



## Country of Origin Labelling - discussion paper

### Introduction

This submission is from the Griffith and District Citrus Growers Association. The committee represents the citrus growers in the Griffith and District area (Riverina area) and has been in existence for over 50 years. The association comprises primarily of citrus farmers but also includes packers and exporters. The Riverina area consisting of over 430 farmers contributes significantly to one of the largest fresh fruit industries in Australia

### Scale and structure of the industry;

- The area of citrus in the Riverina has increased from 8,317 hectares in 2004 to 8,480 hectares in 2008 then to 8,800 hectares in 2011.
- The overall change from 2003 to 2011 is a 6% increase in area planted (483 hectares) and an 8% increase in tree numbers (272,464 trees). Citrus is predominantly drip irrigated and grown on Trifoliata rootstock.
- The dominant Riverina Citrus variety grown is Valencia followed by Washington Navel, Late Lanes and Navelina. In the last few years the average property size has increased from 15.2 – 17.2 hectares.

In summary for Riverina Citrus:

- In 2011; 8,800 hectares of citrus (3,586,241 trees) across 513 citrus properties were mapped
- Riverina predominantly grows Valencia oranges
- The area of citrus increased from 8,317 hectares in 2003 to 8,480 hectares in 2008 and 8,800 hectares in 2011
- The number of citrus trees increased from 3,313,777 in 2003 to 3,456,661 in 2008 to 3,586,241 in 2011
- The number of citrus growers declined from 547 in 2003 to 509 in 2008 and increased to 513 in 2011; the average citrus area per property increased from 15.2 hectares in 2003 to 16.7 hectares in 2008 and 17.2 hectares in 2011
- Citrus in the Riverina is predominantly drip irrigated and grown on a Trifoliata rootstock.

For many years, citrus growers, with many of their fellow permanent plantings horticulturalists have raised issues in regards to Australia's labeling laws and policies towards providing clear and concise information to the consumer. Australian citrus growers believe that the value in protecting the integrity of those laws support not only local industry growth and security but also provide health and social protections to the consumer and communities alike.

GDCGA believes that food security will be one of the largest factors coming into this current century. The growing population and scarcity of resources continually place pressure to develop safe and wholesome foods, due to this, we see fringe problems in farming/food processing systems that can lead to chemical, pathological, ethical, social and environmental issues. Although these issues are restricted to certain geographical and/or national systems, nonetheless under the current Australian labeling laws, consumers cannot discern the value of these issues from the labels as we see today.

We would like to note a particular problem our industry faced in December 2011. In 2011, the world citrus juice industry was rocked with a severe and complex problem whereby the USA USDA discovered Carbendazim in imported Orange Juice Concentrate (OJC). The USA along with many developed nations sought to protect their people as well as their local industries from the health issues and industry scares that can follow by banning the importation. This chemical which is banned for use in Australian Citrus systems and many other developed countries, is still being allowed into Australia through the importation of Brazilian OJC which was only banned in Australia for less than a week before being overturned. During this period, Australian citrus producers had to try and compete against the now abundance of OJC which did not have a home. Industry reports of processors being able to name their price circulated and pricing returned to citrus growers for OJC plummeted promptly. This shouldn't have happened if the above bold points under 1.2 were applied to citrus producers in Australia through tighter controls and fairer policing.

Above this, and in the direct interests to the local citrus economy, Australian citrus farmers understand the value of Australian brands and country of origin Labeling (CoOL) to our Australian population. It is well noted that Australian see security, safety and assurance in buying products made in Australia as they note the rigorous and complex systems we have adopted in Australia to deliver the upmost quality as well as our solid ability to get behind Australia as part of national pride, particularly when it comes to the majority of fresh produce as we as an Island country duly recognise that if it is not

local then it must have some age about the product and in relation to this, lower levels of nutritional quality.

