claimed Reduced fat content and one label claimed No added salt.

Table A9. Breakdown of CoPoNC claims made on labels from Edible oils and emulsions collected in Australia

CoPoNC claims	Australia
Fat – Reduced fat	1
– Low fat	0
– X% Fat Free	0
– Low in saturated fat	0
Cholesterol	
– Low cholesterol	0
– Cholesterol free	9
Sugar	
– Reduced sugar	0
– Low sugar	0
– Sugar free	0
– Unsweetened	0
– No added sugar	0
Dietary Fibre	
– Source of fibre	0
– Excellent source of fibre	0
– High fibre	0
– Fibre increased	0
Salt	
– Low salt	0
– Very low salt	0
– Reduced salt	0
– No added salt	1
– Salt free	0
Energy	
– Low energy	0
– Reduced energy	0
Other claims	
– Lite/Light	0
– “Diet”	0
– X% free other than fat	0

Table A10 shows there were 5 claims on Edible oils and emulsions labels assessed as inconsistent with the relevant labelling provisions. These were all featured on labels collected in Australia. Two labels were missing the expanded fat content information required by Standard 1.2.8. One label did not have the RDI information required by Standard 1.3.2, and another did not provide the amount of a nutrient in the NIP, also required by Standard 1.3.2.

One cholesterol free claim on an olive oil label did not refer to all olive oils being cholesterol free, as required under CoPoNC.

Table A10. Summary of claims on labels collected on labels from Edible oils and emulsions that were assessed as inconsistent with the relevant labelling provisions

Australia			New Zealand	
Label Provision	Number of inconsistent claims	Reason	Number of inconsistent claims	Reason
CoPoNC	0	X% Fat Free	n/a	X% Fat Free
	1	Reference to whole of class absent	n/a	Reference to whole of class absent
Std 1.2.8	2	No Expanded fats	0	No Expanded fats
	0	Fibre, not Dietary Fibre	0	Fibre, not Dietary Fibre
	0	Dietary Fibre not in Panel	0	Dietary Fibre not in Panel
	0	Nutrient not in Panel	0	Nutrient not in Panel
Std 1.3.2	1	RDI Missing	0	RDI Missing
	1	Nutrient not in Panel	0	Nutrient not in Panel
	0	% RDI too low	0	% RDI too low
	0	Non-specific reference to nutrient	0	Non-specific reference to nutrient
	0	Comparison of Vitamin content	0	Comparison of Vitamin content
Std 1.1A.2	0	Reference to a disease or condition	0	Reference to a disease or condition
	0	Medical advice	0	Medical advice
	0	Prophylactic claim	0	Prophylactic claim
	0	Weight loss claim	0	Weight loss claim
NZDSR	n/a	Treating or preventing a disease	0	Treating or preventing a disease
Total	5		0	

n/a = not applicable

Appendix 4.3 Ice Cream and Edible Ices

In Food Category 3, Ice Cream and Edible Ices, 38 labels were assessed and 14 labels (37%) featured nutrition, health or related claims (Table A11).

The 17 Ice Cream and edible ices collected in Australia accounted for 45% of all Category 3 labels, with 29% (n=5) of these carrying a claim. For labels collected in New Zealand, 43% (n=9) Ice Cream and edible ices labels carried claims.

Of the Ice Cream and edible ices labels collected in Australia that carried a claim, all had nutrition claims, and one label also featured a health claim.

Of the Ice Cream and edible ices labels collected in New Zealand that carried a claim, all had nutrition claims, and two labels also featured health claims.

Table A11. Summary of labels from Ice Cream and Edible Ices collected in Australia and New Zealand

	Australia	New Zealand	Total
Number of labels sampled	17	21	38
Labels with Claims	5	9	14
Labels with Nutrition claims only	4	7	11
Labels with Health claims only	0	0	0
Labels with both health & nutrition claims	1	2	3

Of the 5 Ice Cream and edible ices labels collected in Australia that featured nutrition claims, 4 displayed general level absolute content claims, and 2 labels featured comparative content claims (Table A12).

One Ice Cream and edible ices label collected in Australia had general level health claims, which was an endorsement associated with health, namely the National Heart Foundation Tick.

Of the 9 Ice Cream and edible ices labels collected in New Zealand that featured nutrition claims, all had general level absolute content claims, and none had comparative content claims.

Two Ice Cream and edible ices labels collected in New Zealand featured general level health claims, which were endorsements associated with health, namely the National Heart Foundation Tick.

Table A12. Summary of number of labels from Ice Cream and edible Ices with claims assessed against the proposed classification framework

	Australia	New Zealand	Total
General Level Claims - Nutrition			
Labels with Absolute claims only	3	9	12
Labels with Comparative claims only	1	0	1
Labels with both Absolute & Comparative claims	1	0	1
General Level Claims - Health			
Labels with Function claims	0	0	0
Labels with Enhanced Function claims	0	0	0
Labels with Risk reduction (non-serious) claims	0	0	0
Labels with Whole of Diet claims	0	0	0
Labels with Lifestage claims	0	0	0
Labels with Endorsements (Heart Tick)	1	2	3
Labels with health-related Trade marks & Product Names	0	0	0
Labels with health-related Symbols/Graphics	0	0	0
High Level Claims			
Labels with Biomarker maintenance claims	0	0	0
Labels with Biomarker enhancement claims	0	0	0
Labels with Risk reduction (serious disease) claims	0	0	0

Table A13 shows 2 nutrition claims on Ice Cream and edible ices labels collected in New Zealand made claims that were assessed against the provisions of the Food Code for claims relating to certain substances. One related to lactose content and the other to gluten content.

Table A13. Breakdown of nutrition claims made on labels from Ice Cream and edible Ices assessed against Standard 1.2.8 (Division 3)

Food Code Nutrition Claims	Australia	New Zealand	Total
Fat – Poly & Mono Unsaturated Fat	0	0	0
– Omega claims	0	0	0
Joule	0	0	0
Lactose	0	1	1
Gluten	0	1	1
Sodium	0	0	0

Four nutrition claims on Ice Cream and edible ices labels collected in Australia were assessed against CoPoNC, with the breakdown of claim types provided in Table A14. Three of these related to fat content and one label included the word “Lite” in the name of the product.

Table A14. Breakdown of CoPoNC claims made on labels from Ice Cream and edible Ices collected in Australia

CoPoNC claims	Australia
Fat – Reduced fat	1
– Low fat	1
– X% Fat Free	1
– Low in saturated fat	0
Cholesterol	
– Low cholesterol	0
– Cholesterol free	0
Sugar	
– Reduced sugar	0
– Low sugar	0
– Sugar free	0
– Unsweetened	0
– No added sugar	0
Dietary Fibre	
– Source of fibre	0
– Excellent source of fibre	0
– High fibre	0
– Fibre increased	0
Salt	
– Low salt	0
– Very low salt	0
– Reduced salt	0
– No added salt	0
– Salt free	0
Energy	
– Low energy	0
– Reduced energy	0
Other claims	
– Lite/Light	1
– “Diet”	0
– X% free other than fat	0

Table A15 shows there were 6 claims on Ice Cream and edible ices labels assessed as inconsistent with the relevant labelling provisions. These were due to the absence of the RDI information required by Standard 1.3.2.

Table A15. Summary of claims on labels collected on labels from Ice Cream and edible Ices that were assessed as inconsistent with the relevant labelling provisions

Australia			New Zealand	
Label Provision	Number of inconsistent claims	Reason	Number of inconsistent claims	Reason
CoPoNC	0	X% Fat Free	n/a	X% Fat Free
	0	Reference to whole of class absent	n/a	Reference to whole of class absent
Std 1.2.8	0	No Expanded fats	0	No Expanded fats
	0	Fibre, not Dietary Fibre	0	Fibre, not Dietary Fibre
	0	Dietary Fibre not in Panel	0	Dietary Fibre not in Panel
	0	Nutrient not in Panel	0	Nutrient not in Panel
Std 1.3.2	2	RDI Missing	4	RDI Missing
	0	Nutrient not in Panel	0	Nutrient not in Panel
	0	% RDI too low	0	% RDI too low
	0	Non-specific reference to nutrient	0	Non-specific reference to nutrient
	0	Comparison of Vitamin content	0	Comparison of Vitamin content
Std 1.1A.2	0	Reference to a disease or condition	0	Reference to a disease or condition
	0	Medical advice	0	Medical advice
	0	Prophylactic claim	0	Prophylactic claim
	0	Weight loss claim	0	Weight loss claim
NZDSR	n/a	Treating or preventing a disease	0	Treating or preventing a disease
Total	2		4	

n/a = not applicable

Appendix 4.4 Fruit and Vegetables

In Food Category 4, Fruit and vegetables, 166 labels were assessed and 59 labels (26%) featured nutrition, health or related claims (Table A16).

The 89 Fruit and vegetables labels collected in Australia accounted for 54% of all Category 4 labels, with 34% (n=30) of these carrying a claim. On labels collected in New Zealand, 38% (n=29) Fruit and vegetables labels carried claims.

Of the Fruit and vegetables labels collected in Australia that carried a claim, all had nutrition claims, while health claims were present on 4 (13%) of these labels.

Of the Fruit and vegetables labels collected in New Zealand that carried a claim, all had nutrition claims, while health claims were present on 10 (35%) of these labels.

