

COMPLAINT NUMBER	19/296
APPEAL NUMBER	19/012
COMPLAINANT	E Fowler
APPLICANT	Unilever Australasia
ADVERTISER	Unilever Australasia
ADVERTISEMENT	Streets Ice Cream Out of Home
DATE OF MEETING	25 November 2019
OUTCOME	Appeal Allowed, Complaint Not Upheld

SUMMARY

The Complaints Board ruled on 24 September 2019 the complaint made by E Fowler about the out of home advertisement for Streets Ice Cream was Upheld.

The Advertiser appealed the Decision. The Chairperson considered that the Application raised sufficient grounds for the matter to be reheard by the Appeal Board.

The Appeal Board agreed the advertisement did not reach the threshold to undermine the health and well-being of individuals. The Appeal Board said the product, ice cream, is an occasional treat food and the advertisement showed single servings of the product, not excessive quantities.

It agreed that the phrase “ICE CREAM MAKES U HAPPY” is puffery and associated with a product that is recognised as and understood to be an occasional food.

The Appeal Board ruled the advertisement was not in breach of Principle 1 Rule 1(h) of the Advertising Standards Code and the Children and Young People’s Advertising Code did not apply.

The Appeal was Allowed and the Complaint was Not Upheld.

Decision: Complaint **Not Upheld**, Appeal **Allowed**

Please note this headnote does not form part of the Decision.

APPEAL BOARD DECISION

On 24 September 2019 the Complaints Board ruled by majority decision to Uphold the complaint made by E Fowler about the out of home advertisement for Streets Ice Cream.

The Advertiser appealed the Decision. The Chairperson accepted the Appeal and said the Application raised sufficient grounds for the matter to be reheard by the Appeal Board.

The Chairperson directed the Appeal Board to consider the advertisement with reference to the following codes:

ADVERTISING STANDARDS CODE

Principle 1: Social Responsibility Advertisements must be prepared and placed with a due sense of social responsibility to consumers and to society.

Rule 1(h) Health and well-being Advertisements must not undermine the health and well-being of individuals.

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S ADVERTISING CODE

Principle 1: Social Responsibility: Advertisements targeted at children or young people must not contain anything that is likely to result in their physical, mental or moral harm and must observe a high standard of social responsibility.

Rule 1 (i) Targeting children

Advertisements (including sponsorship advertisements) for occasional food or beverage products must not target children or be placed in any media where children are likely to be a significant proportion of the expected average audience.

Principle 2: Truthful Presentation: Advertisements must not by implication, omission, ambiguity or exaggerated claim mislead or deceive or be likely to mislead or deceive children or young people, abuse their trust or exploit their lack of knowledge.

Relevant precedent decisions

In considering this complaint the Appeal Board referred to two precedent decisions, Decision 18/418, which was Not Upheld and Decision 19/102 which was Upheld.

The full versions of these decisions can be found on the ASA website <https://www.asa.co.nz/decisions/>

Decision 18/418 concerned multi-media advertising for BP Oil NZ Ltd. The billboard, bus stop, instore and digital marketing advertisements showed the text 'Good Mood Food'. There were ice cream scoops, doughnuts and food plates in place of the double O letters in each of these three words.

The majority of the Complaints Board found that the advertising was not likely to mislead or deceive consumers or encourage excessive consumption. It said the advertising had been prepared with a due sense of social responsibility. The majority of the Board said the advertising was not in breach of Principles 1 or 2 or Guidelines 1(c), 1(d), 2(b) or 2(c) of the Code for Advertising Food. (NB These Codes differ from the Codes being considered in Complaint 19/296. This is due to the introduction of the new Advertising Standards Code in November 2018).

A minority of the Complaints Board said the advertising made an implicit health claim linking food high in fat, salt and / or sugar to well-being. It said the advertising could mislead consumers about the nutritive value of food and images showed excessive serving sizes for children.

Decision 19/102 concerned Facebook and Instagram advertisements for Cookie Time biscuits which showed breakfast bowls filled with at least eight Cookie Time biscuits, with milk, and the comment: "The struggle is now over to find the perfect breakfast".

The Complaints Board agreed the advertisements undermine the health and well-being of individuals. This is because a bowl of biscuits and milk is not a healthy breakfast option and the serving size shown in the photo exceeds the recommended serving size of three biscuits.

Summary of Complaints Board Decision

In accordance with the majority, the Complaints Board ruled the advertisement did not target children or young people, and therefore the Children and Young People's Advertising Code did not apply.