Current law's under Safe Harbour Defences, allow a high degree of utilisation of brand Australia. Consumers notions about the underlining meaning of Made in Australia we feel is not in sync with what the law entails. We believe that the consumer recognises the statement as being a product whose significant ingredient in the case of orange juice being the juice to be in all intents and purposes, Australian in origin. The consumer would likely have an attitude that foreign goods could perhaps constitute the lesser ingredients. To contrast this with Product of Australia, we believe that many consumers fail to recognise the strictness of this statement, and for this, fail to differentiate the offerings regarding the two statements.

In the past and certainly into the future, growers will continue to try and promote Australian grown orange juice but we continually fracture the consumer when they walk up to the aisle to purchase this juice as they have to cut through so much blinding information to get to the truth, if the truth exists at all.

## **TRANSPARENT FOOD LABELLING**

Grocery products are a highly competitive environment in the Australian market place and it is increasingly important to deliver a point of difference for products to survive. The lack of progress, in improving Australia's labelling laws, identifying the country of origin is an ongoing concern. It is of paramount importance that the shopper is assisted in their choice of products through clear labelling into country of origin. In the Citrus sector this would greatly assist shoppers when choosing products.

Some examples which are confusing to the shopper would be:

- Made in Australia from Imported and Local Ingredients
- Made in Australia from Local and Imported Ingredients
- Packaged in Australia from Imported and Local Ingredients
- Packaged in Australia from Local and Imported Ingredients
- Made in Australia from Imported and Local ingredients when available

The position that Australia has adopted towards the labelling issues has allowed manufacturers to take the easier adoption of labelling practice to confuse the shopper. For example including the packaging product plus the content to make the higher percentage which would show it be proportionally an Australian product, does not reflect the true percentage of the actual consumable product which is contained

in the package fact, where the product is constantly derives a significant portion of its contents from an imported source.

For example, the excerpt below illustrates that although the significant product purchased (ie Orange Juice) is imported, if the total costs of the saleable item is Australian (packaging, label etc) then the product is deemed to be Made In Australia.

Excerpts from the NSW Dept of Fair Trading regarding Country of Origin claims:

- [http://www.fairtrading.nsw.gov.au/Businesses/Acceptable\\_business\\_conduct/Country\\_of\\_origin\\_claims.html](http://www.fairtrading.nsw.gov.au/Businesses/Acceptable_business_conduct/Country_of_origin_claims.html) 'Made in' claims  
For your business to claim goods are 'made in' a particular country:
- the goods must be substantially transformed in that country
- 50 per cent or more of the cost of producing or manufacturing the goods must be incurred in that country.
- 

Australian Citrus farmers think it's unfair that a product can be merely 50% to be allowed the 'Made In Australia' tag. We as Australia's are proud of the Australian name and don't believe that 51% content makes a product truly Australian. The consumer should have the freedom and the right to choose a product through clear and authentic labelling.

The Australian Government can help by introducing 'Authenticity of Labelling' through the following:

- Improve laws to clarify the origin of product to be defined (Name the source origin)
- Improve laws to clarify the actual percentage content of foreign juice
- Change the definition of using terms such as 'made in Australia' or sourced to be a minimum of 99% Australian content.
- Enforce a new term for manufacturing and processing called "Processed in Australia" and/or "Packaged in Australia"
- Change regulations to call any product (citrus juice) that has more than 75% of content as a strictly imported product.

Other countries have implemented similar approaches to labelling which gives their consumers the ability to purchase fairly based on clear and concise information. The above mentioned benefits can and will revolutionise Australia's Juice sector and will have ramifications across the board to all fruit and vegetable growers who suffer from import substitution.

Product manufacturers may resist these methods as cost prohibitive for implementation; however, the difference both to the consumer looking for the product of choice as well as helping Australia's farming sectors by allowing their products to be authentically labelled will ultimately also benefit the manufacturer.

In competition with foreign suppliers, we feel that there should be emphasis on promoting Brand Australia to consumers to fairly and equitably show the consumer which products are Australian and which are not.

