

Another exciting development with Nutri-Facts is the way the program has become part of the advertising. The pattern has been that when a retailer introduces the program, such as here with Food Emporium, a full-page ad is used to just explain the program; then the following ads are showing the Nutri-Facts recipes of the items on sale. I might add that this full-color ad with a beef, pork and lamb shot ran in the *New York Times*, one of the most widely read newspapers in the country.

This is what we'd hoped for. For Nutri-Facts to be successful, it had to fit into the existing merchandising program. Meat Nutri-Facts has to become part of the meat department, the same as nutrition information is found in the rest of the supermarket.

That's why this program is so successful. The entire industry – producers, packers and retailers – have unified to get behind a program.

Plans for the Future

What's our next step? Let me share with you some of what we are currently working on to maintain the Nutri-Facts program.

1. Expanded information. As we've said before, when new information becomes available, we will provide it to the industry. New beef, lamb and veal information will be released. Handbook 8-13 for beef will soon be released. In the case of beef, this will give us the nutrient data, not only by grade but also by trim level. Does this mean all beef nutrition information will be out of date? No, it just means they will be able to offer more complete information catered to their merchandising program.

2. More cuts. The nutrient information collected was collected on cuts from all the major primals throughout the carcass. Those cuts not listed in the Nutri-Facts manual can be cross-linked to the major cut from which they came from.

For example, you will not find "top blade steak" in the USDA research. You will find the blade steak. We can use that information for the top blade. We're simply going to match up the information.

3. Recipes. The recipe part of the program has had an overwhelming pickup. Right now, we are looking at ways to offer a much more expanded recipe program. We hope to provide that even when the new beef data is released.

4. 3-Ounce serving. Without question, one of the most common questions that comes up is defining three ounces. We are looking to provide pictures of three-ounce servings, list what cuts make up a three-ounce serving or list how many servings one can expect from a particular cut.

5. Merchandising. If Meat Nutri-Facts has done anything, it's begun a way of thinking; it's given another form of variety that wasn't thought of before. We are looking to expand this section with more ways to merchandise nutrition.

6. Consumer information. We've taken the four brochures that are presently used in the manual and combined them into one. As we did before, this is available in camera-ready copy.

7. Video. The last area, and the one we are probably most excited about, is video.

This project is called "Meat Features," which are point-of-purchase video programs. We can not only show consumers what a 3-ounce portion size is, but also show them how to prepare it and provide nutrition information. Let me show you some examples already taped.

Nutri-Facts has also helped the meat department feel better about the meat department. What I mean is that the people behind the meat case, our sales force, read and hear the same negative editorials about red meat. And every day, they face those customers who also read or hear those negative editorials. Nutri-Facts allows them to share something positive. It's making them feel better about the products they're selling. And what is one of the first rules in selling? Enthusiasm.

For example, I was in a Houston Kroger store two weeks ago. The market manager said, "With the Nutri-Facts display and our new trim standards, I honestly feel better about my meat case."

I was also talking to another vice-president of meat merchandising. He stated that he didn't agree with cutting the fat off or trimming the tails on T-bones, but then he said, "If that's what consumers want, then that's what we'll give them." Meat Nutri-Facts is changing some old ways of thinking.

The momentum and enthusiasm of the retail industry continues to be high. Our challenge now is to maintain that momentum. Our ultimate goal has to be that nutrition information becomes a part of the meat department way of life, the same way it's found throughout the store.

Discussion

D. Buege: Tom, have you given any thought to, or done anything with comparing muscle movements? Because people see this information, it looks good; but they probably still think red meat may be vastly inferior to poultry, for instance. It doesn't seem like comparing poultry cuts with red meats, or perhaps even fish, to give these two a perspective.

