# **FOP Consultation - Theming**

**Questions for business**

**2b. What percentage of your product portfolio carries Multiple Traffic Light labelling?** **[Free text – specify number]**

1. 0
2. 1–20%
3. 21 - 40%
4. 41- 60%
5. 61 – 80%
6. 81- 99%
7. 100%
8. Did not answer question

**2c. [If less than 100%] What products do not carry Multiple Traffic Light label on and why? Please specify the product categories. [Free text box] Answers can be 2 or more responses.**

1. Branded products
2. Luxury products
3. Whole foods e.g. sugar/flour/eggs/veg/lentils
4. Exempt from labelling requirements e.g. alcohol
5. Voluntary
6. We use our own form of FOPNL
7. Costly
8. Aesthetics
9. Hard to implement
10. Old products not yet updated
11. Catering products/not sold in retail
12. NA
13. Other
14. Did not answer question

**2f. When adopting the Multiple Traffic Light Label - did you incur costs over and above existing labelling cycles?   
Please quantify these costs.** **[Free text box]**

1. Yes, costs were over and above existing labelling cycles
2. No, costs were not above existing labelling cycles
3. < £1K
4. £1 – 20K
5. £21K – 40K
6. Over £40K
7. I do not know
8. Other
9. Did not answer question

**3a. Please explain what Front of Pack Nutrition Labelling your business features on its products and why you chose this over the Government recommended label. [Free text box]. Answers can be given 2 or more.**

1. Company specific FOPNL
2. Calorie only
3. We use a mixture of labels
4. Aesthetics
5. Voluntary
6. Popular with customers
7. Cheap
8. Easier to implement
9. MTL not in line with guidelines
10. Other
11. Did not answer question

**3b. What percentage of your product portfolio carries this form of Front of Pack Nutritional Labelling** **[Free text – specify number]**

1. 0
2. 1–20%
3. 21 - 40%
4. 41- 60%
5. 61 – 80%
6. 81- 99%
7. 100%
8. Did not answer question

**3c. [if less than 100] What products do not carry Front of Pack Nutritional Labelling and why?** **[Free text box] Answers can be 2 or more**

1. Branded products
2. Luxury products
3. Whole foods e.g. sugar/flour/eggs/veg/lentils
4. Exempt from labelling requirements e.g. alcohol
5. Aesthetics
6. Its voluntary
7. Hard to implement
8. Costly
9. Don’t agree with FOPNL/government intervention
10. Other
11. Did not answer question

**3d. Why does your business not use the government recommended MTL on your products?** **[Free text box]** **Answers can be 2 or more**

1. Exempt from labelling requirements
2. Aesthetics
3. Its voluntary
4. Customers don’t use/like it
5. Hard to implement
6. Costly
7. MTL not in line with guidelines
8. Product eaten rarely/unlikely to impact on health
9. Other
10. Did not answer question

**3e. If using different form of FOPNL - What would encourage you to adopt Multiple Traffic Light on your products?** **[Free text box**]

1. Making it mandatory
2. Less costly
3. Evidence of impact
4. Easier implementation
5. Popularity with customers
6. Can’t be encouraged
7. Don’t agree with FOPNL/government intervention
8. Government funded public awareness scheme on label
9. If in line with guidelines
10. Other
11. Did not answer question

**4a. [If no does not use FOPNL] Why does your business not use any Front of Pack Nutrition Labelling? [Free text box]** **Answers can be 2 or more**

1. Exempt from labelling requirements
2. Aesthetics
3. It’s voluntary
4. Customers don’t use/like it
5. Don’t agree with FOPNL/government intervention
6. Hard to implement (time/resources e.g. printers/products change/size of packaging).
7. Only sell single ingredient products/whole foods
8. Nutrition targets not applicable to children & babies
9. Products not sold in retail
10. MTL misrepresents healthy foods.
11. Costly
12. Other
13. Did not answer question

**4b. What would incentivise you to use Front of Pack Nutrition Labelling on your products in the future?** **[Free Text Box] Answers can be 2 or more**

1. Make it mandatory/if other similar businesses used it.
2. Less costly/grant aid
3. Easier implementation (e.g. time, printers, flexibility in font size).
4. Popularity with customers
5. Evidence of impact
6. Can’t be incentivised
7. Government funded public awareness scheme on label
8. RIs applicable to age group marketed for e.g. children/babies
9. non-discriminatory against healthy products
10. Don’t agree with FOPNL/government intervention
11. Other
12. Did not answer question

**Questions for the public and organisations**

6b) Do you use the Multiple Traffic Light label to make choices about the food and drinks that you buy? Please explain your choice [Free text box]

1. Helpful to compare foods
2. Help make healthier choice/avoid reds or ambers quickly & easily
3. Need to know amounts of specific nutrients
4. If buying new purchase items.
5. Easy to see/understand
6. Health conscious
7. No, can’t read label/bad eyesight
8. Traffic lights are bad for eating disorders.
9. No, only buy fresh food.
10. Other
11. NA

Q8. How could the Multiple Traffic Light Label be made easier to use? [Free Text Box]

1. Include added or free sugar
2. Include fibre
3. Show healthy fat vs unhealthy fat
4. Include total carbohydrates
5. Include protein
6. Bigger font size
7. More realistic/standardized/clearer portion sizes
8. Mandatory/consistent
9. Adapt for colour blind
10. Education on FOPLs e.g. adverts
11. RIs not inclusive of everyone’s needs e.g. children/men/women
12. Make it simple - Remove figures, % and RIs
13. Give overall rating on healthiness
14. Does not need to change
15. Other
16. Did not answer question