We as the Griffith and District Citrus Growers Inc feel that this current consultation is a step in the right direction. The most critical point is to develop a strong safe harbour defences and the recommendations given are working towards the ultimate goal of informing the consumer on what they want to know. The most particular item of the proposed safe harbour defence for the 50% rule is to make the device work on the weight/volume of Australian product rather than price. The purpose of this is so percentages don't change when there is pricing fluctuations as well as the consumer has no interest in the price of the goods rather than the volume of the goods in question.

Also, we believe that reconstituting a concentrated juice product does not provide substantial transformation in the eye of the consumer so the source of the concentrated product is the significant good used. This is imperative and deserves further discussion.

#### 4 Subsections 255(8) and (9) of Schedule 2 ...

(9) For the purposes of item 1 in the table in subsection (1) in relation to an ingredient or component, water added to the ingredient or component is treated as having the same origin as the ingredient or component, regardless of its actual origin, if:

- (a) the ingredient or component has been dried or concentrated by the evaporation of water; and
- (b) the added water returns the water content of the ingredient or component to no more than its natural level.

For the changes to be made to the above mentioned subsection, we will need clarification regarding item (b). What if the product was reduced past the point of natural level? We do not see this as being adequate transformation.

### **FOOD SECURITY**

Australia has had a strong and reputable history in food production. Our food security has been strong with food production having been competitive and profitable with many family farms needing only the cost of production to make the livelihood viable. The experience of poor citrus prices over the last few years, has seen farmers having to grapple with the costs of running business's with no returns and being unable to input into capital or invest into new technologies.

We feel that this will lead to a point in time where the production of certain staples such as citrus may need to be imported to suffice local demands hence causing issues in food securities.

In our sector, one should easily look at the import data of frozen orange juice concentrate(FJOC). Over the last 20 years, the data suggests that we import approximately 3 times more juice equivalent than what is produced in all of Australia. The Carbendazim scare of 2011 almost led to the inability to supply the market with FJOC products, this statement was made at the Senate Enquiry into the Citrus Industry 2013 by the representatives of the fruit juice processing sector.

### **FOOD TESTING TO AUSTRALIAN STANDARDS**

Leading from the comment above, to explain more clearly, in 2011 the USA banned the importation of Brazilian FJOC because of the presence of Carbendazim, a known carcinogen.

Carbendazim has been banned for use in Australia for almost a decade because of its proven effects to humans, The USA, followed by many leading world nations, sought to ban the importation of the juice sighting the presence of this chemical. Australia raised a ban which lasted all but 4 days until it was overturned by lobbying.

The issue we face here in Australian growing conditions is that we send mixed signals. As growers, we understand the reasons for banning the use of chemicals with proven health effects but do not understand why:

- (a) Australia does not actively test the imports of food products into Australia for:
  - 1. A more comprehensive level of chemicals;
  - 2. A more comprehensive percentage of imports as to the same levels as some of our more prominent Asian countries strive.
- (b) Set the Maximum Residue Limits (MRL's) of foods in Australia to be next to Nil in respects to chemicals that are banned for use in Australia.

It only makes sense that if the chemical is not good enough to be used on Australian crops, why is it good enough to be consumed in imported goods.

### **Consultation RIS Questions**

The following pages are our attempt to provide further information in response to the Consolidated Questions as part of the Country of Origin Labelling Consultation Package:

## Consultation RIS questions

### What information will satisfy consumers and keep costs down for business?

#### *Food covered by the framework*

1. a. Is the list of non-priority food clear?

**It took a bit of investigation in the report to understand what non-priority meant but yes it is clear.**

- b. Are there any gaps?

**We feel that there could be opportunities to exploit labelling by naming a product a snack food and/or sports drinks. GDCG recommends very tight and concise definition what determines these products listed as non-priority.**

- c. Do you have any other concerns about priority and non-priority food?