A minority disagreed. The minority said the advertisement targeted children (those below the age of 14 years). This is because the product had high appeal to children, especially the Paddle Pop ice creams.

In accordance with the majority, of the Complaints Board ruled the advertisement implied there is a link between ice cream and happiness, and this message could potentially undermine the health and well-being of consumers.

A minority disagreed. It said ice cream was widely recognised as an occasional food, a nice treat, and the advertisement was not making any scientific or nutritional claims.

In accordance with the majority, the Complaints Board ruled the complaint was Upheld.

Advertiser's Appeal

The Advertiser appealed the Complaints Board decision on the grounds that the Complaints Board decision was against the weight of evidence and the advertisement did not undermine the health and well-being of individuals. This is because ice cream is an occasional, treat food, commonly promoted in connection with the positive enjoyment of eating it. The text "ICE CREAM MAKES U HAPPY" is a playful reference to the enjoyment of consuming ice cream and the advertisement is not making a nutritional claim or suggesting that the ice creams featured are beneficial to a consumer's health.

Complainant's response to the Appeal

The Complainant provided additional evidence in support of the view that the advertisement has the potential to undermine the health and wellbeing of consumers. This evidence included references to studies into how marketing affects eating behaviours and why children are highly vulnerable to advertising.

APPEAL BOARD DISCUSSION

The Appeal Board carefully considered the complaint, the advertisement, the information provided by the Complainant and the Advertiser, and the Complaints Board Decision.

Consumer takeout

The Appeal Board agreed with the Complaints Board that the likely consumer takeout of the advertisement was this shop sells ice cream and people enjoy eating ice cream. The Appeal Board noted that ice cream is regarded as a treat food and is often associated with family outings or special occasions.

Precedent decisions

The Appeal Board considered the complaint with reference to precedent decisions 18/418 and 19/102. The Appeal Board noted the Good Mood Food decision, 18/418, was considered under the previous Code for Advertising Food and not the current Advertising Standards Code, which was introduced in November 2018 and came into force for all advertisements on 1 February 2019.

The Appeal Board noted the Cookie Time decision, 19/102, was considered under Principle 1 and Rule 1(h) of the Advertising Standards Code. The Complaints Board said the advertisements promoted unhealthy eating behaviours of adults, children and young people by encouraging a large quantity of an occasional food as the 'perfect' breakfast meal.

Advertisement under the Children and Young People's Advertising Code

Did the advertisement target children or young people?

The Appeal Board said the advertisement was aimed at adults and did not specifically target children, therefore the Children and Young People's Advertising Code did not apply.

The Appeal Board noted the original complaint referred to Principle 1 and Rule 1(h) of the Advertising Standards Code and did not refer to the Children and Young People's Advertising Code.

The advertisement showed three different types of ice cream, a Paddle Pop, a Magnum and a Splice. While the Paddle Pop may appeal to children, all three of these products also have a general appeal. In addition, children were not considered to be a significant proportion of the audience seeing this advertisement.

Advertisement under the Advertising Standards Code

Did the advertisement undermine the health and well-being of individuals?

The Appeal Board agreed the advertisement did not reach the threshold to undermine the health and well-being of individuals. The Appeal Board said the word "undermine" means to injure or weaken the health and wellbeing of individuals, and an advertisement needed to go further than simply showing a product alongside a statement that uses puffery.

The Appeal Board agreed that the phrase "ICE CREAM MAKES U HAPPY" is puffery and associated with a product that is recognised as and understood to be an occasional food. The idea that having an occasional ice cream can make you happy fits appropriately with the concept of a treat food. The advertisement referred to the simple pleasure that can be experienced from eating a single ice cream, which, in the context of an occasional treat, does not reach the threshold to cause harm by undermining the health and well-being of individuals.

The Appeal Board then discussed the product being promoted as well as the context, medium and audience of the advertisement.

The Appeal Board said the product, ice cream, is an occasional treat food and the advertisement showed single servings of the product, not large or excessive quantities. The advertisement did not refer to or encourage excessive consumption of a treat food.

The Appeal Board said the advertisement was located on the side of a retail food outlet, which means it was more likely to be associated with the spontaneous purchase of an occasional treat food.

The Appeal Board ruled the advertisement was not in breach of Principle 1 Rule 1(h) of the Advertising Standards Code and the Children and Young People's Advertising Code did not apply.

The Appeal was Allowed and the Complaint was Not Upheld.