Table A16. Summary of Fruit and Vegetable labels collected in Australia and New Zealand

	Australia	New Zealand	Total
Number of labels sampled	89	77	166
Labels with Claims	30	29	59
Labels with Nutrition claims only	26	19	45
Labels with Health claims only	0	0	0
Labels with both health & nutrition claims	4	10	14

Of the 30 Fruit and vegetables labels collected in Australia that featured nutrition claims, all displayed general level absolute content claims, and no labels featured comparative content claims (Table A17).

Four Fruit and vegetables labels collected in Australia had general level health claims, which were all endorsements associated with health, namely the National Heart Foundation Tick.

Of the 29 Fruit and vegetables labels collected in New Zealand that featured nutrition claims, all had general level absolute content claims, and no labels had comparative content claims.

Ten Fruit and vegetables labels collected in New Zealand featured a total of 13 general level health claims. Five labels featured whole of diet claims, and 3 labels featured endorsements associated with health, namely the National Heart Foundation Tick. Three health-related symbols or graphics, and one health-related trademark were also assessed label. One label also had an enhanced function claim.

Table A17. Summary of number of labels from Fruit and Vegetables with claims assessed against the proposed classification framework

	Australia	New Zealand	Total
General Level Claims - Nutrition			
Labels with Absolute claims only	30	28	58
Labels with Comparative claims only	0	1	1
Labels with both Absolute & Comparative claims	0	0	0
General Level Claims - Health			
Labels with Function claims	0	0	0
Labels with Enhanced Function claims	0	1	1
Labels with Risk reduction (non-serious) claims	0	0	0
Labels with Whole of Diet claims	0	5	5
Labels with Lifestage claims	0	0	0
Labels with Endorsements (Heart Tick)	4	3	7
Labels with health-related Trade marks & Product Names	0	1	1
Labels with health-related Symbols/Graphics	0	3	3
High Level Claims			
Labels with Biomarker maintenance claims	0	0	0
Labels with Biomarker enhancement claims	0	0	0
Labels with Risk reduction (serious disease) claims	0	0	0

Table A18 shows 5 nutrition claims on Fruit and vegetables labels collected in Australia and New Zealand made claims that were assessed against the provisions of the Food Code for claims relating to certain substances. Four of these were related to sodium content and one claim related to poly, mono or unsaturated fat content.

Table A18. Breakdown of nutrition claims made on Fruit and Vegetable labels assessed against Standard 1.2.8 (Division 3)

Food Code Nutrition Claims	Australia	New Zealand	Total
Fat – Poly & Mono Unsaturated Fat	1	0	1
– Omega claims	0	0	0
Joule	0	0	0
Lactose	0	0	0
Gluten	0	0	0
Sodium	2	2	4

Ten nutrition claims on Fruit and vegetables labels collected in Australia were assessed against CoPoNC, with the breakdown of claim types provided in Table A19. Four of these were claims regarding no added sugar, and 3 claims were regarding fat content. Two claims related to sodium or salt content, and one label featured a cholesterol free claim.

Table A19. Breakdown of CoPoNC claims made on Fruit and Vegetable labels collected in Australia

CoPoNC claims	Australia
Fat – Reduced fat	0
– Low fat	1
– X% Fat Free	2
– Low in saturated fat	0
Cholesterol	
– Low cholesterol	0
– Cholesterol free	1
Sugar	
– Reduced sugar	0
– Low sugar	0
– Sugar free	0
– Unsweetened	0
– No added sugar	4
Dietary Fibre	
– Source of fibre	0
– Excellent source of fibre	0
– High fibre	0
– Fibre increased	0
Salt	
– Low salt	1
– Very low salt	0
– Reduced salt	0
– No added salt	1
– Salt free	0
Energy	
– Low energy	0
– Reduced energy	0
Other claims	
– Lite/Light	0
– “Diet”	0
– X% free other than fat	0

Table A20 shows there were 5 claims on Fruit and vegetables labels assessed as inconsistent with the relevant labelling provisions. These were primarily featured on labels collected in New Zealand. One label referenced Fibre instead of Dietary Fibre in the NIP, as required under Standard 1.2.8. Two labels did not have the RDI information required by Standard 1.3.2.

One claim on a label of frozen vegetables was assessed as comparing the vitamin C content of the food to that of another food. The exact wording is as follows:

‘Research indicates that many frozen vegetables contain the same or higher levels of Vitamin C than most fresh vegetables which are sold under normal commercial conditions.’

One label on fresh potatoes made a reference that implied the product has intrinsic weight reducing properties, with the exact wording as follows:

‘Contains Iodine. Iodine assists with weight loss.’

Table A20. Summary of claims on labels collected in Fruit and Vegetable labels that were assessed as inconsistent with the relevant labelling provisions

Australia			New Zealand	
Label Provision	Number of inconsistent claims	Reason	Number of inconsistent claims	Reason
CoPoNC	0	X% Fat Free	n/a	X% Fat Free
	0	Reference to whole of class absent	n/a	Reference to whole of class absent
Std 1.2.8	0	No Expanded fats	0	No Expanded fats
	0	Fibre, not Dietary Fibre	1	Fibre, not Dietary Fibre
	0	Dietary Fibre not in Panel	0	Dietary Fibre not in Panel
	0	Nutrient not in Panel	0	Nutrient not in Panel
Std 1.3.2	1	RDI Missing	2	RDI Missing
	0	Nutrient not in Panel	0	Nutrient not in Panel
	0	% RDI too low	0	% RDI too low
	0	Non-specific reference to nutrient	0	Non-specific reference to nutrient
	0	Comparison of Vitamin content	1	Comparison of Vitamin content
Std 1.1A.2	0	Reference to a disease or condition	0	Reference to a disease or condition
	0	Medical advice	0	Medical advice
	0	Prophylactic claim	0	Prophylactic claim
	0	Weight loss claim	1	Weight loss claim
NZDSR	n/a	Treating or preventing a disease	0	Treating or preventing a disease
Total	1		5	

n/a = not applicable

Appendix 4.5 Confectionery

In Food Category 5, Confectionery, 76 labels were assessed and 13 labels (17%) featured nutrition, health or related claims (Table A21).

The 32 Confectionery labels collected in Australia accounted for 42% of all Category 2 labels, with 16% (n=5) of these carrying a claim. On Confectionery labels collected in New Zealand, 18% (n=8) labels carried claims.

Of the Confectionery labels collected in Australia and New Zealand that carried a claim, all had nutrition claims, and health claims were not present on any of these labels.

Table A21. Summary of Confectionery labels collected in Australia and New Zealand

	Australia	New Zealand	Total
Number of labels sampled	32	44	76
Labels with Claims	5	8	13
Labels with Nutrition claims only	5	8	13
Labels with Health claims only	0	0	0
Labels with both health & nutrition claims	0	0	0

Of the 5 Confectionery labels collected in Australia and New Zealand that featured nutrition claims, all displayed general level absolute content claims, and no labels featured comparative content claims (Table A22).

Table A22. Summary of number of Confectionery labels with claims assessed against the proposed classification framework

	Australia	New Zealand	Total
General Level Claims - Nutrition			
Labels with Absolute claims only	5	8	13
Labels with Comparative claims only	0	0	0
Labels with both Absolute & Comparative claims	0	0	0
General Level Claims - Health			
Labels with Function claims	0	0	0
Labels with Enhanced Function claims	0	0	0
Labels with Risk reduction (non-serious) claims	0	0	0
Labels with Whole of Diet claims	0	0	0
Labels with Lifestage claims	0	0	0
Labels with Endorsements (Heart Tick)	0	0	0
Labels with health-related Trade marks & Product Names	0	0	0
Labels with health-related Symbols/Graphics	0	0	0
High Level Claims			
Labels with Biomarker maintenance claims	0	0	0
Labels with Biomarker enhancement claims	0	0	0
Labels with Risk reduction (serious disease) claims	0	0	0

Table A23 shows no nutrition claims on Confectionery labels collected in Australia and New Zealand made claims that were assessed against the provisions of the Food Code for claims relating to certain substances.

Table A23. Breakdown of nutrition claims made on Confectionery labels assessed against Standard 1.2.8 (Division 3)

Food Code Nutrition Claims	Australia	New Zealand	Total
Fat – Poly & Mono Unsaturated Fat	0	0	0
– Omega claims	0	0	0
Joule	0	0	0
Lactose	0	0	0
Gluten	0	0	0
Sodium	0	0	0

Five nutrition claims on Confectionery labels collected in Australia were assessed against CoPoNC, with the breakdown of claim types provided in Table A24. Three of these claims were “X% Fat free” claims, one was a cholesterol free claim and another was a sugar free claim.

Table A24. Breakdown of CoPoNC claims made on Confectionery labels collected in Australia

CoPoNC claims	Australia
Fat – Reduced fat	0
– Low fat	0
– X% Fat Free	3
– Low in saturated fat	0
Cholesterol	
– Low cholesterol	0
– Cholesterol free	1
Sugar	
– Reduced sugar	0
– Low sugar	0
– Sugar free	1
– Unsweetened	0
– No added sugar	0
Dietary Fibre	
– Source of fibre	0
– Excellent source of fibre	0
– High fibre	0
– Fibre increased	0
Salt	
– Low salt	0
– Very low salt	0
– Reduced salt	0
– No added salt	0
– Salt free	0
Energy	
– Low energy	0
– Reduced energy	0
Other claims	
– Lite/Light	0
– “Diet”	0
– X% free other than fat	0

Table A25 shows there were 3 claims on Confectionery labels assessed as inconsistent with the relevant labelling provisions. Two labels were missing the expanded fat content information required by Standard 1.2.8. One label did not have the RDI information required by Standard 1.3.2.