**As recommendation 1b.**

#### *Easy to read labels*

2. a. Is there a risk that changes to improve prominence of country of origin labels would make it harder to identify other labelling information, such as allergen warnings?

**We feel that it is important to have all correct information available to consumers including allergen warnings, our wishes are that correct and meaningful information can be conveyed to consumers rather than an abundance of useless information**

- b. Are there any specific problems that might arise in relation to small packages?

**Of course there would have to be consideration for small serve packaging, there would need to be guidance on percentage allowed for labelling and a reduction of font/graphic if appropriate.**

#### *Proportion of Australian ingredients*

3. Can you provide an indication of the current number of hours spent and costs to your business from maintaining records to substantiate current origin claims being used today?

**As farmers we spend seriously countless hours preparing, maintaining and updating records, this is a very important part of our businesses to assure quality products will be on-sold to suppliers that will then supply consumers in Australia and across the globe. We acknowledge that some of our inputs are from foreign sources however the transformation of these inputs such as fertiliser and fuel do not have a bearing on final crop production and vastly outweighed by the inputs we provide including employment and contribution to the national economy.**

4. To allow for variations, businesses could calculate the average proportion of Australian ingredients and provide this average on the label.

- a. How often should business need to calculate the average proportion of Australian ingredients to have the least impact on business costs, e.g. every 12 months, 24 months or 36 months?

**Firstly, the implementation of these proposed systems should not adversely affect the general cost of production for slightly transformed goods that Griffith and District Citrus Growers are concerned with, that being Citrus Juice product hence, these calculations should be based on product group basis. For Citrus juices and many juices are available 12**



**month's of the year using standard processing techniques. We propose a 24 Month system to allow processors the extra flexibility however we do not think this would unfairly penalise any processor.**

b. Please explain the cost impacts of these options for your business.

**N/A**

c. Can you suggest another option?

**We suggest that the calculation to be based on the significant products in the purchased good. That being for example, the cost of the orange juice in a container rather than the whole of packaging and on-costs. We feel that consumers expect that a label would indicate where the significant product was grown and made.**

d. What would be the estimated costs of your alternative option?

**N/A**

5. The Consultation RIS outlines estimated costs to change labels, including:
- business processes - understanding new requirements, staff training, IT, inventory planning (\$14 000 per business)
  - initial label changes for packaged for (\$6245 per SKU)
  - initial label changes for fresh food (\$500–\$1300 per SKU)
  - regular label updates (\$2813 per SKU).

a. Do you agree with each of these estimated costs?

**Although we cannot substantiate our claims, what we believe is that the costs will come down if these recommendation are adopted because this will stir a frenzy of technical providers. We also think that if these are adopted, Government would provide substantial education packages to provide as much information as possible to lower the cost of compliance.**

b. If no, please provide your estimates.

c. Are there any other areas of business costs that have not been covered here? Please explain.

6. a. How do you think the proposed labelling changes would affect your record keeping time and costs?

**We do not think it would add too much burden as product traceability should already be conducted in Australian processing sites.**

b. Can you provide an estimate of these hours/costs?

7. Business size has not been accounted for in the estimates (noting that most food product businesses are micro or small). What impact will business size have on costs outlined here?

### *Specific country in which key ingredients were grown*

8. Can you provide an estimate of the cost to your business to provide a label that details the origin of all ingredients?

**We feel that listing all ingredients would be too confusing for the products Griffith and District Citrus Growers are concerned about. We feel that the concern would probably go for the top 2 or 3 used ingredients in a product minus water if this is the largest ingredient. Most business's would use product that may come from up to two major producers and the rest would be minor so I think this is fine. We would not know how much this costs but considering the costs of constantly changing suppliers, we doubt the costs would be significant. The food manufacturers should have the ability to list 2 or 3 source countries to save on labelling costs. This should be ranked on volume**



9. How long do you believe the label will remain current? That is, how often would you estimate the need to update the label due to a change in the origin of ingredients?