Decision: Complaint **Not Upheld**, Appeal **Allowed**

APPENDICES

1. Description of Advertisement
 2. Complaint from E Fowler
 3. Summary of the Complaints Board Ruling
 4. Appeal Application from Unilever Australasia
 5. Response to the Appeal Application from E Fowler
-

Appendix 1

DESCRIPTION OF ADVERTISEMENT

The advertisement for three types of Streets ice creams (Paddle Pop, Magnum and Splice) was located on the outside wall of the Tui Crescent Foodmarket in Whangarei. The advertisement showed images of the three types of ice cream, next to the text: "ICE CREAM MAKES U HAPPY".

Appendix 2

COMPLAINT FROM E FOWLER

I would like to make a complaint under the advertising standards code (code). The streets advertisement breaches principle 1 and rule 1(h) of the code.

Why am i making this complaint? The advertisement is located on the wall of my local dairy. It is clearly visible from the main road. I see this advertisement every time i drive or walk to town, the pools, library, the doctors, supermarket or park. If you are a parent or have spent time with young children you will know how impressionable children are. You would also know that children learn from what they see around them and how quickly they pick up on things. [abridged...] think this message is extremely irresponsible especially given the obesity and mental health problems we as a country are facing.

How does the advertisement breach the code? Principle 1 social responsibility. The advertisement has not been prepared or placed with a due sense of social responsibility to parents or children.

Preparation: the statement 'ice cream makes you happy' is an irresponsible message to tell parents and children. Foods should not be advertised as way to improve peoples mood. Ice cream is a food that is high in fat and sugar. Eating ice cream to make yourself happy is damaging to ones health.

Placement: the advertisement is on the outside of tui crescent foodmarket. It is visible from the main road. There is a primary school and high school near by (1.3km and 1.0km away respectively). School children and their families stop at the dairy before and after school regularly. School children walk pass the shop before and after school. Due to the placement of the advertisement a large number of children and adults are exposed to it regularly.

Rule 1(h) health and wellbeing. The advertisement undermines the health and wellbeing of children and adults by promoting an unhealthy relationship with food.

The statement 'ice cream makes you happy' is promoting an unhealthy relationship with food. Eating food to make yourself happy is not a healthy relationship to have with food, in particular with a food such as ice cream that is high in fat and sugar. Hence, why this message could be damaging to the health of those exposed to the message regularly.

Appendix 3

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINTS BOARD DECISION 19/296

Summary of the Complaint

The Complainant was concerned the message "ICE CREAM MAKES U HAPPY" is extremely irresponsible given the obesity and mental health problems that exist in New Zealand. The Complainant said food should not be advertised as a way to improve people's mood, given that ice cream is high in fat and sugar. The Complainant was concerned about the impact of the advertisement on children as well as on their parents.

Issues Raised:

- Social Responsibility
- Health and Well-being
- Targeting Children
- Truthful Presentation

Summary of the Advertiser's Response

The Advertiser said the target audience for the advertisement is adults, ice cream is an occasional food and the advertisement does not condone excessive consumption. The Advertiser said the advertisement is not misleading.

Summary of the Complaints Board Decision

The Complaints Board upheld a complaint about an advertisement for Streets ice creams, located on the outside wall of a store in Whangarei. The Board said the advertisement implies there is a link between ice cream and happiness, and this message could potentially undermine the health and well-being of consumers.

The full version of this decision can be found on the ASA website:

<https://www.asa.co.nz/decisions/>

Appendix 4

APPEAL APPLICATION FROM UNILEVER AUSTRALASIA

We refer to the decision of the Advertising Standards Complaints Board ('**Board**') on 24 September 2019 regarding the complaint made by E Fowler in relation to a Streets advertisement with the text 'ICE CREAM MAKES U HAPPY' beside images of three Streets Magnum, Paddle Pop, and Splice products (the '**Products**'). I received this decision by email on Wednesday 9 October 2019. This request for an appeal of the decision is being made within 14 days of receipt of the decision (in line with Rule 6.2, Schedule 2).

The complainant was concerned that our advertisement is socially irresponsible, and that ice cream should not be advertised as a way to improve people's moods. The complaint was concerned about the impact of the advertisement on children as well as their parents. We submitted in reply that the Products are an occasional food, that the advertisement does not condone excessive consumption of ice cream, and that the target audience for the advertisement is adults.