Table A25. Summary of claims on labels collected in Confectionery labels that were assessed as inconsistent with the relevant labelling provisions

Australia			New Zealand	
Label Provision	Number of inconsistent claims	Reason	Number of inconsistent claims	Reason
CoPoNC	0 0	X% Fat Free Reference to whole of class absent	n/a n/a	X% Fat Free Reference to whole of class absent
Std 1.2.8	1 0 0 0	No Expanded fats Fibre, not Dietary Fibre Dietary Fibre not in Panel Nutrient not in Panel	0 0 0 0	No Expanded fats Fibre, not Dietary Fibre Dietary Fibre not in Panel Nutrient not in Panel
Std 1.3.2	1 0 0 0 0	RDI Missing Nutrient not in Panel % RDI too low Non-specific reference to nutrient Comparison of Vitamin content	1 0 0 0 0	RDI Missing Nutrient not in Panel % RDI too low Non-specific reference to nutrient Comparison of Vitamin content
Std 1.1A.2	0 0 0 0	Reference to a disease or condition Medical advice Prophylactic claim Weight loss claim	0 0 0 0	Reference to a disease or condition Medical advice Prophylactic claim Weight loss claim
NZDSR	n/a	Treating or preventing a disease	0	Treating or preventing a disease
Total	2		1	

n/a = not applicable

Appendix 4.6 Cereal and cereal products

In Food Category 6, Cereal and cereal products, 76 labels were assessed and 48 labels (63%) featured nutrition, health or related claims (Table A26).

The 43 Cereal and cereal products labels collected in Australia accounted for 57% of all Category 6 labels, with 56% (n=24) of these carrying a claim. On Cereal and cereal products labels collected in New Zealand, 73% (n=24) carried claims.

Of the Cereal and cereal products labels collected in Australia that carried a claim, all had nutrition claims, while health claims were present on 7 (29%) of these labels.

Of the Cereal and cereal products labels collected in New Zealand that carried a claim, all had nutrition claims, while health claims were present on 11 (46%) of these labels.

Table A26. Summary of Cereal and cereal product labels collected in Australia and New Zealand

	Australia	New Zealand	Total
Number of labels sampled	43	33	76
Labels with Claims	24	24	48
Labels with Nutrition claims only	17	13	30
Labels with Health claims only	0	0	0
Labels with both health & nutrition claims	7	11	18

Of the 24 Cereal and cereal products labels collected in Australia that featured nutrition claims, all displayed general level absolute content claims, while only 1 label featured comparative content claims (Table A27).

The 7 Cereal and cereal products labels collected in Australia that had health claims had a total of 8 claims. Four of these were whole of diet claims, and 3 were function claims. One label featured an endorsement associated with health, namely the National Heart Foundation Tick, and one label featured a health-related symbol or graphic.

Of the 24 Cereal and cereal products labels collected in New Zealand that featured nutrition claims, all had general level absolute content claims, and none had comparative content claims.

Eleven Cereal and cereal products labels collected in New Zealand featured a total of 12 general level health claims. Six labels with health claims featured endorsements associated with health, namely the National Heart Foundation Tick, and one label featured a health-related symbol or graphic. Two labels featured whole of diet claims. Two labels had a function claim and one label had an enhanced function claim.

Table A27. Summary of number of Cereal and cereal product labels with claims assessed against the proposed classification framework

	Australia	New Zealand	Total
General Level Claims - Nutrition			
Labels with Absolute claims only	23	24	47
Labels with Comparative claims only	0	0	0
Labels with both Absolute & Comparative claims	1	0	1
General Level Claims - Health			
Labels with Function claims	3	2	5
Labels with Enhanced Function claims	0	1	1
Labels with Risk reduction (non-serious) claims	0	0	0
Labels with Whole of Diet claims	4	2	6
Labels with Lifestage claims	0	0	0
Labels with Endorsements (Heart Tick)	1	6	7
Labels with health-related Trade marks & Product Names	0	0	0
Labels with health-related Symbols/Graphics	1	1	2
High Level Claims			
Labels with Biomarker maintenance claims	0	0	0
Labels with Biomarker enhancement claims	0	0	0
Labels with Risk reduction (serious disease) claims	0	0	0

Table A28 shows 15 nutrition claims on Cereal and cereal products labels collected in Australia and New Zealand made claims that were assessed against the provisions of the Food Code for claims relating to certain substances. Nine of these were related to sodium content, five to gluten content and one related to poly, mono or unsaturated fat content.

Table A28. Breakdown of nutrition claims made on Cereal and cereal product labels assessed against Standard 1.2.8 (Division 3)

Food Code Nutrition Claims	Australia	New Zealand	Total
Fat – Poly & Mono Unsaturated Fat	1	0	1
– Omega claims	0	0	0
Joule	0	0	0
Lactose	0	0	0
Gluten	5	0	5
Sodium	5	4	9

Thirty-one nutrition claims on Cereal and cereal products labels collected in Australia were assessed against CoPoNC, with the breakdown of claim types provided in Table A9. Seven of these were 'X% Fat free' claims, and 4 were Low fat claims. Ten claims related to fibre content, 4 to salt content and 2 to sugar content. One product name included the word 'Lite'.

Table A29. Breakdown of CoPoNC claims made on Cereal and cereal product labels collected in Australia

CoPoNC claims	Australia
Fat – Reduced fat	0
– Low fat	4
– X% Fat Free	7
– Low in saturated fat	0
Cholesterol	
– Low cholesterol	0
– Cholesterol free	2
Sugar	
– Reduced sugar	0
– Low sugar	1
– Sugar free	0
– Unsweetened	0
– No added sugar	1
Dietary Fibre	
– Source of fibre	4
– Excellent source of fibre	3
– High fibre	3
– Fibre increased	0
Salt	
– Low salt	3
– Very low salt	1
– Reduced salt	0
– No added salt	1
– Salt free	0
Energy	
– Low energy	0
– Reduced energy	0
Other claims	
– Lite/Light	1
– “Diet”	0
– X% free other than fat	0

Table A30 shows there were 3 claims on Cereal and cereal products labels assessed as inconsistent with the relevant labelling provisions. These were all featured on labels collected in Australia. Two labels referred to Fibre, not Dietary Fibre as required by Standard 1.2.8. One label did not provide the expanded fat content information required by Standard 1.2.8.

Table A30. Summary of claims on labels collected in Cereal and cereal product labels that were assessed as inconsistent with the relevant labelling provisions

Australia			New Zealand	
Label Provision	Number of inconsistent claims	Reason	Number of inconsistent claims	Reason
CoPoNC	0 0	X% Fat Free Reference to whole of class absent	n/a n/a	X% Fat Free Reference to whole of class absent
Std 1.2.8	1 1 0 0	No Expanded fats Fibre, not Dietary Fibre Dietary Fibre not in Panel Nutrient not in Panel	0 1 0 0	No Expanded fats Fibre, not Dietary Fibre Dietary Fibre not in Panel Nutrient not in Panel
Std 1.3.2	0 0 0 0 0	RDI Missing Nutrient not in Panel % RDI too low Non-specific reference to nutrient Comparison of Vitamin content	0 0 0 0 0	RDI Missing Nutrient not in Panel % RDI too low Non-specific reference to nutrient Comparison of Vitamin content
Std 1.1A.2	0 0 0 0	Reference to a disease or condition Medical advice Prophylactic claim Weight loss claim	0 0 0 0	Reference to a disease or condition Medical advice Prophylactic claim Weight loss claim
NZDSR	n/a	Treating or preventing a disease	0	Treating or preventing a disease
Total	2		1	

n/a = not applicable

Appendix 4.7 Bread and bakery products

In Food Category 7, Bread and bakery products, 161 labels were assessed and 65 labels (40%) featured nutrition, health or related claims (Table A31).

The 103 Bread and bakery products labels collected in Australia accounted for 64% of all Category 7 labels, with 41% (n=42) of these carrying a claim. On Bread and bakery products labels collected in New Zealand, 40% (n=23) carried claims.

Of the Bread and bakery products labels collected in Australia that carried a claim, all had nutrition claims, while health claims were present on 7 (17%) of these labels.

Of the Bread and bakery products labels collected in New Zealand that carried a claim, all had nutrition claims, while health claims were present on 8 (35%) of these labels.

Table A31. Summary of Bread and bakery product labels collected in Australia and New Zealand

	Australia	New Zealand	Total
Number of labels sampled	103	58	161
Labels with Claims	42	23	65
Labels with Nutrition claims only	35	15	50
Labels with Health claims only	0	0	0
Labels with both health & nutrition claims	7	8	15

Of the 42 Bread and bakery products labels collected in Australia that featured nutrition claims, all displayed general level absolute content claims, while only 2 labels featured comparative content claims (Table A32).

Seven Bread and bakery products labels collected in Australia had 13 general level health claims, of which 5 were endorsements associated with health, namely the National Heart Foundation Tick. Three labels had function claims, 3 had whole of diet claims and one featured a health-related symbol or graphic.