**We would suggest 24 month cycle for this.**

10. Can you estimate the space that a label that details the origin of all ingredients would require on your product?

**N/A**

11. Do you believe providing such detailed origin information is a viable option the government should consider?

**We feel this could be a good option however it would require more time from the consumer.**

12. As a consumer, do you want this information to be provided?

**Personally, we would like to be able to see the source countries of the main ingredients so we can make a choice if there is a food scare in the particular country to allow for surety in food safety**

### *How can businesses be more confident in using the safe harbour defences?*

13. How many staff do you devote to interpreting, applying and establishing compliance with the current ACL safe harbour defences?

**N/A**

14. a. What aspects of the current ACL safe harbour defences do you find the most difficult to interpret, apply and comply with?  
b. Why?

15. The Consultation RIS outlines estimates time for businesses to undertake the 50 per cent production cost test, including:

- time new businesses spend learning and understanding the test (approximately nine hours per year)
- time new businesses spend applying the test for the first time (approximately 36 hours per year)
- time most businesses spend reviewing the test to ensure they remain compliant (approximately 30 minutes per year).

a. Do you agree with each of these estimated times?

b. If no, please provide your estimates.

16. Business size has not been accounted for in the estimates (noting that most food product businesses are micro or small). What impact will business size have on savings outlined here?

### *How should labelling of imported food be treated?*

17. Do you believe the proposed labelling requirements will be met by the international manufacturer/supplier or will the imported products need to be stickered on arrival to Australia?

**Labeling must be consistent, as long as labelling is compliant, we feel that stickered on arrival does not pose a risk. For added assurance, there should be harmonisation in applied label requirements so easy identification of the label**

18. If products are stickered in Australia:

a. Will importers use a machine to apply the sticker or require people to apply the sticker?

**N/A**

b. If by hand, can importers estimate the number of hours that would be required to complete the process?

19. The Consultation RIS outlines estimates for label changes for imported food, including:

- initial label changes for manufactured food (\$2800-\$6200 per SKU)
- initial label changes for fresh food (\$500-\$1300 per SKU)

- administrative costs (\$1560 per SKU).

a. Do you agree with each of these estimated costs?

**If all priority foods are treated equal, market forces should keep price parity**

b. If no, please provide your estimates.

c. Are there any other areas of business costs that have not been covered here? Please explain.

d. Would you expect any ongoing costs for label changes or business processes for imported food?

20. Is the information on the number of countries ingredients have been sourced from readily available? If not, would there be any additional costs in seeking this information?

### *What is the role for digital information?*

21. a. If you are an Australian food manufacturer or producer, do you currently use digital solutions to provide additional information to your consumers?

b. If so, what do you do?

22. a. What are the costs associated with digital solutions in relation to the price of the food good?

b. Is this cost likely to be passed onto consumers?

c. Are the specific costs or solutions impacted by seasonality?

### *Education and awareness raising*

23. Do you think a targeted education campaign on the current country of origin labelling framework would be a cost- effective solution to address consumer concerns?

**We are not aware of the current education program. This needs to be improved.**

### *The proposed response*

#### *Proposed labels*

24. a. Are there other ways to express the proportion of Australian ingredients that are simple, clear and not confusing for consumers, yet not overly burdensome for business?

**We feel that if a company needs to take a large amount of time and/or resources to figure out if they are barely compliant, this should be taken as not compliant... We really should only be looking at the obvious costs of the significant product such as orange juice in an orange juice product.**

b. What would the costs/savings of these options be?

25. a. If you are an Australian food manufacturer or producer, which of the two suggested variations for expressing the proportion of Australian ingredients on the bar chart do you find the most appropriate for your business:

- quartile - at least 25 per cent

- decile - at least 10 per cent?

b. Why?

c. How does this flexibility affect your business costs?