T. Flaherty: The poultry people, it was announced at FMI, are coming out with a Nutri-Facts program.

J. Williams: The problem with the fish data, according to the USDA, is that they are not completing the studies for another year. So it looks like the fish data will not be available

for two or three years. This means that someone who is selling fish would have to do his own analysis, so it is difficult to make the composite comparison of fish to poultry and red meat. Poultry not so much a problem, but red meat vs. fish is a problem.

Flaherty: I think you are going to see poultry by the end of 1986. FMI, who helped us with Nutri-Facts, is also working with the poultry people. I don't know if they will do it in the same format we have done. I am assuming they will. If they do, I think you are automatically going to see those comparisons. I think we are going to have to be very careful. If we

were to come out with a poster, or some other print material that showed beef, pork, lamb, and poultry, it could be criticized because of the way this information can be interpreted. The poultry industry may not like the way we share the information. It may not be wrong, but they might want to share it in a different light. For example, the whole issue of 3-ounce, cooked, trimmed serving. That is what we say. On all of our cuts, we take the data, and how the item is normally prepared is how we list the information. Let's look at a chuck. How do we normally cook a chuck? We braise it. So that is the information we share – per 3-ounce cooked, braised serving. Take top loin. We broil it – per 3-ounce cooked, broiled serving.

How is most poultry consumed? It's probably mostly consumed fried. I don't think you are going to see nutrient information displayed that way. You are going to see it broiled, skin off. We have to be cautious about how we share that information. We are taking care of our interests and they are going to follow suit.

W. Townsend: Tom, I agree with Nutri-Facts and what Nutri-Facts is trying to do so as far as educating the public to red meat and how good it is for you, but I know that I very seldom eat 3 ounces at a sitting. That is one thing I think the public is not adhering to. It seems like a little deception.

Flaherty: You are not the first one who has ever said that. The whole question of a 3-ounce serving is one that invariably comes up in any Nutri-Facts presentation I give. There are two reasons for sharing the information in 3 ounces. Number one: If we are going to communicate USDA data, we have to use their terminology and their definition of a serving size. If you look at Handbook 8-10, it says "unit of serving size at 3 ounces." That is their definition of a serving size – 3 ounces. The general guideline that is prevalent in the health community is two 3-ounce servings from the meat group a day. The meat group means not just red meat but also the white protein sources. Whether we want to communicate 3 ounces or not, we are more or less locked into that.

Let's understand what we are talking about in terms of 3 ounces. A quarter-pounder that you buy at McDonald's, that is a serving size. A quarter-pounder on a cooked basis is a 3-ounce portion size. That is a boneless product. If you look at bone-in, take an 8-ounce pork chop; 8 ounces of center-cut pork chop. To get an 8-ounce pork chop, it has to be about one inch thick. Once you cook it, take the bone out, trim the fat, you are going to be roughly at 3 ounces. What I am saying, on bone-in product, you need to be in the area of 5 to 7 ounces of fresh, raw product to get to a serving size. On very bony cuts, you may need a pound of spareribs before you get a 3-ounce serving. On boneless cuts, there are a lot of cuts in the meat case that are already a serving size – thin-sliced tip steaks, eye of round steak, top blade steaks. A lot of those are going to be 4 or 5-ounce size in the meat case. When you cook them, they are going to be a 3-ounce portion size.

When I go through that with the market managers, they say "yes, but I still eat two T-bones every night." There are people who do that. Not everyone is looking for this nutrition information. Who is really concerned about nutrition information? It is those people that are not eating a lot of meat. They are some of our lightest users. If we can just get them to consume a 3-ounce portion size, we are going to be in great

shape. So that is where we think the opportunity is in sharing this 3-ounce concept. With this information, we think we are targeting a group of people who do not shop the meat case, or shop it a lot less than we would like them to. For the heavy meat eaters, the guidelines are two 3-ounce servings. That is 6 ounces cooked, 8 ounces raw. That is a healthy portion and you can still stay within the guidelines. For those lighter users, we think we have some opportunities in talking in terms of 3 ounces. Let alone the fact that that is more or less what we have to communicate in terms of. Serving sizes – that is a tough question.