Of the 23 Bread and bakery products labels collected in New Zealand that featured nutrition claims, all had general level absolute content claims, and one had a comparative content claim.

Eight Bread and bakery products labels collected in New Zealand featured a total of 9 general level health claims. Six labels with health claims featured endorsements associated with health, namely the National Heart Foundation Tick. Two labels featured whole of diet claims and one label also had a function claim. Two product labels featured high level health claims, one of which was assessed as a biomarker enhancement claim and the other a risk reduction claim for a serious disease.

Table A32. Summary of number of Bread and bakery product labels with claims assessed against the proposed classification framework

	Australia	New Zealand	Total
General Level Claims - Nutrition			
Labels with Absolute claims only	40	22	62
Labels with Comparative claims only	0	0	0
Labels with both Absolute & Comparative claims	2	1	3
General Level Claims - Health			
Labels with Function claims	3	1	4
Labels with Enhanced Function claims	1	0	1
Labels with Risk reduction (non-serious) claims	0	0	0
Labels with Whole of Diet claims	3	2	5
Labels with Lifestage claims	0	0	0
Labels with Endorsements (Heart Tick)	5	6	11
Labels with health-related Trade marks & Product Names	0	0	0
Labels with health-related Symbols/Graphics	1	0	1
High Level Claims			
Labels with Biomarker maintenance claims	0	0	0
Labels with Biomarker enhancement claims	0	1	1
Labels with Risk reduction (serious disease) claims	0	1	1

Table A8 shows 14 nutrition claims on Bread and bakery products labels collected in Australia and New Zealand made claims that were assessed against the provisions of the Food Code for claims relating to certain substances. Seven of these were related to poly, mono or unsaturated fat content and one claim related to omega fatty acid content. Three claims each related to gluten and sodium content.

Table A33. Breakdown of nutrition claims made on Bread and bakery product labels assessed against Standard 1.2.8 (Division 3)

Food Code Nutrition Claims	Australia	New Zealand	Total
Fat – Poly & Mono Unsaturated Fat	7	0	7
– Omega claims	1	0	1
Joule	0	0	0
Lactose	0	0	0
Gluten	2	1	3
Sodium	2	1	3

Thirty-five nutrition claims on Bread and bakery products labels collected in Australia were assessed against CoPoNC, with the breakdown of claim types provided in Table A34. Fourteen of these related to fat content, and 9 related to dietary fibre content. Seven cholesterol free claims were assessed and 2 labels featured no added sugar claims. Two labels featured claims in relation to salt content, and one product name featured the word 'Lite'.

Table A34. Breakdown of CoPoNC claims made on Bread and bakery product labels collected in Australia

CoPoNC claims	Australia
Fat – Reduced fat	0
– Low fat	3
– X% Fat Free	11
– Low in saturated fat	0
Cholesterol	
– Low cholesterol	0
– Cholesterol free	7
Sugar	
– Reduced sugar	0
– Low sugar	0
– Sugar free	0
– Unsweetened	0
– No added sugar	2
Dietary Fibre	
– Source of fibre	6
– Excellent source of fibre	1
– High fibre	2
– Fibre increased	0
Salt	
– Low salt	0
– Very low salt	1
– Reduced salt	1
– No added salt	0
– Salt free	0
Energy	
– Low energy	0
– Reduced energy	0
Other claims	
– Lite/Light	1
– “Diet”	0
– X% free other than fat	0

Table A35 shows there were 10 claims on Bread and bakery products labels assessed as inconsistent with the relevant labelling provisions.

Of particular note in this category was a claim on a label collected in New Zealand. This claim made reference to a disease or medical condition, and was also assessed as providing advice of a medical nature, according to Standard 1.1A.2. The exact wording is as follows:

‘This gluten free bread is ideal for Coeliacs. Many people with no apparent gluten sensitivity feel better when reducing or eliminating wheat or gluten from their diet.’

Table A35. Summary of claims on labels collected in Bread and bakery product labels that were assessed as inconsistent with the relevant labelling provisions

Australia			New Zealand	
Label Provision	Number of inconsistent claims	Reason	Number of inconsistent claims	Reason
CoPoNC	0	X% Fat Free	n/a	X% Fat Free
	0	Reference to whole of class absent	n/a	Reference to whole of class absent
Std 1.2.8	1	No Expanded fats	0	No Expanded fats
	2	Fibre, not Dietary Fibre	1	Fibre, not Dietary Fibre
	0	Dietary Fibre not in Panel	1	Dietary Fibre not in Panel
	0	Nutrient not in Panel	0	Nutrient not in Panel
Std 1.3.2	0	RDI Missing	2	RDI Missing
	0	Nutrient not in Panel	0	Nutrient not in Panel
	1	% RDI too low	0	% RDI too low
	0	Non-specific reference to nutrient	0	Non-specific reference to nutrient
	0	Comparison of Vitamin content	0	Comparison of Vitamin content
Std 1.1A.2	0	Reference to a disease or condition	1	Reference to a disease or condition
	0	Medical advice	1	Medical advice
	0	Prophylactic claim	0	Prophylactic claim
	0	Weight loss claim	0	Weight loss claim
NZDSR	n/a	Treating or preventing a disease	0	Treating or preventing a disease
Total	4		6	

n/a = not applicable

Appendix 4.8 Meat and meat products

In Food Category 8, Meat and meat products, 98 labels were assessed and 23 labels (70%) featured nutrition, health or related claims (Table A36).

The 82 Meat and meat products labels collected in Australia accounted for 84% of all Category 8 labels, with 22% (n=18) of these carrying a claim. On Meat and meat products labels collected in New Zealand, 31% (n=5) carried claims.

Of the 18 Meat and meat products labels collected in Australia that carried a claim, 17 had nutrition claims, while health claims were present on 3 (17%) of these labels.

Of the Meat and meat products labels collected in New Zealand that carried a claim, all had nutrition claims, while health claims were present on 2 (40%) of these labels.

Table A36. Summary of Meat and meat product labels collected in Australia and New Zealand

	Australia	New Zealand	Total
Number of labels sampled	82	16	98
Labels with Claims	18	5	23
Labels with Nutrition claims only	15	3	18
Labels with Health claims only	1	0	1
Labels with both health & nutrition claims	2	2	4

Of the 17 Meat and meat products labels collected in Australia that featured nutrition claims, all displayed general level absolute content claims, while only 1 label featured comparative content claims (Table A7).

Four Meat and meat products labels collected in Australia had general level health claims, 3 of which were endorsements associated with health, namely the National Heart Foundation Tick. One label featured a function claim.

Of the 5 Meat and meat products labels collected in New Zealand that featured nutrition claims, all had general level absolute content claims, and none had comparative content claims.

Two Meat and meat products labels collected in New Zealand featured endorsements associated with health, namely the National Heart Foundation Tick.

Table A37. Summary of number of Meat and meat product labels with claims assessed against the proposed classification framework

	Australia	New Zealand	Total
General Level Claims - Nutrition			
Labels with Absolute claims only	16	5	21
Labels with Comparative claims only	0	0	0
Labels with both Absolute & Comparative claims	1	0	1
General Level Claims - Health			
Labels with Function claims	1	0	1
Labels with Enhanced Function claims	0	0	0
Labels with Risk reduction (non-serious) claims	0	0	0
Labels with Whole of Diet claims	0	0	0
Labels with Lifestage claims	0	0	0
Labels with Endorsements (Heart Tick)	3	2	5
Labels with health-related Trade marks & Product Names	0	0	0
Labels with health-related Symbols/Graphics	0	0	0
High Level Claims			
Labels with Biomarker maintenance claims	0	0	0
Labels with Biomarker enhancement claims	0	0	0
Labels with Risk reduction (serious disease) claims	0	0	0

Table A38 shows 5 nutrition claims on Meat and meat products labels collected in Australia and New Zealand made claims that were assessed against the provisions of the Food Code for claims relating to certain substances. These all related to gluten content.

Table A38. Breakdown of nutrition claims made on Meat and meat product labels assessed against Standard 1.2.8 (Division 3)

Food Code Nutrition Claims	Australia	New Zealand	Total
Fat – Poly & Mono Unsaturated Fat	0	0	0
– Omega claims	0	0	0
Joule	0	0	0
Lactose	0	0	0
Gluten	3	2	5
Sodium	0	0	0

Seventeen nutrition claims on Meat and meat products labels collected in Australia were assessed against CoPoNC, with the breakdown of claim types provided in Table A39. The majority of these (71%, n=12) were 'X% Fat free' claims. Two labels claimed a low fat content and two labels claimed low cholesterol content. One product name included the word 'Lite'.

Table A39. Breakdown of CoPoNC claims made on Meat and meat product labels collected in Australia

CoPoNC claims	Australia
Fat – Reduced fat	0
– Low fat	2
– X% Fat Free	12
– Low in saturated fat	0
Cholesterol	
– Low cholesterol	2
– Cholesterol free	0
Sugar	
– Reduced sugar	0
– Low sugar	0
– Sugar free	0
– Unsweetened	0
– No added sugar	0
Dietary Fibre	
– Source of fibre	0
– Excellent source of fibre	0
– High fibre	0
– Fibre increased	0
Salt	
– Low salt	0
– Very low salt	0
– Reduced salt	0
– No added salt	0
– Salt free	0
Energy	
– Low energy	0
– Reduced energy	0
Other claims	
– Lite/Light	1
– “Diet”	0
– X% free other than fat	0

Table A40 shows there were 7 claims on Meat and meat products labels assessed as inconsistent with the relevant labelling provisions. Three labels did not have the RDI information required by Standard 1.3.2. Two labels with X% Fat free claims did not meet the requirements of CoPoNC, as they had greater than 3% fat. Two labels were missing the expanded fat content information required by Standard 1.2.8.