The Board considered the complaint with reference to the Advertising Standards Code Principle 1: Social Responsibility and Rule 1(h) Health and well-being, and to the Children and Young People's Advertising Code. The majority of the Board upheld the complaint under the Advertising Standards Code ('**Decision**'), but determined that the target audience for the advertisement was adults, so the Children and Young People's Advertising Code did not apply.

We consider the Decision is against the weight of evidence, and it is in the interests of natural justice that the matter be reheard. We therefore request an appeal of the Decision under Rule 6.4(d) and (e), Schedule 2.

Rule 1(h) Health and well-being

Our advertisement does not undermine the health and well-being of individuals

The Board considered whether our advertisement contains anything that could undermine the health and well-being of individuals. A majority held that it could do so, because the advertisement contains an implicit claim that there is a link between ice cream and happiness, because ice cream is a high fat, high sugar food, and the desire to be happy is universal.

A minority of the Board disagreed and found that ice cream is widely recognised as an occasional food, a nice treat, and the advertisement is not making any scientific or nutritional claims.

We consider the majority of the Board erred in their finding that our advertisement is not socially responsible because it could undermine the health and well-being of individuals. In our view, this finding was not reasonable in the circumstances and is not supported by the evidence of common understanding amongst New Zealand adults that ice cream is an occasional food that should be enjoyed in moderation, and a general awareness that ice cream and other treat foods are commonly promoted in connection with the positive enjoyment and pleasure of eating them.

Rule 1(h) makes it clear that advertisers must not undermine the food and nutrition policies of the Government and the Ministry of Health. As the Board will be aware, the Ministry of Health's Eating and Activity Guidelines provide key statements for New Zealand adults, including the statement that adults should '*enjoy a variety of nutritious foods each day...*'. While the Products do not fall under the recommended categories we note that two of the three options in our advertisement are low or reduced fat (Splice and Paddle Pop). If a healthy adult eats a balanced diet with an occasional higher fat ice cream 'treat' such as a Magnum ice cream, he or she can still maintain a healthy diet that is in line with the Ministry of Health's guidelines.

Rule 1(h) also makes it clear that advertisements for food must not condone or encourage excessive consumption or show a quantity of food that exceeds the portion size that would be appropriate for consumption. The serving sizes in our advertisement are appropriate for an adult consumer, and the advertisement does not encourage excessive consumption. Our advertisement does not suggest that the Products should be seen as a meal replacement. The Board did not indicate any concern in relation to this aspect of the guidelines in its Decision. The advertisement can be clearly distinguished from that which was the subject of decision 19/102, which the Board referred to in the present case. In that case, the advertisement in question showed a larger than recommended serving size (eight or more biscuits in a bowl when the recommended serving size was three), and suggested that the food advertised was an appropriate meal choice (with the wording "the struggle is now over

to find the perfect breakfast”). This advertisement showed a quantity of food that exceeded the appropriate portion size, and suggested that the cookies were a meal replacement option, rather than a treat food.

Our advertisement does not contain a nutritional claim

The wording ‘ICE CREAM MAKES U HAPPY’ is a playful reference to the enjoyment of consuming ice cream as a treat food. The advertisement does not make a nutritional claim or suggest that the ice creams featured are beneficial to a consumer’s health. The advertisement uses puffery to illustrate the enjoyment of eating ice cream. It is simply not credible to suggest that the average adult consumer will expect that eating any of the products featured will lead to a permanent mood improvement, or will provide a mood improvement such that the products should be consumed in order to achieve happiness.

The statement ‘ICE CREAM MAKES U HAPPY’ is intended to tell consumers that the ice cream products shown are delicious, and eating them will be enjoyable.
Consumers are well educated to understand that occasional foods are regularly marketed as bringing joy

The marketing of occasional or treat foods commonly involves promoting the enjoyment and happiness of consuming such foods. Other similar claims for ice cream, chocolate, or related goods are:

Whittaker’s: https://www.whittakers.co.nz/en_NZ/products/

‘Sante: ... Long, thin and elegant, sante means health in a happy way. And these certainly make you feel happy’

Cadbury: <https://www.cadbury.co.nz/product/cadbury-dairy-milk-milk-chocolate/>

‘... It contains more joy than most people can handle. Even our most experienced chocolatiers need to bliss out in the joy-decompression chamber after a day of making Cadbury Dairy Milk Chocolate.’

