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Oqali aims

- To collect and analyze nutritional data on branded processed **foodstuffs**, taking into account socio-economic parameters (types of brands, market shares and prices)

- To follow nutritional and labelling changes in the food supply (nutrient contents, ingredients, serving sizes, claims, …)

- To publish periodic reports on labelling and food characteristics

→ Decision tool for French authorities
To complete its mission, Oqali rely on

- **A steering committee**
  - **Members**:
    - Representatives of 3 Ministries: Health, Agriculture and Consumption
    - Representatives of Anses
    - Representatives of INRA
  - **Mission**: approve the work program and Oqali deliverables (reports)

- **A larger committee**
  - **Members**:
    - Steering committee members
    + Stakeholders representatives of manufacturers, retailers and consumers
  - **Mission**: express its views on the work program and Oqali deliverables (reports)
The information about the products in the database is mainly provided by Oqali partners within sectoral working groups.

**Collaborations with manufacturers and retailers are essential**
- To facilitate data collection at the branded products level
- To establish relevant food classifications
- To identify the main technological constraints for better interpreting the results

These collaborations are governed by a unique Charter of partnerships, available on the Oqali website.
Data collection at the branded products level

- **General information**: brand, names, commercial names
- **Nutrient contents**
- **Nutritional information**: nutrition facts panel, nutrition labelling schemes (e.g. the GDA or Traffic Light systems), nutrition and health claims, consumption advices, and serving sizes
- **Ingredient lists**: order and sometimes quantity
- **Other information**: organic or environmental label,…
- **Internal codification**: food sectors, food categories, types of brands, …

➔ **Nutrition Data sources**
   1. PDF of products packaging, send by manufacturers
   2. Pictures of the products taken on the shelves by OQALI staff

➔ **TNS/Kantar Worldpanel marketing panel**: price and market shares
Data collection

But also labels (organic, quality, environment, ...)

Brand
Health and nutritional claims
Sales description
Bar code
Serving size
Ingredients lists
Nutritional content

But also labels (organic, quality, environment, ...)

+ Socio economic parameters
  Mean price
  Market share

Indicators weighted by references market share
**Oqali database**: more than 50 000 food items from 31 different food sectors

- All manufactured food sectors covered
Oqali studies

• **Food sector reports**
  – Monitoring of nutritional information provided on labels
  – Monitoring of nutrient contents
  – Assessment of the nutrient composition variability, integrating product market shares

• **Thematic studies**
  – Assessment of the potential cumulative impact of voluntary commitment charters on consumer nutrient intakes or volumes of sold nutrients
  – Ingredients study on all the food sectors (Allergens, additives, …)
  – Characterisation of reformulated products

➢ [https://www.oqali.fr/oqali_eng/](https://www.oqali.fr/oqali_eng/)
# Oqali food sector studies

- **31 food sectors**
- All processed foodstuffs
- More than **50 000 references**

## FOOD SECTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baby food</th>
<th>Ready-to-eat canned meals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crackers</strong></td>
<td>Ready-to-eat fresh meals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cereal bars</td>
<td>Ready-to-eat frozen meals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cakes and biscuits</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dessert mixes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft drinks</td>
<td>Fresh dairy products and similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soups and broths</td>
<td>Fresh delicatessen products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Breakfats cereals</strong></td>
<td>Processed potato products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delicatessen meat</td>
<td>Hot sauces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chocolate products</td>
<td>Cold sauces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit purees, compotes and desserts</td>
<td>Syrups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jams</td>
<td>Frozen snacking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canned fruits</strong></td>
<td>Frozen pastries and desserts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice creams and sorbets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fruit juices and nectars</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant milk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margarins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bread products</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Coming
- Confectionery
Public policy monitoring

- To **assess voluntary commitment charters** signed by food stakeholders (manufacturers or retailers) with the public authorities

- To monitor Nutriscore implementation
Food supply monitoring
Significant renewal between first and second food sectors monitoring (11 food sectors out of 30 followed by Oqali)

### Products removed from the market
- 32% of the products considered for the first food sectors monitoring
- 9% of the first food sectors monitoring market share

### Same products
- 11% of the products considered for the second food sectors monitoring
- 8% of the second food sectors monitoring market share

### Reformulated products
- 34% of the products considered for the second food sectors monitoring
- 45% of the second food sectors monitoring market share

### New products
- 55% of the products considered for the second food sectors monitoring
- 26% of the second food sectors monitoring market share