**Questions for all respondents**

**Q12. What aspects of the Nutri-score label do you like/ dislike? Other (please specify)** **[Free text box]**

1. Easy to understand
2. Too simple – people want to know specific nutrients
3. Would reduce sales of HFSS products
4. Discriminatory
5. Confusing/Never seen before
6. Considers overall healthiness of a total product
7. Good approach
8. Not transparent
9. Appear alongside traffic light label
10. People should be able to use own judgement
11. Other
12. Did not answer question

**Q13. What aspects of the Chilean health warning label do you like/ dislike? Other (please specify) [Free text box]**

1. Easy to understand
2. Would reduce sales of HFSS products
3. Would make me think twice
4. Too simple
5. Discriminatory

Not in line with guidelines/Codex

1. Confusing/never seen before

Appear in addition to MTL system

Too negative/doesn’t educate on positive aspects of food

Colour scheme not eye catching/hard to see

1. Bad for people with eating disorders
2. Other
3. Did not answer question

**Q15. Are there any other Front of Pack Nutritional Labels that you think Government should consider? Please provide evidence on the following to explain your answer:**

**A - Understanding or identification of healthier choices [Free text box]**

**B - Healthier purchasing behaviours [Free text box]**

1. Healthy choices logo
2. Keyhole symbol
3. Australian star rating
   1. PACE labelling (physical activity calorie equivalents)
   2. Pie chart
   3. Not relevant labelling (allergen/CO2/origin/vegan/organic)
   4. Other - Include nutrient e.g. carbohydrates/protein/GI/minerals
   5. Other - Clearer/standardised/realistic portion sizes
   6. Other – educate people
   7. Other

**Q16. Do you think the Government should ensure that the recommended front of pack nutritional label reflects latest dietary advice on free sugar? [Yes/No/I do not know]\* Please explain your answer [Free text box]**

1. Yes, it would reduce sugar consumption/people eat too much ‘bad’ sugar/free sugar causes obesity etc
2. Yes, it should contain include total and free sugar.
3. Yes, important for diabetics
4. No, total sugars are more important/sugar is sugar/body can’ tell difference.
5. No, too complicated/people don’t understand difference between free sugars and intrinsic
6. Yes, Government should reflect latest dietary advice and evidence
7. Yes, Current label is misleading
8. Yes, People need access to improved information and updated guidelines
9. Need to educate people about difference/if using need to explain.
10. No, Practical issues for industry to uptake (calculation of free sugars)
11. Other -- Diabetics need carbohydrate included too
12. Other
13. Did not answer question

**Q17. Do you think the Government should ensure that the recommended front of pack nutritional label reflects the latest dietary advice on fibre? [Yes/No/I do not know]\* Please explain your answer [Free text box]**

1. Yes, It would increase fibre consumption/people don’t eat enough fibre
2. Yes, Fibre is good for people
3. Yes, Government should reflect latest dietary advice and evidence
4. No, Practical issues for industry to uptake
5. No, Confusing for consumers/too much information
6. No, Already have ‘high in/source of fibre’ labels, separate to FOPNL
7. People need education/more information
8. Needs to be displayed in simple way
9. Other
10. Did not answer question

**PSED Questions – for all respondents**

**Q19b. Do you think that Front of Pack Nutritional Labelling is likely to have an impact on people on the basis of their age, sex, race, religion, sexual orientation, pregnancy and maternity, disability, gender reassignment and marriage/civil partnership?** **[Yes/No/I do not know]** Please explain your answer and provide relevant evidence. [Free text box]

1. People who are blind or visually impaired
2. Age – children & older people are less likely to use FOPNL
3. People with eating disorders
   1. Sex
   2. Could impact people undergoing gender reassignment
   3. Impact people with eating disorders
   4. Pregnant people have different needs
4. Include children RIs
5. People with learning disabilities can’t use FOPNL/have different needs
6. Issues for people with language barriers
   1. Religion/culture affects purchasing habits
   2. Everyone has different nutrition needs/needs to be inclusive for everyone
   3. It is inclusive and simple/useful for everyone
   4. Other - FOPNL has nothing to do with equalities
   5. Other – people need to be educated
7. Other
8. Did not answer question

**Q20b. Do you think that any of the proposals in this consultation would help achieve any of the following aims?** Please explain which aims it would help achieve and how**.**

1. Evidence sought from consultation could make FOPNL clearer for people/help people make healthier choice
2. Reduce health inequalities
3. Need to take into account colour blindness/language barrier
4. Make FOPNL consistent/mandatory
5. Other – FOPNL not an equality issue/only aim should be health
6. Other
7. Did not answer question

**Q20c. Could the proposals be changed so that they are more effective?**

1. Mandate FOPNL to ensure consistency which makes it easier for people
2. Hold focus groups with under-represented people in community to ensure that FOPNL works for them
3. Include proposals to support visually impaired
4. Include new design e.g. physical activity calorie equivalents where it is more relatable.
5. Other
6. Did not answer question

**Q21b. Do you think that the proposals in this consultation could impact on people from more deprived backgrounds?** Please explain your answer and provide relevant evidence. **[Free text box]**

1. Yes, simplifying label would be better for deprived people/less educated
2. FOPNL is not only factor affecting food choice for more deprived people e.g. price/convenience/advertising/access.
3. Need education alongside label
4. Proposals in consultation could benefit all people
5. Yes, reduce health inequalities
6. Other
7. Did not answer question

**Q22. Do you have any comments on the material provided in the technical annex?**

**Please provide your comments. [Free text box]**

1. Other
2. COVID should be mentioned
3. Small businesses can’t afford testing products/updating labels would result in higher costs.
4. Need data & impact of FOP on health
5. Education needed/familiarisation costs
6. Examine impacts of labelling in other countries
7. Consider eating disorders
8. Mandatory
9. Did not answer question