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Antitrust Caution

**GS1 US is committed to complying fully with antitrust laws.**

We ask and expect everyone to refrain from discussing prices, margins, discounts, suppliers, the timing of price changes, marketing or product plans, or other competitively sensitive topics.

If anyone has concerns about the propriety of a discussion, please inform a GS1 US® representative as soon as possible.

Please remember to make your own business decisions and that all GS1 Standards are voluntary and not mandatory.

Please review the complete GS1 US antitrust policy at: [www.gs1us.org/gs1-us-antitrust-compliance-policy](http://www.gs1us.org/gs1-us-antitrust-compliance-policy)
Legal Disclosure

GS1 US, Inc. is providing this presentation, as is, as a service to interested parties. GS1 US MAKES NO REPRESENTATIONS IN THIS REGARD AND DISCLAIMS ALL WARRANTIES, EITHER EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, ANY WARRANTY OF ACCURACY OR RELIABILITY OF ANY CONTENT, NONINFRINGEMENT, MERCHANTABILITY, OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

GS1 US shall not be liable for any consequential, special, indirect, incidental, liquidated, exemplary, or punitive damages of any kind or nature whatsoever, or any lost income or profits, under any theory of liability, arising out of the use of this presentation or any content herein, even if advised of the possibility of such loss or damage or if such loss or damage could have been reasonably foreseen.

*GS1 US employees are not representatives or agents of the U.S. FDA, and the content of this presentation has not been reviewed, approved, or authorized by the U.S. FDA.  

*If applicable
TPA Information Accuracy Project
Transparency

Can your customer see your product clearly?
Context

• Unlike Europe, there are no laws requiring regulated on-pack information (e.g. ingredient list, allergens) to be available in a digital purchasing environment.
  - EU1169 (Food-Beverage), EU1223/2009 (Beauty-Cosmetics), EU648/2004 (Cleaning Products-Detergents)

• However, in the United States, if you make this regulated information available, it is considered label equivalent and must be accurate.
  - On the BRAND’s OWN website (brand.com or SmartLabel™)
  - Or on a 3rd party website ON-BEHALF of the brand (providing a retailer information for the purpose of sharing)
Overview: Information Accuracy Assessment

There is a sense that information accuracy relating to consumer-facing data may be an issue in the industry. However, it is not clear if the trading partners see the magnitude of the problem as worthy of significant energy/investment by their individual companies or an industry problem to “solve.”

• **Our Objective:** Conduct an assessment of product data accuracy and completeness from a consumer’s perspective by comparing label data to products on “partnered” retailer websites and SmartLabel™ web pages.

• **Our Participants:** 13 brand owners, 6 retailers; 222 unique products (brand and private label), 746 product/retailer combinations.

• **Our Approach:** 1) Product Identification, 2) Data Collection, 3) Data Comparison

• **Our Scope:**
  - Analyzing 74 food attributes and 27 non-food attributes (required attributes by SmartLabel).
  - Assessing physical product and comparing to retailer web pages and SmartLabel web pages.
Criteria

Accuracy

• Did the data on a physical label match the data on the partnered retailer’s website and SmartLabel?
  - “Hard” pass/fail measures (did the consumer services phone number match?)
  - Was systemically hard to determine contextually required attributes

Completeness

• Was all the required information found on the label found on the partnered retailers website and SmartLabel?
  - Completeness a BIG but different issue from accuracy
  - Was systemically hard to determine contextually required attributes
  - Could not measure “intent to share”
What Were The Overall Results? *(Across 6 Retailer Websites)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DQ Test Name</th>
<th>Attributes evaluated</th>
<th>Complete: Audited attribute present</th>
<th>Accurate: GS1 US audited value matches online</th>
<th>Complete and Accurate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Accuracy</td>
<td></td>
<td>By attribute</td>
<td>By attribute</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ingredient</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identification</td>
<td>4,674</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nutrition</td>
<td>15,180</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Claims, Warnings, Instructions</td>
<td>2,059</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL RESULT</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,754</strong></td>
<td><strong>74%</strong></td>
<td><strong>81%</strong></td>
<td><strong>55%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** No single product achieved completeness & accuracy on all attributes for a single retailer
How Did Retailer Results Compare To SmartLabel?

Overall

- **Accuracy**
  - SmartLabel: 92%
  - Retailer: 81%

- **Completeness**
  - SmartLabel: 94%
  - Retailer: 74%

- **Accuracy & Completeness**
  - SmartLabel: 86%
  - Retailer: 55%
Retailer Results vs SmartLabel By Attribute Grouping

Nutrition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SmartLabel</th>
<th>Retailer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completeness</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy &amp; Completeness</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ingredients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SmartLabel</th>
<th>Retailer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completeness</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy &amp; Completeness</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Retailer Results vs SmartLabel By Attribute Grouping (continued)

Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Identification SmartLabel</th>
<th>Identification Retailer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completeness</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy &amp; Completeness</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Claims, Warnings, Precautions, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>SmartLabel</th>
<th>Retailer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completeness</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy &amp; Completeness</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are There Other Distinctions?

Food vs. Non-Food

- Complete: Food 77% vs. Non-Food 67%
- Accurate: Food 83% vs. Non-Food 67%
- Accurate & Complete: Food 61% vs. Non-Food 34%

Private Label vs. Branded

- Complete: Private Label 74% vs. Branded 76%
- Accurate: Private Label 86% vs. Branded 82%
- Accurate & Complete: Private Label 60% vs. Branded 58%
Panel Discussion

Is there a compelling case for change to pursue data accuracy improvement through industry engagement?

Key Take-Aways

Possible course(s) of action -
• Do nothing as an industry effort – address individually
• Consider creation of data standards for online sites
• Establish on-going monitoring tools
• Deep dive on study results to identify root causes (requires additional trading partner engagement)
• Others?
Trademark Notices

DataBar®, EAN®, EPC®, EPCglobal®, GDSN®, GS1 Global Registry®, GTIN®, and Global Trade Item Number® are registered trademarks of GS1 AISBL.

GS1 US® and design is a registered trademark of GS1 US, Inc. Trademarks appearing in this presentation are owned by GS1 US, Inc. unless otherwise noted, and may not be used without the permission of GS1 US, Inc.

The letters “U.P.C.” are used solely as an abbreviation for the “Universal Product Code” which is a product identification system. They do not refer to the UPC, which is a federally registered certification mark of the International Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials (IAPMO) to certify compliance with a Uniform Plumbing Code as authorized by IAPMO.