Scope of the study: 11 food sectors on 30 followed by Oqali
Nutrient content variability
Nutritional content variability
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Saturated fatty acids variability of frozen snacks

Pizzas
Salty pies
Salty cakes
Pancakes
Burgers Croque-monsieur, wraps...
Various

Figure 18: Variabilité des teneurs en acides gras saturés (g/100g) au sein du snacking surgelé étudié.
Nutrient content variability for a product family: saturated fatty acids

3 = Classic sweet yoghurts and fermented milks n=527)
10 = Custards, gelified milks, chocolate custards topped with whipped cream (n=300)
Nutrient content variability for a product family

Classic sweet yoghurts and fermented milks

2011

Fat (g/100g)

Sugars (g/100g)

Type of brand

One point : one reference
Circle size reflects the reference market share
Nutrient content variability for a product family

Custards, gelified milks, chocolate custards topped with whipped cream

2011

One point : one reference
Circle size reflects the reference market share
Nutrient content monitoring
Sugar content distribution for pizza containing ham and cheese

Monitoring food reformulation but also changes in food supply: with products removed from the market and new products.
- Decrease of saturated fatty acid content for 55% of the paired references
  - Product reformulation
  - Palm oil has been replaced by sunflower oil for crisps frying
- Approach started by some food operators from 2009: 36% of paired reference already have a 3g/100g content in 2009
Product reformulation in Ice cream sticks

Evolution of fat content between 2010 and 2015 for paired reference of Ice Cream sticks < 80ml
Conclusions

- An important turnover of manufactured products
- A capacity to discuss the extent of possible reformulation by product family
- Some evolutions of the nutritional composition, but in a limited number, downwards or upwards
- With a limited but significant impact on nutrients intakes
- Necessity to monitor food reformulation and nutritional quality of food supply at the branded product level, by product family (disaggregated level)
  - Enable to make comparisons between countries
- The Oqali project is expanding
  - Québec, JANPA
**WORK PACKAGES**

JANPA is organised in seven work packages. Three of them are cross-cutting while four are technical packages.

- **WP1 COORDINATION**
  Ensure the success of the joint action by efficient management and coordination of the different work packages.

- **WP2 DISSEMINATION**
  Promote the joint action and disseminate the results with the involvement of the relevant stakeholders.

- **WP3 EVALUATION**
  Carry out a systematic evaluation of the entire project, on three levels: performance and impact of JANPA, performance of the partners.

- **WP4 COST OF CHILDHOOD OBESITY**
  Develop an evidence-based economic rationale for action on childhood obesity.

- **WP5 NUTRITIONAL INFORMATION**
  Share the best practices on how the nutritional information on food and diet is gathered and used for nutritional policies.

- **WP6 HEALTHY ENVIRONMENTS**
  Provide guidance on policy options and national initiatives to create healthier environments in kindergartens and schools.

- **WP7 EARLY INTERVENTIONS**
  Promote policies and interventions on healthy diets and physical activity for pregnant women and families with young children.
### Task 5.1 identification of available food information

- **Aims:** identify in the 9 participating countries
  - available studies about nutritional information on labels (+/- 200 sources)
  - monitoring tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Food composition database</th>
<th>Specificity / main use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Ciqual</td>
<td>Generic level. Used to estimate the nutrient intake of the population (in combination with the consumption survey INCA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cipale</td>
<td>Branded level (48000 references). Used to monitor the quality of the food supply and the evolution of food sectors over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Nubel</td>
<td>Branded level but limited number of references (6000 branded references). Used to estimate the nutrient intake of the population (in combination with the food consumption survey).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Nubel</td>
<td>Branded level but limited number of references (6000 branded references). Used to estimate the nutrient intake of the population (in combination with the food consumption survey).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Food chemical composition database</td>
<td>Generic level. Used to calculate energy intake of dishes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>National food composition database</td>
<td>Most generic level, but also branded level. In total 1600 references.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>National food composition database</td>
<td>Most generic level, but also branded level. In total 1600 references.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Slovak Food Composition Data Bank</td>
<td>Generic level. Used to estimate the nutrient intake of the population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>Database of products</td>
<td>Generic level. Used to estimate the nutrient intake of the population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Database of products</td>
<td>Generic level. Used to estimate the nutrient intake of the population.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Need to develop monitoring tools to follow the nutritional composition of the food supply**
Task 5.2 use by government

• Aims
  ✓ Inventory and summarize nutrition policies and voluntary actions aimed at improving nutrient intakes

• Results: 3 main types of action (+/- 230 sources – 210 websites)
  
  o **Food reformulation**: quite efficient to improve the quality of the food offer, significantly benefiting to the whole population but impact limited (increased if they are part of collective agreements).

  o **Information campaigns**: widely developed in the European countries, increasing the consumers’ awareness regarding nutrition but not necessarily affecting those with lower socio-economic status and low impact on consumers’ behavior.

  o **Work on food environment** (serving sizes, advertisements...): more direct impact, should be encouraged.