New Zealand Natural: <https://www.newzealandnatural.com/scoops>

‘What does happiness taste like you say? We’re glad you asked. Like mint ice cream blended with choc chips and mint fondant chocolate cups. Happiness tastes like this scoop of world famous ice cream’

The prevalence of happiness-related claims in relation to promotion of occasional foods mean that consumers are well versed in these sorts of claims, and can be expected to distinguish between puffery of the type used in our advertisement, and genuine nutritional claims. No reasonable consumer could be expected to believe that the happiness experienced when eating an ice cream is equivalent to good health – mental or otherwise.

The Decision is out of line with other recent decisions involving comparable advertisements

We consider the issues addressed in decision 18/418 are similar to the present scenario. This decision was considered by the Board and involves some parallels with the present issues (though we note it was decided in February 2019 under the previous Code for Advertising Food). The BP advertisement in this matter involved the wording “Good Mood Food” with ice cream scoops, doughnuts and food plates used in place of the double O letters. The advertisement was placed (among other locations) near convenience stores.

The majority of the Board held in this decision that the products would be seen as 'enjoyable comfort foods or an occasional treat', and that the 'good mood reference was about the enjoyment of consuming comfort food'. and decided to not uphold the complaint. As in the BP case, our advertisement does not make any nutritional claims or suggest that the products featured are beneficial to mental health. Instead, the advertisement is a playful reference to the products as a treat food and the enjoyment to be experienced while eating such food.

Decision 19/229 involving the advertising of Tiny Teddies biscuits is also relevant. In this instance, the website advertisement included the text "Tiny Teddy biscuits are the delicious treat your kids will love. With no artificial colours, flavours or preservatives, they're sure to put a smile on everyone's face". The complaint relating to the website advertisement (which included the above text) was not upheld. In its decision, the Board held that the consumer takeout of the website advertisement was that "Tiny Teddies are a treat to add to your child's lunch box, to make everyone happy", and that this did not undermine the health and well-being of individuals.

The Appeals Board has a duty to act fairly and even handedly. If the present Decision was upheld, it would be out of keeping with decisions 18/418 and 19/229.

Summary

We acknowledge how important it is for New Zealanders to eat a balanced diet, maintain a healthy weight and to look after their mental wellbeing. Unilever is committed to promoting mental and physical health. However, a finding that occasional foods like ice cream and ice confection cannot be advertised in a way that promotes the basic enjoyment or happiness experienced in consuming such foods comes perilously close to an effective ban on advertising occasional foods at all. The very nature of an occasional or treat food is that it brings pleasure. The average adult is well aware of this. If manufacturers like Unilever are prevented from promoting ice cream to adults in a way that highlights the enjoyment of indulging in a treat food, this will impact on the whole market and will deprive consumers of legitimate free choice in their diets.

Appendix 5

RESPONSE TO THE APPEAL APPLICATION FROM E FOWLER

Firstly, I would like to state that I am not anti-ice cream or on a crusade to ban it. I am a mother who is concerned by the pervasive and persuasive food marketing that is contributing to the obesogenic environment we are now living in.

Summary of decision

The Complaints Board upheld my complaint (19/296), ruling that the Streets Ice Cream Out of Home advertisement was in breach of Principle 1 and Rule 1(h) of the Advertising Standards Code.

The advertisement was deemed not socially responsible taking into account the context, medium, audience and product. The Complaint Board summarised its decision stating (1) the advertising implies there is a link between ice cream and happiness and (2) this message could potentially undermine the health and wellbeing of consumers.

Response to the opportunity to comment on the appeal

Unilever Australasia has appealed the Board's decision on two grounds. My response to the appeal will focus on (d) that the decision is against the weight of evidence as I am not aware of any natural justice issues with the decision.

The evidence

It appears that no one, including Unilever Australasia, disagrees with the Board's decision that the advertisement links ice cream to happiness. However, the evidence that this message could undermine the health and wellbeing of consumers is contested.

The evidence to support that this message undermines the health and wellbeing of consumers is:

1. Marketing is a macrolevel environmental factor that, directly and indirectly, has a powerful impact on eating behaviours.¹
2. Food marketing influences what New Zealand families and individuals eat.²
3. One proven effective marketing technique is promoting the enjoyment and happiness of consuming foods. This technique is commonly used to market occasional foods. Eating in response to emotional and situational influences has been associated with a higher BMI.³
4. There is unequivocal evidence that the marketing of unhealthy foods is related to childhood obesity.⁴
5. It is well documented that marketing influences children's food preferences, purchasing choices, requests and consumption.^{5 6}
6. Children are more likely to take advertisements at face value including playful references and puffery. Psychological research has found that children are highly vulnerable to advertising because they do not understand its persuasive intent and lack the cognitive ability needed to interpret advertising messages critically.⁷
7. Ice cream and ice confectionary products are occasional foods. Occasional foods do not meet the Ministry of Health's Eating Guidelines. Furthermore, one of the recommended dietary changes for New Zealand adults is to reduce highly processed foods that are high in saturated fat and sugar.⁸

Unilever Australasia did not acknowledge or address this evidence in its appeal.