S. Godbar: Are there any plans to expand the Nutri-Facts concept beyond just presenting serving size and what that contributes to the composition of your diet? I was wondering if you were going to get into concepts of nutrition. For example, there is a lot of information that is potentially misinformation and a lot of other information that is not known. We could probably use this concept to address those issues also.

Flaherty: Other nutrients?

Godbar: Just aspects of meat in the diet that are important. I am particularly interested in the fact that meat has a beneficial effect on the availability of non-heme iron. Most people do not know that. I think that would be information that could be used to sell meat products. I think there is more that we could do with this type of program than just tell people what they are getting from meat, but how meat is benefitting them nutritionally.

Flaherty: You raise a very good point. When you look at the Nutri-Facts information, there is a lot we could talk about. We have a tremendous iron story – of meat's role and the type of iron that it provides. One of the things we try to do, as we learned in the field tests, is to keep it simple – very simple. You have just a few seconds to communicate a message to the consumers. Some retailers have taken this information in their print material and expanded upon it in much more detail than we have done here. You have only a few seconds to communicate a message, and if you get into other areas, you lose their interest.

J. Williams: I think there is more to it than that, though. It is a part of what he has asked in terms of what else can sell in red meat. Certainly, iron is one story we need to start selling; and zinc is another. Probably the biggest question or concern that we get from people who are in support of red meat is "Look at what the dairy industry has done with calcium. Why don't you do that with iron?" I think there is a little hesitancy to do that from our perspective so far because the new data is not yet available. We will be able to provide the information in terms of what it means, once the numbers come out. But until they do, we are waiting to see what is going to happen next before we do that. I think the point is well taken that there are other things to sell about red meat besides just the Nutri-Facts program and the facts that iron is there and it is more readily available and, combined with other foods, it is better still. Jane Brodie tells us to use red meat only as a condiment. We would be well advised to say "Look here, Jane Brodie, guess what! This condiment provides readily available iron to you and increases absorption of other iron." She would probably like to know that. She says she can be convinced.

I think the story that we need to tell in the next year or so is

that there are lots of nutrients there that we have not talked about in the past. I think the country must be sold on those nutrients, particularly iron. I think your point is a very good one.

T. Hillier: It is one thing to present the calories as you have here. That reminds the customer "What percentage of my daily intake am I going to consume right here?" A lot of cereals, on their boxes, present the amount of protein as a percentage of your daily intake that you will get from this one serving. Do you have any information or ideas on this point?

Williams: His question relates to how this fits into a diet. If you are presenting this as a 3-ounce serving, how does that 3-ounce serving fit into a diet?

Hillier: What percentage of your calories do you get out of this 3-ounce serving?

Williams: That is on the Meat Nutri-Facts bar. It is the first bar that you see. I think something that is important to know about the Meat Nutri-Facts bar is that we have used 2,000 calories as our standard. The reason we have used 2,000 calories is because this seems to be the amount required for a very active female or a sedentary male. In this case, 185 calories is nine percent of a 2,000-calorie diet.

Let me just run this by you real quickly what the standards are here. The USRDA, the standard that is normally used for nutrition labeling, is what has been used for the protein, iron, zinc, thiamine, niacin and Vitamin B12. For the fat cholesterol, we have taken the American Heart Association recommendations as the standards which say 1) 10 percent of the calories from saturated fat; 2) 30 percent of the calories in a diet from total fat, and 3) no more than 300 milligrams per day of cholesterol. When you back the numbers into those standards, the standard that you see at the right is the percent of the USRDA or the other standard that this serving represents in the order that seems to be of most interest to consumers – calories, fat, cholesterol, and then sodium.