Need to combine several types of actions
Task 5.3 understanding by consumers

• **Aims**
  ✓ Inventory the use and understanding of nutritional information provided on labels by families (according to their socio-economic status)

• **Results (+/- 130 sources):**
  o **Necessity to simplify/standardize food labeling:** lot of information but not easy to understand.
  o **Front of Pack labels** should be: Simple/interpretive/ordinal/supported by identifiable logo/allowing comparisons inside a family and between product of different families of products.
  o **Efficiency:** Efficient tool to help the consumer in purchase situation, but limited impact on food basket (influence of price, habits, tastes…)

Necessity to combine with other types of actions
Task 5.4 Pilot studies

• **Aims**
  ✓ **Collect the nutritional information**: harmonize the analysis and presentation of the data
  ✓ **Present comparisons** and identify best formulations
  ✓ **Test the Oqali model from France**

• **Results:**
  o **Methodology easily transposable** to other European countries
  o **Data gathered** for 520 breakfast cereals and 890 soft drinks (in only 2 months)
  o **Data collected and treated following harmonized rules**
Segmentation of the market by family of product* for regular soft drinks

Proportion of the different families of products for regular soft drinks (in number of references)

- **Tonics and bitters (sugar > 2.5g/100 ml)**
- **Flavoured waters (sugar > 2.5g/100 ml)**
- **Lemonades (sugar > 2.5g/100 ml)**
- **Colas (sugar > 2.5g/100 ml)**
- **Non carbonated beverages with fruits (sugar > 2.5g/100 ml)**
- **Carbonated beverages with fruits (sugar > 2.5g/100 ml)**
- **Fruit based beverages with fruit content > 50%**

Different food offer in the 3 countries (in number of references)

- Prevalence of beverages with fruits in the 3 countries (60-80%)
- Much more non carbonated beverages with fruits in Romania
- Different definition of flavoured waters, lemonades

* Products with similar characteristics e.g. colas or beverages with tea among soft drinks
Segmentation of the market by type of brand for soft drinks

Different structuration of the market in the 3 countries (in number of references)
Comparison of sugar content in soft drinks between countries

Example for carbonated beverages with fruits with sugar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of products</th>
<th>Mean value</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Minimum value</th>
<th>Maximum value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria (2016)</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>6,8 (^c)</td>
<td>2,8</td>
<td>2,7</td>
<td>13,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France (2013)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>8,7 (^b)</td>
<td>1,7</td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>12,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania (2016)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9,5 (^a)</td>
<td>2,6</td>
<td>3,8</td>
<td>13,8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- High variability
  - different offer (type of products / flavoured waters type products)
  - Type and percentage of fruit
- Reformulation possible
- Significant difference between the 3 countries but same variability of results
Comparison of sugar content in soft drinks between countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sugar content (g/100ml)</th>
<th>Austria 2016</th>
<th>France 2013</th>
<th>Romania 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family of product</td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>Number of references</td>
<td>Mean value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit based beverages with fruit content &gt;50%</td>
<td>1,4E-06</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.0&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbonated beverages with fruits (sugar &gt; 2.5g/100 ml)</td>
<td>3,7E-12</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>6.8&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non carbonated beverages with fruits (sugar &gt; 2.5g/100 ml)</td>
<td>4,8E-07</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>9.5&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverages with tea (sugar &gt; 2.5g/100 ml)</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colas (sugar &gt; 2.5g/100 ml)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemonades (sugar &gt; 2.5g/100 ml)</td>
<td>4,0E-04</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.4&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flavoured waters (sugar &gt; 2.5g/100 ml)</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonics and bitters (sugar &gt; 2.5g/100 ml)</td>
<td>2E-06</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.4&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverages with fruits (sugar ≤ 2.5g/100 ml)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverages with tea (sugar ≤ 2.5g/100 ml)</td>
<td>5,4E-04</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colas (sugar ≤ 2.5g/100 ml)</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemonades (sugar ≤ 2.5g/100 ml)</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flavoured waters (sugar ≤ 2.5g/100 ml)</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonics and bitters (sugar ≤ 2.5g/100 ml)</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **a** Highest sugar content (significant difference)
- **b** Lowest sugar content (significant difference)