Response to other points raised in Unilever Australasia's appeal application

One of the key appeal points is that the decision lacks evidence. I have provided some of the existing evidence to show why the decision is supported by evidence. Unilever Australasia, on the other hand, has not done so. Unilever Australasia makes the following unsubstantiated claims:

- there "is a *general awareness* that ice cream and other treat food are commonly promoted in connection with positive enjoyment and pleasure of eating them" [emphasis added]
- "*Consumers are well educated* to understand that occasional foods are regularly marketed as bringing joy" [emphasis added]
- the very nature of an occasional food is that it brings pleasure; and
- the serving sizes advertised are *appropriate* for an adult consumer [emphasis added]

The advert was deemed not to 'target' children or young people and therefore the Children and Young People's Advertising Code did not apply. However, all advertisements must comply with the Advertising Standards Code regardless of the specific audience targeted by the advertiser. The unrestricted nature of out-of-home mediums makes it difficult for advertisers to target a specific audience. This is particularly difficult when one of the products (Paddle Pop) is for children and young people as well as adults. As stated on the Streets website "*Paddle Pop believes in wholesome childhood fun. We encourage families to enjoy the experience of eating ice cream together.*" Due to the placement of the advertisement children, young people and adults are regularly exposed to this marketing. There is substantial evidence that children do not understand the persuasive intent of marketing and take messages at face value. They lack the cognitive ability to interpret messages critically and therefore constant exposure to the message 'Ice Cream Makes U Happy' has the potential to undermine the health and wellbeing of children and young people.

Unilever Australasia submitted the decision is out of line with other recent decisions and refer to decision 19/229. This decision was for a webpage for Tiny Teddies biscuits on the Arnott's website. This is a very different medium, context and audience. To that extent, it is not comparable to the advert which is on the outside of a dairy, on the corner of a busy public road with nearby schools and shops which attract the general public. Unlike out-of-home advertisements, consumers choose to actively visit a website to view the content.

Unilever Australasia provided examples of similar claims for ice cream, chocolate and related food, again, all those examples are advertisements on company websites.

Unilever Australasia's view that the decision is close to an effective ban on advertising occasional foods is, in my view, simply not true. It is alarmism. The advertisement has been replaced with an advertisement for Weirs ice creams - another occasional food, which as far as I am aware, does not breach any of the Advertising Standards Authority's codes.

Unilever Australasia submitted that consumers will be deprived of free choice in their diet if the complaint is upheld. This is another unsubstantiated claim. It is arguably either naive or disingenuous to suggest that marketing does not affect free choice.

Commentary was provided around the advertisement not making nutritional claims. My complaint did not allege a breach of Rule 2(g).

Footnotes

1 Story M, Kaphingst KM, Robinson-O'Brien R, et al. 2008. Creating Healthy Food and Eating Environments: Policy and Environmental Approaches. Annual Review of Public Health 29(1): 253-27

2 Ministry of Health. 2012. Food and Nutrition Guidelines for Healthy Children and Young People (Aged 2–18 years): A 2 background paper. Partial revision February 2015. Wellington: Ministry of Health

3 Madden CE, Leong SL, Gray A, et al. 2012. Eating in Response to Hunger and Satiety Signals is Related to BMI in a Nationwide Sample of 1601 Mid-Age New Zealand Women. Public Health Nutrition 15(2): 2272-2279

4 Commission on Ending Childhood Obesity. Report of the Commission on Ending Childhood Obesity: implementation plan. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2017

5 Cairns, G., et al. Systematic reviews of the evidence on the nature, extent and effects of food marketing to children. A retrospective summary. Appetite (2012), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2012.04.017>

6 Policy Brief - Food Advertising to Children <https://www.opc.org.au/downloads/policy-briefs/food-advertising-to-children.pdf> 6

7 Kunkel D, Wilcox BL, Cantor J, Palmer E, Linn S & Dowrick P. Report of the APA Task Force on Advertising and Children. Washington DC: American Psychological Association, 2004

8 Ministry of Health. 2015. Eating and Activity Guidelines for New Zealand Adults. Wellington: Ministry of Health