Table A40. Summary of claims on labels collected in Meat and meat product labels that were assessed as inconsistent with the relevant labelling provisions

Australia			New Zealand	
Label Provision	Number of inconsistent claims	Reason	Number of inconsistent claims	Reason
CoPoNC	2 0	X% Fat Free Reference to whole of class absent	n/a n/a	X% Fat Free Reference to whole of class absent
Std 1.2.8	2 0 0 0	No Expanded fats Fibre, not Dietary Fibre Dietary Fibre not in Panel Nutrient not in Panel	0 0 0 0	No Expanded fats Fibre, not Dietary Fibre Dietary Fibre not in Panel Nutrient not in Panel
Std 1.3.2	2 0 0 0 0	RDI Missing Nutrient not in Panel % RDI too low Non-specific reference to nutrient Comparison of Vitamin content	1 0 0 0 0	RDI Missing Nutrient not in Panel % RDI too low Non-specific reference to nutrient Comparison of Vitamin content
Std 1.1A.2	0 0 0 0	Reference to a disease or condition Medical advice Prophylactic claim Weight loss claim	0 0 0 0	Reference to a disease or condition Medical advice Prophylactic claim Weight loss claim
NZDSR	n/a	Treating or preventing a disease	0	Treating or preventing a disease
Total	6		1	

n/a = not applicable

Appendix 4.9 Fish and fish products

In Food Category 9, Fish and fish products, 35 labels were assessed and 17 labels (49%) featured nutrition, health or related claims (Table A41).

The 21 Fish and fish products labels collected in Australia accounted for 60% of all Category 9 labels, with 62% (n=13) of these carrying a claim. Of Fish and fish products labels collected in New Zealand, 28% (n=4) carried claims.

Of the Fish and fish products labels collected in Australia that carried a claim, all had nutrition claims, while health claims were present on 2 of these labels.

Of the Fish and fish products labels collected in New Zealand that carried a claim, all had nutrition claims, while health claims were present on one label.

Table A41. Summary of Fish and fish product labels collected in Australia and New Zealand

	Australia	New Zealand	Total
Number of labels sampled	21	14	35
Labels with Claims	13	4	17
Labels with Nutrition claims only	11	3	14
Labels with Health claims only	0	0	0
Labels with both health & nutrition claims	2	1	3

Of the 13 Fish and fish products labels collected in Australia that featured nutrition claims, all displayed general level absolute content claims, and no labels featured comparative content claims (Table A42).

Two Fish and fish products labels collected in Australia had general level health claims, one of which was an endorsement associated with health, namely the National Heart Foundation Tick. One was a function claim.

Of the 4 Fish and fish products labels collected in New Zealand that featured nutrition claims, all had general level absolute content claims, and one also had a comparative content claim.

One Fish and fish products labels collected in New Zealand featured an endorsement associated with health, namely the National Heart Foundation Tick.

Table A42. Summary of number of Fish and fish product labels with claims assessed against the proposed classification framework

	Australia	New Zealand	Total
General Level Claims - Nutrition			
Labels with Absolute claims only	13	3	16
Labels with Comparative claims only	0	0	0
Labels with both Absolute & Comparative claims	0	1	1
General Level Claims - Health			
Labels with Function claims	1	0	1
Labels with Enhanced Function claims	0	0	0
Labels with Risk reduction (non-serious) claims	0	0	0
Labels with Whole of Diet claims	0	0	0
Labels with Lifestage claims	0	0	0
Labels with Endorsements (Heart Tick)	1	1	2
Labels with health-related Trade marks & Product Names	0	0	0
Labels with health-related Symbols/Graphics	0	0	0
High Level Claims			
Labels with Biomarker maintenance claims	0	0	0
Labels with Biomarker enhancement claims	0	0	0
Labels with Risk reduction (serious disease) claims	0	0	0

Table A43 shows 12 nutrition claims on Fish and fish products labels collected in Australia and New Zealand made claims that were assessed against the provisions of the Food Code for claims relating to certain substances. Almost all of these (92%) were related to omega fatty acid content. One claim related to sodium content.

Table A43. Breakdown of nutrition claims made on Fish and fish product labels assessed against Standard 1.2.8 (Division 3)

Food Code Nutrition Claims	Australia	New Zealand	Total
Fat – Poly & Mono Unsaturated Fat	0	0	0
– Omega claims	9	3	11
Joule	0	0	0
Lactose	0	0	0
Gluten	0	0	0
Sodium	1	0	1

Two nutrition claims on Fish and fish products labels collected in Australia were assessed against CoPoNC, with the breakdown of claim types provided in Table A44. One of these wasn't X% fat free claim, and one was a low salt claim.

Table A44. Breakdown of CoPoNC claims made on Fish and fish product labels collected in Australia

CoPoNC claims	Australia
Fat – Reduced fat	0
– Low fat	0
– X% Fat Free	1
– Low in saturated fat	0
Cholesterol	
– Low cholesterol	0
– Cholesterol free	0
Sugar	
– Reduced sugar	0
– Low sugar	0
– Sugar free	0
– Unsweetened	0
– No added sugar	0
Dietary Fibre	
– Source of fibre	0
– Excellent source of fibre	0
– High fibre	0
– Fibre increased	0
Salt	
– Low salt	1
– Very low salt	0
– Reduced salt	0
– No added salt	0
– Salt free	0
Energy	
– Low energy	0
– Reduced energy	0
Other claims	
– Lite/Light	0
– “Diet”	0
– X% free other than fat	0

Table A45 shows there were 2 claims on Fish and fish products labels assessed as inconsistent with the relevant labelling provisions. Both labels were missing the expanded fat content information required by Standard 1.2.8.

Table A45. Summary of claims on labels collected in Fish and fish product labels that were assessed as inconsistent with the relevant labelling provisions

Australia			New Zealand	
Label Provision	Number of inconsistent claims	Reason	Number of inconsistent claims	Reason
CoPoNC	0	X% Fat Free	n/a	X% Fat Free
	0	Reference to whole of class absent	n/a	Reference to whole of class absent
Std 1.2.8	1	No Expanded fats	1	No Expanded fats
	0	Fibre, not Dietary Fibre	0	Fibre, not Dietary Fibre
	0	Dietary Fibre not in Panel	0	Dietary Fibre not in Panel
	0	Nutrient not in Panel	0	Nutrient not in Panel
Std 1.3.2	0	RDI Missing	0	RDI Missing
	0	Nutrient not in Panel	0	Nutrient not in Panel
	0	% RDI too low	0	% RDI too low
	0	Non-specific reference to nutrient	0	Non-specific reference to nutrient
	0	Comparison of Vitamin content	0	Comparison of Vitamin content
Std 1.1A.2	0	Reference to a disease or condition	0	Reference to a disease or condition
	0	Medical advice	0	Medical advice
	0	Prophylactic claim	0	Prophylactic claim
	0	Weight loss claim	0	Weight loss claim
NZDSR	n/a	Treating or preventing a disease	0	Treating or preventing a disease
Total	1		1	

n/a = not applicable

Appendix 4.10 Eggs and egg products

In Food Category 10, Eggs and egg products, 8 labels were assessed and 4 labels (50%) featured nutrition, health or related claims (Table A46).

The 6 Eggs and egg products labels collected in Australia accounted for 75% of all Category 10 labels, with 67% (n=4) of these carrying a claim. No Eggs and egg products labels collected in New Zealand carried claims.

Of the Eggs and egg products labels collected in Australia that carried a claim, all had nutrition claims, and one also featured a health claim.

Table A46. Summary of Egg and egg product labels collected in Australia and New Zealand

	Australia	New Zealand	Total
Number of labels sampled	6	2	8
Labels with Claims	4	0	4
Labels with Nutrition claims only	3	0	3
Labels with Health claims only	0	0	0
Labels with both health & nutrition claims	1	0	1

Of the 4 Eggs and egg products labels collected in Australia that featured nutrition claims, all displayed general level absolute content claims, with no labels featuring comparative content claims (Table A47).

One Eggs and egg products label collected in Australia had 2 general level health claims, one of which was assessed as a Lifestage claim and the other a Whole of diet claim.

Table A47. Summary of number of Egg and egg product labels with claims assessed against the proposed classification framework

	Australia	New Zealand	Total
General Level Claims - Nutrition			
Labels with Absolute claims only	4	0	4
Labels with Comparative claims only	0	0	0
Labels with both Absolute & Comparative claims	0	0	0
General Level Claims - Health			
Labels with Function claims	0	0	0
Labels with Enhanced Function claims	0	0	0
Labels with Risk reduction (non-serious) claims	0	0	0
Labels with Whole of Diet claims	1	0	1
Labels with Lifestage claims	1	0	1
Labels with Endorsements (Heart Tick)	0	0	0
Labels with health-related Trade marks & Product Names	0	0	0
Labels with health-related Symbols/Graphics	0	0	0
High Level Claims			
Labels with Biomarker maintenance claims	0	0	0
Labels with Biomarker enhancement claims	0	0	0
Labels with Risk reduction (serious disease) claims	0	0	0

Table A48 shows no nutrition claims on Eggs and egg products labels collected in Australia and New Zealand made claims that were assessed against the provisions of the Food Code for claims relating to certain substances.

