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Background
• Allergen Labelling Survey Australia only

• How are Australian food manufacturers declaring allergens in
  - the ingredient list; (bold or not?)
  - summary statements; (Location)
  - precautionary statements; (what statements are being used?)
  - allergen label claims? (frequency?)

• We consider consistency will drive consumer confidence
Allergen Labelling Review Survey 2009

Background

• Are food manufacturers following the recommendations of the Australian Food and Grocery Council (AFGC) *Food Industry Guide to Allergen Management and Labelling – 2007 Revised Edition* (‘The Guide’)?

• Has the way allergens are declared changed since the last survey was done in 2005?

• Freely available voluntary Guide
  www.allergenbureau.net

• Recommendations on Allergen Management (including VITAL) & Labelling

• Labelling recommendations include:
  -General Allergen Labelling Requirements
  -Recommended Labelling Format
RECOMMENDED LABELLING FORMAT EXAMPLE.

INGREDIENTS

Tree nuts specifically identified.

Water, vegetable oil, vinegar, cane sugar, tomato paste (5%), salt, parmesan cheese (2%), egg yolk, maize thickener (1412), almonds, red capsicum, soybean oil, garlic (1.0%), vegetable gum (415), spice, herbs, wheat cornflour, flavour (wheat maltodextrin, sesame oil), antioxidant (320).

Contains milk, egg, almonds, soy, wheat and sesame.

May be present: xxx.

Precautionary statement declared if appropriate. This statement must only be used in conjunction with VITAL.

Summary statement listing all allergenic ingredients in the product as per Table to Clause 4 of Standard 1.2.3.

Gluten source (grain source) qualified in ingredient list.

Allergenic ingredients & derivatives declared in bold each time they appear.
Allergen Labelling Review Survey 2009

- beverages
- biscuits
- bread & baked goods
- breakfast foods
- canned fish
- condiments
- confectionary & chocolate
- cooking aids
- dairy
- desserts
- fruit/veg/nuts/seeds
- gravies & stocks
- infant food
- oils & spreads
- other spreads
- pasta/rice/noodles
- prepared meals
- salad dressing
- sauce
- snacks and soups.
Allergen Labelling Review Survey 2009

• Products were purchased from:
  - Coles Supermarkets
  - ALDI Stores
  - Woolworths

• Products provide a representative sample
  - products with major shelf presence
  - products with minor shelf presence
  - private label brands

• 340 products
Allergen Labelling Review Survey 2009

- Review was conducted at NSWFA
- University Students assisted with the review
- Training the students to achieve a consistent approach to label review
- Allergen Bureau Management Committee Members on hand throughout the survey data collection
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>GENERAL REQUIREMENTS Recommendation in The Guide</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C⁺</td>
<td>Allergen Information Grouped</td>
<td>Improving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Plain English terms</td>
<td>Excellent, keep up the good work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Distinct, easy to read</td>
<td>Needs constant vigilance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results – General Information

“Allergen information should be grouped together to be easily identified and not hidden amongst other labelling information”

• Survey showed an increase in the grouping together of allergen information – ie. ingredient list, summary statement, precautionary statement should be grouped together

• For example, where a summary statement was used, 78% were directly below the ingredient list (increased from 57% in 2005)
Results – General Information

“Allergens must be declared using plain English terms and be consistent with the Code”

• The survey showed positive results

• Products judged to be using plain English increased:
  - from 86% to 93% on all labels
Results – General Information

“The print size should be big enough to be easily read, preferably at a minimum 1.5mm with sans serif font and the font colour should contrast distinctly from the background”
Results – General Information

- Labels which met the minimum font size (1.5mm):
  - 77% of ingredient lists for products in 2005 and 2009
  - 80% in 2005 and 83% in 2009 for summary statements
  - 78% in 2005 and 81% in 2009 for precautionary statements

- Labels which had allergen information in distinct writing 96% in 2005 to 87% in 2009.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>INGREDIENT LIST Recommendation in The Guide</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Allergens listed in bold</td>
<td>Not widely adopted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results – Ingredient List

“Allergens are declared in bold type each time they appear in the ingredient list”

- Ingredient lists which contained allergens in bold type increased from 24% to 26%.
RECOMMENDED LABELLING FORMAT EXAMPLE.