⇒ Significant difference for 6 families out of the 14 studied (5 out of the 8 families of regular products)
⇒ Important difference between families of soft drinks
Comparison of sugar content in soft drinks for common references

21 similar products out of 33 common references (total = 2155)

- Few common references
- The same reference may have different formulations in different countries (adaptation to local taste / delay in implementation of reformulation / different owner of the brand etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family of product</th>
<th>Number of references</th>
<th>Number of common references</th>
<th>Number of common references with similar nutritional composition*</th>
<th>Percentage of common references with similar nutritional composition*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fruit based beverages with fruit content &gt;50%</td>
<td>Austria: 21, France: 76, Romania: 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbonated beverages with fruits (sugar &gt; 2,5g/100 ml)</td>
<td>Austria: 114, France: 150, Romania: 57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non carbonated beverages with fruits (sugar &gt; 2,5g/100 ml)</td>
<td>Austria: 78, France: 292, Romania: 227</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverages with tea (sugar &gt; 2,5g/100 ml)</td>
<td>Austria: 63, France: 117, Romania: 23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colas (sugar &gt; 2,5g/100 ml)</td>
<td>Austria: 26, France: 61, Romania: 17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemonades (sugar &gt; 2,5g/100 ml)</td>
<td>Austria: 35, France: 95, Romania: 16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flavoured waters (sugar &gt; 2,5g/100 ml)</td>
<td>Austria: 1, France: 35, Romania: 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonics and bitters (sugar &gt; 2,5g/100 ml)</td>
<td>Austria: 15, France: 28, Romania: 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* references showing exactly the same sugar content or a difference of sugar content lower than 0.1 g/100 ml
Conclusions for soft drinks

• Difference observed in the sugar content between the 3 countries for 6 families out of the 14 studied.

• Differences due to:
  ✓ Different food offer in the 3 countries (different segmentation of the market, few common references);
  ✓ Different definition of a same appellation (lemonades, flavoured waters);
  ✓ Different characteristics within a family of products;
  ✓ Different composition of a same reference.

Food producers should be encouraged to reformulate their major references on the basis of the “best in class” products.
Comparison of sugar content in soft drinks for common references

Same value for the 3 countries

Sugar in beverages with tea
(sugar >2,5g/100ml)

Romania and Austria ≠ France
Conclusions for soft drinks

- Need to work at the family level because the portfolio of families of products is different according to countries.
- High variability observed for sugar content in some families.
- Potential for reformulation.
Conclusions for breakfast cereals

- Results for breakfast cereals are also available in the study (for sugar, fat, saturated fat, salt and fibres)

- Conclusions are the same for both sectors (breakfast cereals and soft drinks) for all nutrients
• Resources necessary for data collection and data treatment for both sectors (approximately 2 months for each country):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of products collected</th>
<th>Preparation of collection and training of students</th>
<th>Data collection</th>
<th>Data entry</th>
<th>Quality check</th>
<th>Data analysis</th>
<th>Drafting of the reports</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>305</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>336</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Number and qualification of persons:
  – Austria: 1 nutrition expert, 1 senior expert
  – Romania: 1 PhD student, 3 third year BA students in food sciences, 1 first year BA student in public health and 1 MA student in psychology.
Monitoring tool managed by public authorities and fed by industry necessary:
- to qualify the nutritional quality of the food offer
- to follow up the impact of the nutrition policies deployed

Necessity to work at the brand and at the country level:
- the offer varies depending of the country,
- but also because the composition of the products can be different from one country to another.

Methodology used in Oqali adaptable to other European countries with minor modifications

http://www.janpa.eu/work/wp5.asp
Thank you for your attention!

For more information, please contact:

Julie Gauvreau: julie.gauvreau@anses.fr (Oqali)
Karine Vin: karine.vin@anses.fr (Janpa)
First price products : less nutritional quality ?

Caractérisation de l’offre alimentaire, par secteur et segment de marché-Oqali-Edition 2015
Entry-level retailer brands: their product range is less diversified than that of the other types of brands (national, retailer, specialised retailer brand and hard discount brands).

- On the basis of the data collected for 16,081 products from 24 food sectors between 2008 and 2011, the range of entry-level retailer brands was concentrated on the most basic and traditional recipes.
  - For instance among Fresh dairy products, there were 30% Fresh creams, liégeois and flavoured jellied milk, 24% Classic sweet yogurts, and 17% Classic plain fresh cheeses with no added sugar, but no Light and/or sweetened fresh dairy desserts.