Table A48. Breakdown of nutrition claims made on Egg and egg product labels assessed against Standard 1.2.8 (Division 3)

Food Code Nutrition Claims	Australia	New Zealand	Total
Fat – Poly & Mono Unsaturated Fat	0	0	0
– Omega claims	0	0	0
Joule	0	0	0
Lactose	0	0	0
Gluten	0	0	0
Sodium	0	0	0

No nutrition claims on Eggs and egg products labels collected in Australia were assessed against CoPoNC, as shown in Table A49.

Table A49. Breakdown of CoPoNC claims made on Egg and egg product labels collected in Australia

CoPoNC claims	Australia
Fat – Reduced fat	0
– Low fat	0
– X% Fat Free	0
– Low in saturated fat	0
Cholesterol	
– Low cholesterol	0
– Cholesterol free	0
Sugar	
– Reduced sugar	0
– Low sugar	0
– Sugar free	0
– Unsweetened	0
– No added sugar	0
Dietary Fibre	
– Source of fibre	0
– Excellent source of fibre	0
– High fibre	0
– Fibre increased	0
Salt	
– Low salt	0
– Very low salt	0
– Reduced salt	0
– No added salt	0
– Salt free	0
Energy	
– Low energy	0
– Reduced energy	0
Other claims	
– Lite/Light	0
– “Diet”	0
– X% free other than fat	0

Table A50 shows there were no claims on Eggs and egg products labels assessed as inconsistent with the relevant labelling provisions.

Table A50. Summary of claims on labels collected in Egg and egg product labels that were assessed as inconsistent with the relevant labelling provisions

Australia			New Zealand	
Label Provision	Number of inconsistent claims	Reason	Number of inconsistent claims	Reason
CoPoNC	0	X% Fat Free	n/a	X% Fat Free
	0	Reference to whole of class absent	n/a	Reference to whole of class absent
Std 1.2.8	0	No Expanded fats	0	No Expanded fats
	0	Fibre, not Dietary Fibre	0	Fibre, not Dietary Fibre
	0	Dietary Fibre not in Panel	0	Dietary Fibre not in Panel
	0	Nutrient not in Panel	0	Nutrient not in Panel
Std 1.3.2	0	RDI Missing	0	RDI Missing
	0	Nutrient not in Panel	0	Nutrient not in Panel
	0	% RDI too low	0	% RDI too low
	0	Non-specific reference to nutrient	0	Non-specific reference to nutrient
	0	Comparison of Vitamin content	0	Comparison of Vitamin content
Std 1.1A.2	0	Reference to a disease or condition	0	Reference to a disease or condition
	0	Medical advice	0	Medical advice
	0	Prophylactic claim	0	Prophylactic claim
	0	Weight loss claim	0	Weight loss claim
NZDSR	n/a	Treating or preventing a disease	0	Treating or preventing a disease
Total	0		0	

n/a = not applicable

Appendix 4.11 Sugars, honey and related products

In Food Category 11, Sugar, honey and related products, 23 labels were assessed and 4 labels (36%) featured nutrition, health or related claims (Table A51).

The 13 Sugar, honey and related products labels collected in Australia accounted for 56% of all Category 11 labels, with 31% (n=4) of these carrying a claim. No Sugar, honey and related products labels collected in New Zealand carried claims.

All of the claims on Sugar, honey and related products labels collected in Australia were nutrition claims.

Table A51. Summary of Sugars, honey and related product labels collected in Australia and New Zealand

	Australia	New Zealand	Total
Number of labels sampled	13	10	23
Labels with Claims	4	0	4
Labels with Nutrition claims only	4	0	4
Labels with Health claims only	0	0	0
Labels with both health & nutrition claims	0	0	0

Of the 4 Sugar, honey and related products labels collected in Australia that featured nutrition claims, all displayed general level absolute content claims (Table A52).

No Sugar, honey and related products labels had health claims.

Table A52. Summary of number of Sugars, honey and related product labels with claims assessed against the proposed classification framework

	Australia	New Zealand	Total
General Level Claims - Nutrition			
Labels with Absolute claims only	4	0	4
Labels with Comparative claims only	0	0	0
Labels with both Absolute & Comparative claims	0	0	0
General Level Claims - Health			
Labels with Function claims	0	0	0
Labels with Enhanced Function claims	0	0	0
Labels with Risk reduction (non-serious) claims	0	0	0
Labels with Whole of Diet claims	0	0	0
Labels with Lifestage claims	0	0	0
Labels with Endorsements (Heart Tick)	0	0	0
Labels with health-related Trade marks & Product Names	0	0	0
Labels with health-related Symbols/Graphics	0	0	0
High Level Claims			
Labels with Biomarker maintenance claims	0	0	0
Labels with Biomarker enhancement claims	0	0	0
Labels with Risk reduction (serious disease) claims	0	0	0

Table A53 shows 2 nutrition claims on Sugar, honey and related products labels collected in Australia made claims that were assessed against the provisions of the Food Code for claims relating to certain substances. These both related to energy content.

Table A53. Breakdown of nutrition claims made on Sugars, honey and related product labels assessed against Standard 1.2.8 (Division 3)

Food Code Nutrition Claims	Australia	New Zealand	Total
Fat – Poly & Mono Unsaturated Fat	0	0	0
– Omega claims	0	0	0
Joule	2	0	2
Lactose	0	0	0
Gluten	0	0	0
Sodium	0	0	0

Two nutrition claims on Sugar, honey and related products labels collected in Australia were assessed against CoPoNC, with the breakdown of claim types provided in Table A9. These both related to low energy content.

Table A54. Breakdown of CoPoNC claims made on Sugars, honey and related product labels collected in Australia

CoPoNC claims	Australia
Fat – Reduced fat	0
– Low fat	0
– X% Fat Free	0
– Low in saturated fat	0
Cholesterol	
– Low cholesterol	0
– Cholesterol free	0
Sugar	
– Reduced sugar	0
– Low sugar	0
– Sugar free	0
– Unsweetened	0
– No added sugar	0
Dietary Fibre	
– Source of fibre	0
– Excellent source of fibre	0
– High fibre	0
– Fibre increased	0
Salt	
– Low salt	0
– Very low salt	0
– Reduced salt	0
– No added salt	0
– Salt free	0
Energy	
– Low energy	2
– Reduced energy	0
Other claims	
– Lite/Light	0
– “Diet”	0
– X% free other than fat	0

Table A55 shows there were no claims on Sugar, honey and related products labels assessed as inconsistent with the relevant labelling provisions.

Table A55. Summary of claims on labels collected in Sugars, honey and related product labels that were assessed as inconsistent with the relevant labelling provisions

Australia			New Zealand	
Label Provision	Number of inconsistent claims	Reason	Number of inconsistent claims	Reason
CoPoNC	0	X% Fat Free	n/a	X% Fat Free
	0	Reference to whole of class absent	n/a	Reference to whole of class absent
Std 1.2.8	0	No Expanded fats	0	No Expanded fats
	0	Fibre, not Dietary Fibre	0	Fibre, not Dietary Fibre
	0	Dietary Fibre not in Panel	0	Dietary Fibre not in Panel
	0	Nutrient not in Panel	0	Nutrient not in Panel
Std 1.3.2	0	RDI Missing	0	RDI Missing
	0	Nutrient not in Panel	0	Nutrient not in Panel
	0	% RDI too low	0	% RDI too low
	0	Non-specific reference to nutrient	0	Non-specific reference to nutrient
	0	Comparison of Vitamin content	0	Comparison of Vitamin content
Std 1.1A.2	0	Reference to a disease or condition	0	Reference to a disease or condition
	0	Medical advice	0	Medical advice
	0	Prophylactic claim	0	Prophylactic claim
	0	Weight loss claim	0	Weight loss claim
NZDSR	n/a	Treating or preventing a disease	0	Treating or preventing a disease
Total	0		0	

n/a = not applicable

Appendix 4.12 Food intended for particular dietary use

In Food Category 12, Food intended for particular dietary use, 27 labels were assessed and 26 labels (96%) featured nutrition, health or related claims (Table A56).

The 14 Food intended for particular dietary use labels collected in Australia accounted for 52% of all Category 12 labels, with 93% (n=13) of these carrying a claim. All Food intended for particular dietary use labels collected in New Zealand (n=13) carried claims.

Of the Food intended for particular dietary use labels collected in Australia that carried a claim, all had nutrition claims, while health claims were present on 6 (46%) of these labels.

Of the Food intended for particular dietary use labels collected in New Zealand that carried a claim, all had nutrition claims, while health claims were present on 8 (61%) of these labels.

Table A56. Summary of Food intended for particular dietary use labels collected in Australia and New Zealand

	Australia	New Zealand	Total
Number of labels sampled	14	13	27
Labels with Claims	13	13	26
Labels with Nutrition claims only	7	5	12
Labels with Health claims only	0	0	0
Labels with both health & nutrition claims	6	8	14

Of the 13 Food intended for particular dietary use labels collected in Australia that featured nutrition claims, all displayed general level absolute content claims (Table A57).