INGREDIENTS

Water, vegetable oil, vinegar, cane sugar, tomato paste (5%), salt, parmesan cheese (2%), egg yolk, maize thickener (1412), almonds, red capsicum, soybean oil, garlic (1.0%), vegetable gum (415), spice, herbs, wheat cornflour, flavour (wheat maltodextrin, sesame oil), antioxidant (320).

Contains milk, egg, almonds, soy, wheat and sesame.

May be present: xxx.

Precautionary statement declared if appropriate. This statement must only be used in conjunction with VITAL.

Allergenic ingredients & derivatives declared in bold each time they appear.

Gluten source (grain source) qualified in ingredient list.

Summary statement listing all allergenic ingredients in the product as per Table to Clause 4 of Standard 1.2.3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>SUMMARY STATEMENT Recommendation in The Guide</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A+</td>
<td>Use “contains” for the summary statement</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>Font size of summary statement equal to ingredient listing</td>
<td>Declining adherence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>“Tree nuts” declared in preference to “nuts”</td>
<td>Keep improving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results – Summary Statement

“Declared as “Contains xxx...” and appears directly below the ingredient list on a separate line in bold”

(NB. “Alternative Labelling Recommendations” in The Guide also allow the use of “ingredients contain”)

- 80% of summary statements used “Contains”

- 20% used “This product contains“ or “ingredients contain”.

Allergen Bureau
informing the food industry
Example

WHOLEGRAIN CEREALS (60%) (CORN, WHEAT, OATS), VEGETABLE OIL, RICE, SUGAR, MALTODEXTRIN, MILK POWDER, SALT, ONION POWDER, YEAST EXTRACT, CHEESE POWDER, NATURAL FLAVOURS, PARSLEY FLAKES, FOOD ACIDS (330, 270)

Contains Gluten
Contains Milk or Milk Products
Contains Soybeans or Soybean Products
Example

- Label has “Contains 10% Milk Fat”

- A consumer may incorrectly assume this is an Allergen Summary Statement and that this product contains milk as the only allergen

- A consumer may not realise that this also contains egg
Summary Statement

• Summary statement is in a different font to the ingredient listing

• Does this make it more or less easy to find? Does it stand out? Or could it be missed?
Example

- Labels with “Contains no known allergens” & “No Allergens Present”

- What does this mean? Many people are allergic to foods outside those required for mandatory labelling

- Supporting this claim could be difficult, very absolute statement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>PRECAUTIONARY STATEMENT Recommendation in The Guide</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D⁺</td>
<td>Use of VITAL</td>
<td>Improving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B⁺</td>
<td>In bold, on a separate line</td>
<td>Improving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B⁻</td>
<td>Use same font size as ingredient list</td>
<td>Declining adherence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDED LABELLING FORMAT EXAMPLE.

INGREDIENTS

Tree nuts specifically identified.

Water, vegetable oil, vinegar, cane sugar, tomato paste (5%), salt, parmesan cheese (2%), egg yolk, maize thickener (1412), almonds, red capsicum, soybean oil, garlic (1.0%), vegetable gum (415), spice, herbs, wheat cornflour, flavour (wheat maltodextrin, sesame oil), antioxidant (320).

Contains milk, egg, almonds, soy, wheat and sesame.

May be present: xxx.

Precautionary statement declared if appropriate. This statement must only be used in conjunction with VITAL.

Allergenic ingredients & derivatives declared in bold each time they appear.

Gluten source (grain source) qualified in ingredient list.