26. We understand that the percentage of Australian sourced ingredients in a product may be highly seasonal, or subject to large annual variations in supply.

a. Will the proposed labelling requirements negatively impact on your business or industry?

b. If so, why?

**This shouldn't since it is averaged out on a 24 month cycle.**

27. Are there any unintended consequences for Australian food producers or manufacturers exporting products with Australian country of origin information?

28. Would there be benefits for consumers or food businesses if the bar chart could be used voluntarily on imported foods containing Australian ingredients?

**There should be benefit to a consumer who is looking for this appropriate information**

Also see Explanatory and discussion paper for the Draft Information standard.

### *Safe harbour*

29. Will the proposed changes to the safe harbour defences increase or decrease costs for your business?
30. a. If you are a food business, would the proposed changes make it easier for you to determine the correct country of origin claim to use?  
b. Would guidance material help?
31. a. If you are a non-food business, are you supportive of the proposed simplification of the safe harbour defences?

**We feel that these proposed changes to the safe harbour defences go a long way towards giving clearer information to consumers. We as the Griffith and District Citrus Growers Inc feel that this current consultation is a step in the right direction. The most critical point is to develop a strong safe harbour defences and the recommendations given are working towards the ultimate goal of informing the consumer on what they want to know. The most particular item of the proposed safe harbour defence for the 50% rule is to make the device work on the weight/volume of Australian product rather than price. The purpose of this is so percentages don't change when there is pricing fluctuations as well as the consumer has no interest in the price of the goods rather than the volume of the goods in question. Proportion is better than price for all.**

- b. Would you be more likely to use country of origin labels following the proposed changes?

Also see Explanatory and discussion paper for the Draft Safe harbour defence amendments.

### *Digital solutions*

32. Should the government be helping to prepare consumers and business for more innovative technological solutions to country of origin labelling in the future?
33. How do you think businesses will implement these new measures?
34. What barriers are there to the use of digital solutions for country of origin labelling?

### *Education campaign*

35. Do you believe that it would be important to support any change to the country of origin labelling framework with an education campaign? Please explain.

**We are unfamiliar of the education campaign so we would suggest that more needs to be done for education of industry stakeholders as well as consumers.**

## **Implementation**

### *Transition*

36. How would a flat transition period affect implementation costs for your business?
37. How would a phased transition arrangement affect implementation costs for your business?
38. Are there alternative transitional arrangements that will encourage speedy take up of the new labels without imposing undue costs on business?

39. a. Do you order your packaging or labels in advance?  
b. If so, how would the transition periods impact on your labelling approach?
40. a. Are there complicating or unusual factors about your business that would make either transition approach difficult to comply with?  
b. If so, please provide details.
41. If you are a small business, are there alternative transitional arrangements that would better suit you?
42. If you are an importer, do you have any specific preferences or concerns about transition approaches?
43. a. As a business, would you choose to adopt the new labelling ahead of the timelines highlighted in the transition periods?  
b. If so, please describe the regime you would employ including how you would minimise costs and ensure compliance.

Also see Explanatory and discussion paper for the Draft Information standard.

### Compliance

44. Do you consider an audit power is necessary for a regulator to assess compliance with the information standard? What are the associated benefits and costs?  
**Self assessment may allow most companies to comply however without audit power there will not be mechanisms to help companies comply.**
45. What would be the expected compliance costs for a business associated with the use of an audit power?
46. What alternative arrangements could be applied to support compliance with the information standard?

**Incorporation into their current QA audits.**

## Item 3 - Draft information standard - Explanatory and discussion paper questions

Please review questions with the 'Draft country of origin food labelling information standard' and associated 'Explanatory and discussion paper'. Both items are available on the [Department of Industry, Innovation and Science Consultation hub](#). Note that the Explanatory and discussion paper provides discussion points for selected items.