In terms of nutritional content:
- Only isolated and non-systematic differences in the nutrient contents between types of brands were underlined.
- No cross-sectional tendency was found among the 24 food sectors studied in this comparative study between types of brands.
Labelling monitoring
Labelling monitoring by food sector

Improvement of nutritional labelling and information, excepting for claims
What impact on nutrients intakes?
Nutritional composition changes weighted by consumption

- Differences are small but significant for some studied population
- Decrease for sugars, proteins, sodium and saturated fatty acids: less than 1%
- Increase for fats: between +1 and +3%
- Scope: 12 food sectors out of 30 followed by Oqali
- Observation time: between 1 and 4 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Sugar</th>
<th>Fat</th>
<th>Saturated fatty acids</th>
<th>Sodium</th>
<th>Dietary fibres</th>
<th>Proteins</th>
<th>Calculated energy value (calculated from labeled nutrition values of carbohydrates, fat and proteins)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Male (n=774)</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.04%</td>
<td>+0.3***</td>
<td>+1.5%</td>
<td>-0.2***</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
<td>-0.004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female (n=1142)</td>
<td>+0.1</td>
<td>+0.2%</td>
<td>+0.3***</td>
<td>+2.1%</td>
<td>-0.1**</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
<td>-0.003**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenagers</td>
<td>Male (n=408)</td>
<td>-0.3**</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td>+0.6***</td>
<td>+2.7%</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>-0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female (n=465)</td>
<td>-0.3***</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
<td>+0.4***</td>
<td>+2.3%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
<td>-0.003**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Male (n=276)</td>
<td>-0.4***</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
<td>+0.6***</td>
<td>+2.7%</td>
<td>+0.1</td>
<td>+0.5%</td>
<td>-0.004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female (n=294)</td>
<td>-0.2**</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td>+0.4***</td>
<td>+2.3%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Orange box: significant increase between daily intakes calculated with composition data of first food sectors monitoring and second food sectors monitoring
Purple box: significant decrease between daily intakes calculated with composition data of first food sectors monitoring and second food sectors monitoring

* p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001
• **French Observatory of Food Quality (OQALI) has been set up in 2008** as part of the French Nutrition and Health Programme by the Ministries in charge of Agriculture, Health and Consumer Affairs

• **Implemented and managed by 2 teams**
  – The French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety (**Anses**)  
  – The French National Institute for Agricultural Research (**INRA**)
Oqali team

- 2 project leader (1 for Anses and 1 for INRA)
- 7 project manager (to analyse data and realise reports)
- 4 dieticians (to collect and verify data, to monitor outsourced input and coding)

- Data input and coding is outsourced (since 2015)

- Functioning thanks to
  - An annual funding of Health and Agriculture ministries (750 000 €)
    - Financing 6 project manager and 4 dieteticians, outsourced data input and coding, socio economic parameters purchase (Kantar Worldpanel), database updating…
  - Internal resources of Anses and INRA
Feedback/perspectives

- After 10 years
  - Positive assessment of partners (stakeholders)
  - The Ministries support the Oqali project and stakeholders also find an interest in the project

- Challenges
  - Simplify data collection
  - Market shares cost at the branded product level is high
  - Try to answer the consumer need of transparency taking into consideration stakeholders concerns
Conclusions

- An important turnover of manufactured products
- An nutritional information more and more present
- Some evolutions of the nutritional composition, but in a limited number, downwards or upwards
- With a limited but significant impact on nutrients intakes

- Necessity to monitor food reformulation and nutritional quality of food supply at the branded product level, by product family (disaggregated level)
  - Enable to make comparisons between countries

- The Oqali project is expanding
  - Québec, JANPA
**Presentation of Janpa**

- **WHAT IS JANPA?**
  Janpa = Joint action on nutrition and physical activity
  Objective: to contribute to halting the rise of overweight and obesity in children and adolescents in EU Member states by 2020

- **WHO IS INVOLVED?**
  26 countries (25 of the 28 European Member states + Norway)

- **WHAT DO WE WANT TO ACHIEVE?**
  Through sharing, identification and selection of best practices within participating countries
  → estimate and forecast the economic costs of overweight and obesity
  → improve the implementation of integrated interventions to promote healthy nutrition and physical activity for pregnant women and families with young children
  → contribute to healthier child care in family, kindergarten, pre-school and school environments
  → improve the way in which nutritional information about foods is collected and used by public health authorities, stakeholders and families.