Six labels from Food intended for particular dietary use category collected in Australia had general level health claims, which were all function claims.

Of the 13 Food intended for particular dietary use labels collected in New Zealand that featured nutrition claims, all had general level absolute content claims, and one also had a comparative content claim.

Eight labels from the Food intended for particular dietary use category collected in New Zealand featured a total of 9 general level health claims. Four labels with health claims featured Whole of diet claims, three labels also featured function claims and two featured enhanced function claims.

Table A57. Summary of number of Food intended for particular dietary use labels with claims assessed against the proposed classification framework

	Australia	New Zealand	Total
General Level Claims - Nutrition			
Labels with Absolute claims only	13	12	25
Labels with Comparative claims only	0	0	0
Labels with both Absolute & Comparative claims	0	1	1
General Level Claims - Health			
Labels with Function claims	6	3	9
Labels with Enhanced Function claims	0	2	2
Labels with Risk reduction (non-serious) claims	0	0	0
Labels with Whole of Diet claims	0	4	4
Labels with Lifestage claims	0	0	0
Labels with Endorsements (Heart Tick)	0	0	0
Labels with health-related Trade marks & Product Names	0	0	0
Labels with health-related Symbols/Graphics	0	0	0
High Level Claims			
Labels with Biomarker maintenance claims	0	0	0
Labels with Biomarker enhancement claims	0	0	0
Labels with Risk reduction (serious disease) claims	0	0	0

Table A58 shows 17 nutrition claims on Food intended for particular dietary use labels collected in Australia and New Zealand made claims that were assessed against the provisions of the Food Code for claims relating to certain substances. Gluten and sodium content claims each featured on 6 labels, with 5 label claims relating to lactose content.

Table A58. Breakdown of nutrition claims made on Food intended for particular dietary use labels assessed against Standard 1.2.8 (Division 3)

Food Code Nutrition Claims	Australia	New Zealand	Total
Fat – Poly & Mono Unsaturated Fat	0	0	0
– Omega claims	0	0	0
Joule	0	0	0
Lactose	3	2	5
Gluten	5	1	6
Sodium	4	2	6

Ten nutrition claims on Food intended for particular dietary use labels collected in Australia were assessed against CoPoNC, with the breakdown of claim types provided in Table A59. Salt and sugar content claims each featured on 4 labels, with one label claim relating to increased fibre content and one 'X% Fat free' claim.

Table A59. Breakdown of CoPoNC claims made on Food intended for particular dietary use labels collected in Australia

CoPoNC claims	Australia
Fat – Reduced fat	0
– Low fat	0
– X% Fat Free	1
– Low in saturated fat	0
Cholesterol	
– Low cholesterol	0
– Cholesterol free	0
Sugar	
– Reduced sugar	0
– Low sugar	0
– Sugar free	1
– Unsweetened	0
– No added sugar	3
Dietary Fibre	
– Source of fibre	0
– Excellent source of fibre	0
– High fibre	0
– Fibre increased	1
Salt	
– Low salt	0
– Very low salt	0
– Reduced salt	0
– No added salt	3
– Salt free	1
Energy	
– Low energy	0
– Reduced energy	0
Other claims	
– Lite/Light	0
– “Diet”	0
– X% free other than fat	0

Table A60 shows there were 4 claims on Food intended for particular dietary use labels assessed as inconsistent with the relevant labelling provisions. These were all featured on labels collected in New Zealand. Three labels did not have the RDI information required by Standard 1.3.2, and another did not provide the amount of a nutrient in the NIP, also required by Standard 1.3.2.

Table A60. Summary of claims on labels collected in Food intended for particular dietary use labels that were assessed as inconsistent with the relevant labelling provisions

Australia			New Zealand	
Label Provision	Number of inconsistent claims	Reason	Number of inconsistent claims	Reason
CoPoNC	0	X% Fat Free	n/a	X% Fat Free
	0	Reference to whole of class absent	n/a	Reference to whole of class absent
Std 1.2.8	0	No Expanded fats	0	No Expanded fats
	0	Fibre, not Dietary Fibre	0	Fibre, not Dietary Fibre
	0	Dietary Fibre not in Panel	0	Dietary Fibre not in Panel
	0	Nutrient not in Panel	0	Nutrient not in Panel
Std 1.3.2	0	RDI Missing	3	RDI Missing
	0	Nutrient not in Panel	1	Nutrient not in Panel
	0	% RDI too low	0	% RDI too low
	0	Non-specific reference to nutrient	0	Non-specific reference to nutrient
	0	Comparison of Vitamin content	0	Comparison of Vitamin content
Std 1.1A.2	0	Reference to a disease or condition	0	Reference to a disease or condition
	0	Medical advice	0	Medical advice
	0	Prophylactic claim	0	Prophylactic claim
	0	Weight loss claim	0	Weight loss claim
NZDSR	n/a	Treating or preventing a disease	0	Treating or preventing a disease
Total	0		4	

n/a = not applicable

Appendix 4.13 Non-alcoholic beverages

In Food Category 13, Non-alcoholic beverages, 130 labels were assessed and 60 labels (46%) featured nutrition, health or related claims (Table A61).

The 76 Non-alcoholic beverages labels collected in Australia accounted for 58% of all Category 13 labels, with 43% (n=33) of these carrying a claim. Of the Non-alcoholic beverages labels collected in New Zealand, 50% (n=27) carried claims.

Of the Non-alcoholic beverages labels collected in Australia that carried a claim, 31 had nutrition claims, while health claims were present on 6 (18%) of these labels.

Of the Non-alcoholic beverages labels collected in New Zealand that carried a claim, all had nutrition claims, while health claims were also present on 11 (41%) of these labels.

Table A61. Summary of Non-alcoholic beverage labels collected in Australia and New Zealand

	Australia	New Zealand	Total
Number of labels sampled	76	54	130
Labels with Claims	33	27	60
Labels with Nutrition claims only	27	16	43
Labels with Health claims only	2	0	2
Labels with both health & nutrition claims	4	11	15

Of the 31 Non-alcoholic beverages labels collected in Australia that featured nutrition claims, all displayed general level absolute content claims, and 2 also featured comparative content claims (Table A62).

Six labels from Non-alcoholic beverages category collected in Australia had general level health claims. Two of these were health-related symbols or graphics, two were function claims and one was an enhanced function claim.

Of the 27 Non-alcoholic beverages collected in New Zealand that featured nutrition claims, 96% (n=26) had general level absolute content claims, and two labels featured comparative content claims.

Eleven labels from the Non-alcoholic beverages category collected in New Zealand featured a total of 15 general level health claims. Four labels with health claims featured function claims and four featured enhanced function claims. Two labels featured health-related endorsements, namely the National Heart Foundation Tick, and two labels featured health-related symbols or graphics. One label had a Whole of diet claim and one had a risk reduction claim for a non-serious disease.

The product name of one New Zealand label was assessed as a general level health claim, with the exact wording as follows:

'Red Seal Relaxing Tea Caffeine Free Herbal Tea Bags'

Table A62. Summary of number of Non-alcoholic beverage labels with claims assessed against the proposed classification framework

	Australia	New Zealand	Total
General Level Claims - Nutrition			
Labels with Absolute claims only	29	25	54
Labels with Comparative claims only	0	1	1
Labels with both Absolute & Comparative claims	2	1	3
General Level Claims - Health			
Labels with Function claims	2	4	6
Labels with Enhanced Function claims	1	4	5
Labels with Risk reduction (non-serious) claims	0	1	1
Labels with Whole of Diet claims	1	1	2
Labels with Lifestage claims	0	0	0
Labels with Endorsements (Heart Tick)	0	2	2
Labels with health-related Trade marks & Product Names	0	1	0
Labels with health-related Symbols/Graphics	2	2	4
High Level Claims			
Labels with Biomarker maintenance claims	0	0	0
Labels with Biomarker enhancement claims	0	0	0
Labels with Risk reduction (serious disease) claims	0	0	0

Table A63 shows 4 nutrition claims on Non-alcoholic beverage labels collected in Australia and New Zealand made claims that were assessed against the provisions of the Food Code for claims relating to certain substances. Energy content claims featured on 3 labels, and one label featured a claim in relation to poly and mono unsaturated fat content.

Table A63. Breakdown of nutrition claims made on Non-alcoholic beverage labels assessed against Standard 1.2.8 (Division 3)

Food Code Nutrition Claims	Australia	New Zealand	Total
Fat – Poly & Mono Unsaturated Fat	1	0	1
– Omega claims	0	0	0
Joule	1	2	3
Lactose	0	0	0
Gluten	0	0	0
Sodium	0	0	0

Nineteen nutrition claims on Non-alcoholic beverage labels collected in Australia were assessed against CoPoNC, with the breakdown of claim types provided in Table 64. The majority of these (68%, n=13) related to sugar content. Two labels featured the word 'Diet' and one label featured the word 'light or lite'. One label featured an 'X% Fat free' claim, one featured a low energy claim and another featured a Cholesterol free claim.