Summary statement listing all allergenic ingredients in the product as per Table to Clause 4 of Standard 1.2.3.
Results – Precautionary Statements

“The precautionary statement is declared as “May be contact allergens present at VITAL Action Level 2”

- Incidence of precautionary statements on all labels – 48% in 2005 and 47% in 2009
- “May contain traces of...” was most commonly used in both 2005 (35%) and 2009 (38%) of all precautionary statements
- In 2009, 11 products (or 7%) used the “May be present” VITAL precautionary labelling statement
Results – Precautionary Statements

“This statement [May be present] is placed below the summary statement on a separate line in bold.”

• “May be present” statement placed as recommended in The Guide 82% of the time

• Other precautionary statements showed increasing compliance to the recommendations – from 93% (2005) to 96% (2009).

• Recommendation for “bolding” the precautionary statement also showed increased compliance to The Guide - 43% (2005) to 58% (2009).
Allergen Claims

- Decreased from 17% (2005) to 9% (2009)
- Majority of claims are for wheat-free or gluten-free
- Further investigation required
Labelling Recommendations

• Repeat this survey in four years (2013)
  • monitoring partnership with FSANZ

• Investigate why ‘The Guide’ is not more widely adopted

• Scoping exercise for developing Australian Standard for allergen labelling

• Provide increased guidance to address major issues (eg. font size)

• Convene a working group to formally address issue of gluten-free criteria (Stakeholder Meeting)

• Compile a list of “consumer-friendly” terms for allergen-derived ingredients on the Allergen Bureau website - (Completed)
VITAL Review in 2010

- FSANZ Feedback
- VITAL overall Review including Scientific Review
- International Interest
- Consumer Communication Strategy
- Expanding Training Providers
FSANZ

- Food industry is addressing allergen labelling and precautionary labelling well
- Satisfied that there is a consistent and collaborative industry approach
- No justification for a regulatory outcome at this stage
VITAL Review 2010

• Review of the VITAL Procedure, Grid and Decision Tree

• Revise VITAL tools (calculator, FAQs, worked examples) and other supporting information

• training documents will be aligned with the amendments to the VITAL as a result of the review
VITAL Scientific Review

• Aim: Completion of scientific review of the VITAL Grid including an article suitable for peer review and publishing in suitable journal

• Draft has been developed

• Feedback received from Dr Steve Taylor & team, Director, Food Allergy Research & Resource Program

• Convene scientific Expert Panel
International Interest

- Requests to speak in UK, Canada, USA and provide further information about the rollout of VITAL
  - BRC & FDF presentations in UK

- Emails requesting assistance with VITAL & interest in becoming training providers from Europe, Asia, South Africa

- Over 40% website traffic from outside Australia and New Zealand
Consumer Communication Strategy

• Advise consumers of our message:

“Don’t eat products which contain a precautionary statement with an allergen to which you are sensitive”

• Strategy in draft form and will be released and rolled out in the coming months
Training Providers

• Expanding eligible Allergen Bureau-endorsed VITAL training providers

• Two-stage approval process, close to completion

• Watch our website and eNews for information about new trainers

• Increase options for trainees (training formats, timetable)
Summary – Allergen Labelling

• As an industry we are striving to provide a consistent allergen labelling approach to facilitate consumer information

• Compliance to the industry Guide varies dependant on the attribute

• There is more work to be done by industry and by the Allergen Bureau

• Feedback from FSANZ:
  − Industry has been proactive in addressing labelling needs
  − Collaborative effort
  − No regulatory outcomes required
  − Label monitoring partnership approach
Summary – VITAL Review

• Reviewing and Updating VITAL Tools and support information & most importantly the Calculator

• Scientific Review underway

• Scientific Expert Panel to assist with review and ongoing support

• International interest, so how do protect VITAL to ensure ongoing sustainability

• Consumer Communication Strategy

• Further Training Providers will become available shortly
Thank you

VITAL Co-ordinator
vital@allergenbureau.net

Allergen Bureau Management
management@allergenbureau.net

Information
info@allergenbureau.net