### Part 1 – Preliminary information

#### Section 8

- a. Do you agree with the lists of changes and processes for food that should or should not be considered as substantial transformation set out in Attachment A to Consultation Package Item 6? Why?  
**We believe that reconstituting a concentrated juice product does not provide substantial transformation in the eye of the consumer so the source of the concentrated product is the significant good used. This is imperative and deserves further discussion.**
- b. What other changes or processes do you think are or are not sufficiently transformative to warrant a change in the origin of a product that incorporates imported ingredients? Why?

**4 Subsections 255(8) and (9) of Schedule 2 ...**

**(9) For the purposes of item 1 in the table in subsection (1) in relation to an ingredient or component, water added to the ingredient or component**

*is treated as having the same origin as the ingredient or component, regardless of its actual origin, if:*

- (a) the ingredient or component has been dried or concentrated by the evaporation of water; and*
- (b) the added water returns the water content of the ingredient or component to no more than its natural level.*

**For the changes to be made to the above mentioned subsection, we will need clarification regarding item (b). What if the product was reduced past the point of natural level? We do not see this as being adequate transformation.**

- c. Should the lists of changes and processes that are or are not substantial transformation be included in regulations, or should they be in guidance material? Why?

### **Section 9**

- a. We welcome feedback on whether there is sufficient clarity about the scope of non-priority foods. For example, is the difference between biscuits and snack foods and fruit and nut products, muesli bars and cakes and other bakery products sufficiently clear?

### **Section 12**

- a. As a business, is it easier to determine the percentage of Australian ingredients using ingoing weight rather than final weight? Why?
- b. Is there much difference between the ingoing weight of all ingredients in your food and the final weight? If so, what accounts for this difference?
- c. We have provisions dealing with how water should be treated when calculating the percentage of Australian ingredients (see Section 13 below). Do we need to make it clear that packaging is not an ingredient in food to make sure its weight is not used in the calculation?

## **Part 2 – Country of origin labelling requirements**

### **Division 3**

- d. While research showed that the origin information consumers most wanted to see in relation to food was the proportion of Australian ingredients, some consumers did want to see the origin of key ingredients. Would any businesses welcome the possible alternative approach that required the labelling of all of the different countries of origin of the food in the package instead of requiring a statement about the proportion of Australian ingredients? (but still with a bar chart reflecting the proportion of Australian ingredients).

**Origin of ingredients is vital as it allows for quick and easy designation of products that may or could have come from a country with a poor or current food production issue such as food safety scare.**

### **Section 18**

- a. Do we need to clarify the meaning of significant ingredients?  
**Yes, the term must be known without a doubt**
- b. Would consumers find the use of the filled bar chart misleading if all significant ingredients are Australian, rather than all ingredients?
- c. Do we need to make sure significant ingredients make up more than 90 or 95 per cent of the food by weight?

## Section 19

- a. We would like your feedback on whether the percentage of Australian ingredients should be based on multiples of 10% or 25%. Please let us know the reasons for your preference. (See also question 25 in the Consultation RIS.)

**We feel that 10% increments allow for competitors whom may use more of an expensive local ingredient to be fairly applying promotion of the proportional value of the local good.**

- b. As an alternative to the 'at least' statements, should there be an option to nominate the actual percentage of Australian ingredients with a tolerance of up to five per cent – and using the bar chart filled to the 10% or 25% multiple below the claimed percentage?  
e.g. 'Made in Australia from 55% Australian ingredients' with the bar chart filled to 50% – where the actual percentage could be between 50% and 60%?
- c. Or, as another alternative to the proposed provision, could businesses voluntarily name the single origin of ingredients that make up a significant proportion of the food (i.e. 70%, 75%, 80%, 90%, etc.)?  
e.g. 'Made in Australia from Canadian pork' if the pork is only from Canada and meets the minimum percentage in a product like ham?  
or  
'Made in Australia from Australian milk' if the milk is only from Australia and meets the minimum percentage in a product like yoghurt?  
- Noting that the bar chart partially filled to the appropriate level would still be required.