Table A64. Breakdown of CoPoNC claims made on Non-alcoholic beverage labels collected in Australia

CoPoNC claims	Australia
Fat – Reduced fat	0
– Low fat	0
– X% Fat Free	1
– Low in saturated fat	0
Cholesterol	
– Low cholesterol	0
– Cholesterol free	1
Sugar	
– Reduced sugar	0
– Low sugar	0
– Sugar free	1
– Unsweetened	1
– No added sugar	11
Dietary Fibre	
– Source of fibre	0
– Excellent source of fibre	0
– High fibre	0
– Fibre increased	0
Salt	
– Low salt	0
– Very low salt	0
– Reduced salt	0
– No added salt	0
– Salt free	0
Energy	
– Low energy	1
– Reduced energy	0
Other claims	
– Lite/Light	1
– “Diet”	2
– X% free other than fat	0

Table A65 shows there were 4 claims on Non-alcoholic beverage labels assessed as inconsistent with the relevant labelling provisions. Three labels did not have the RDI information required by Standard 1.3.2. One did not provide the amount of a nutrient in the NIP, required by Standard 1.2.8, and one label listed fibre, instead of dietary fibre in the NIP.

One label collected in New Zealand referenced a disease or medical condition, and was therefore assessed as inconsistent with the requirements of the transitional Standard 1.1A.2. As the claim provided advice about treating or preventing a disease, it was also assessed as inconsistent with the requirements of the NZDSR. The exact wording is as follows:

‘Echinacea is believed to reduce the severity and duration of colds. Combined with Acerola Berry, a rich natural source of Vitamin C, and a delicious blend of fruit, Simply Berry is a unique way to boost your immune system.’

Table A65. Summary of claims on labels collected in Non-alcoholic beverage labels that were assessed as inconsistent with the relevant labelling provisions

Australia			New Zealand	
Label Provision	Number of inconsistent claims	Reason	Number of inconsistent claims	Reason
CoPoNC	0 0	X% Fat Free Reference to whole of class absent	n/a n/a	X% Fat Free Reference to whole of class absent
Std 1.2.8	0 1 0 1	No Expanded fats Fibre, not Dietary Fibre Dietary Fibre not in Panel Nutrient not in Panel	0 0 0 0	No Expanded fats Fibre, not Dietary Fibre Dietary Fibre not in Panel Nutrient not in Panel
Std 1.3.2	1 0 0 0 0	RDI Missing Nutrient not in Panel % RDI too low Non-specific reference to nutrient Comparison of Vitamin content	2 0 0 0 0	RDI Missing Nutrient not in Panel % RDI too low Non-specific reference to nutrient Comparison of Vitamin content
Std 1.1A.2	0 0 0 0	Reference to a disease or condition Medical advice Prophylactic claim Weight loss claim	1 0 0 0	Reference to a disease or condition Medical advice Prophylactic claim Weight loss claim
NZDSR*	n/a	Treating or preventing a disease	1	Treating or preventing a disease
Total	3		4	

n/a = not applicable

* One claim assessed as inconsistent with the provisions of the transitional Standard 1.1A.2 was also assessed as inconsistent with the provisions of the NZDSR.

Appendix 4.14 Mixed foods

In Food Category 14, Mixed foods, 282 labels were assessed and 111 labels (39%) featured nutrition, health or related claims (Table A61).

The 145 Mixed food labels collected in Australia accounted for 51% of all Category 14 labels, with 44% (n=64) of these carrying a claim. Of the Mixed food labels collected in New Zealand, 34% (n=47) carried claims.

Of the 64 Mixed food labels collected in Australia that carried a claim, 63 (98%) had nutrition claims, while health claims were present on 7 (11%) of these labels.

Of the 47 Mixed food labels collected in New Zealand that carried a claim, 45 (96%) had nutrition claims, while health claims were present on 10 (21%) of these labels.

Table A66. Summary of Mixed food labels collected in Australia and New Zealand

	Australia	New Zealand	Total
Number of labels sampled	145	137	282
Labels with Claims	64	47	111
Labels with Nutrition claims only	57	37	94
Labels with Health claims only	1	2	3
Labels with both health & nutrition claims	6	8	14

Of the 63 Mixed food labels collected in Australia that featured nutrition claims, 98% (n=62) displayed general level absolute content claims, and 7 (11%) featured comparative content claims (Table A67).

Seven labels from Mixed food category collected in Australia had general level health claims. Three of these were function claims, three were health-related endorsements, namely the National Heart Foundation Tick and one was a health-related symbol or graphic.

Of the 45 Mixed food category collected in New Zealand that featured nutrition claims, all had general level absolute content claims, and one label also featured a comparative content claim.

Ten labels from the Mixed food category collected in New Zealand featured general level health claims. Eight labels featured health-related endorsements, namely the National Heart Foundation Tick. Three labels with health claims featured function claims and one featured a health-related symbol or graphic.

Table A67. Summary of number of Mixed food labels with claims assessed against the proposed classification framework

	Australia	New Zealand	Total
General Level Claims - Nutrition			
Labels with Absolute claims only	56	44	100
Labels with Comparative claims only	1	0	1
Labels with both Absolute & Comparative claims	6	1	7
General Level Claims - Health			
Labels with Function claims	3	3	6
Labels with Enhanced Function claims	0	0	0
Labels with Risk reduction (non-serious) claims	0	0	0
Labels with Whole of Diet claims	0	0	0
Labels with Lifestage claims	0	0	0
Labels with Endorsements (Heart Tick)	3	8	11
Labels with health-related Trade marks & Product Names	1	0	1
Labels with health-related Symbols/Graphics	0	1	1
High Level Claims			
Labels with Biomarker maintenance claims	0	0	0
Labels with Biomarker enhancement claims	0	0	0
Labels with Risk reduction (serious disease) claims	0	0	0

Table A68 shows 19 nutrition claims on Mixed food labels collected in Australia and New Zealand made claims that were assessed against the provisions of the Food Code for claims relating to certain substances. Poly and mono unsaturated fat content claims featured on 9 labels, and six labels featured claims in relation to gluten content. Four labels featured sodium content claims.

Table A68. Breakdown of nutrition claims made on Mixed food labels assessed against Standard 1.2.8 (Division 3)

Food Code Nutrition Claims	Australia	New Zealand	Total
Fat – Poly & Mono Unsaturated Fat	9	0	9
– Omega claims	0	0	0
Joule	0	0	0
Lactose	0	0	0
Gluten	4	2	6
Sodium	4	0	4

Forty-nine nutrition claims on Mixed food labels collected in Australia were assessed against CoPoNC, with the breakdown of claim types provided in Table 69. The majority of these (55%, n=27) related to fat content. Nine labels featured claims in relation to cholesterol content, and 4 labels made claims in relation to fibre content. A further 4 labels made claims in relation to salt content, 2 featured energy content claims and 2 labels featured the word 'Light' or 'Lite'.

Table A69. Breakdown of CoPoNC claims made on Mixed food labels collected in Australia

CoPoNC claims	Australia
Fat – Reduced fat	0
– Low fat	4
– X% Fat Free	21
– Low in saturated fat	2
Cholesterol	
– Low cholesterol	1
– Cholesterol free	8
Sugar	
– Reduced sugar	1
– Low sugar	0
– Sugar free	0
– Unsweetened	0
– No added sugar	0
Dietary Fibre	
– Source of fibre	1
– Excellent source of fibre	1
– High fibre	2
– Fibre increased	0
Salt	
– Low salt	0
– Very low salt	0
– Reduced salt	2
– No added salt	2
– Salt free	0
Energy	
– Low energy	0
– Reduced energy	2
Other claims	
– Lite/Light	2
– “Diet”	0
– X% free other than fat	0

Table A70 shows there were 12 claims on Mixed food labels assessed as inconsistent with the relevant labelling provisions. The majority of these (92%, n=11) were on labels collected in Australia. Four labels did not have the RDI information required by Standard 1.3.2. Three did not provide the expanded information about fat content required by Standard 1.2.8. Three labels made ‘X% Fat free’ claims were the products contained more than 3% fat, and were therefore inconsistent with the requirements of CoPoNC. One label omitted the amount of a nutrient in the NIP, required by Standard 1.2.8, and one label listed fibre, instead of dietary fibre in the NIP.

Table A70. Summary of claims on labels collected in Mixed food labels that were assessed as inconsistent with the relevant labelling provisions

Australia			New Zealand	
Label Provision	Number of inconsistent claims	Reason	Number of inconsistent claims	Reason
CoPoNC	3 0	X% Fat Free Reference to whole of class absent	n/a n/a	X% Fat Free Reference to whole of class absent
Std 1.2.8	3 0 0 1	No Expanded fats Fibre, not Dietary Fibre Dietary Fibre not in Panel Nutrient not in Panel	0 1 0 0	No Expanded fats Fibre, not Dietary Fibre Dietary Fibre not in Panel Nutrient not in Panel
Std 1.3.2	4 0 0 0 0	RDI Missing Nutrient not in Panel % RDI too low Non-specific reference to nutrient Comparison of Vitamin content	0 0 0 0 0	RDI Missing Nutrient not in Panel % RDI too low Non-specific reference to nutrient Comparison of Vitamin content
Std 1.1A.2	0 0 0 0	Reference to a disease or condition Medical advice Prophylactic claim Weight loss claim	0 0 0 0	Reference to a disease or condition Medical advice Prophylactic claim Weight loss claim
NZDSR	n/a	Treating or preventing a disease	0	Treating or preventing a disease
Total	11		1	

n/a = not applicable