Buege: Earlier this year in *Food Technology*, there were the results of a survey that looked at what information consumers think is believable regarding nutrition. The American Medical Association and a doctor were at the top of the list. Our clinical sciences nutrition unit was at a shopping center with a nutrition quiz on a computer. One of the questions was "How many calories are there in 3 ounces of prime rib." They answered 450 calories. I could perceive that many doctors do not have a good grip on the calorie information. Have you interacted with physicians about this information and how have they received it? Have they been surprised? Are they willing to use it?

Williams: I think everyone is surprised about the information. How willing they are to use it is going to be better known after the program has been available for a while. The program has only been in use for a year. What you should know in getting nutritional information across to doctors, (since doctors apparently are our "best" sources of nutrition information or at least certainly the one we are most familiar with) is that the problem we have is that they are not getting appropriate information. What we are doing at the Meat Board, hopefully in the next year, is to provide a page as a paid advertisement to general practitioners giving information about different nutrition issues. Of course, incumbent in that would be some sort of a meat item each time. The ads will get across the fact that there are important nutritional

issues that they are not addressing which should be addressed, and the information will be available to them.

Doctors have information given to them by companies and are providing it to consumers, sometimes without any further information. I think something we hear quite often is that physicians are telling people not to eat red meat, because it's high in fat, high in cholesterol, etc. What we are trying to do is to provide the message that this is what it provides by comparison to poultry, to a tuna fish sandwich, to a piece of cheese, or whatever. This is what it provides.

Dietitian seminars are also things we are doing nationwide. We are choosing one state every month or every other month and we're going to provide seminars with the American Dietetic Association to key individuals or top professionals in those states. These seminars are to provide consumption information also on the role of red meat in the diet. We go through carcass weight as the basis for looking at what consumption is versus retail weight as the basis for consumption versus on down, considering plate weights, cooking loss, and what we are in fact actually consuming. Instead of the 8-ounce pork chop, it ends up being the 3 ounces of lean tissue. We are also talking about separable lean and fat. We are talking about fat, cholesterol and all the other nutrients that we think are appropriate to our discussion in terms of red meat. Also, we are trying to address what the concerns are. So far we have obtained a fairly positive response. What we find is that they are surprised by the information; and they are the ones who should *not* be surprised. They should already know it. But they are surprised by the information. They think they will use the information. They think they will use red meat more often. Hopefully, it is a message we can deliver to many more states in the coming years.

J. Kemp: Do you have any feedback from the chains who have used this program for a year or more as to its effectiveness?

Faherty: Understand that even though it is a year and two months old, just now there are a lot of chains in it for a full year. We are trying to position this as a long-term educational program. P&C, one of the first chains to get involved in the program, is not yet starting to look at consumers' awareness to the program. But they have been holding off until they start getting into that.

One of the best things that we have seen as far as feedback is from Kroger. Kroger installed a hot-line that is mentioned on their packages of meat and their posters. It says "If you have any questions about meat, please call us." This is an 800 number that went to all their stores. They have heard tremendous positive response through that on the program. That is one of the reasons they are so committed, not just to Nutri-Facts, but also to the 1/4-inch trim program. That is what I can tell you immediately that we have seen short-term.

One of the things that the cooperating organizations – American Meat Institute, Food Marketing Institute and the Meat Board – are going to be looking at is customer follow-up. We want to wait until the program has been out there longer. Several chains have just started the program and others are developing their own programs. It is still relatively new and until we get more out there, we will not begin to survey attitudes. You do not change attitudes overnight.

D. Jones: Do you see this evolving to the processed

meats line, particularly delicatessen, where there would be a lot of consumer-retailer interaction?

Flaherty: Handbook 8-10 for pork has some very limited deli-meat items in it. One of the areas, as you are well aware, that you get into is the labeling laws. What we are talking here is a consumer information program, not a labeling program. The big distinction is that when you get into labeling you are restricted in what you can share and how you can share it. That is why we opted for the consumer information program so we could communicate the information that we felt the consumer would most benefit from. The information is not really designed for a processor to incorporate into a label because it does not meet FDA's guidelines. There are a lot of processors who have taken the information and provided materials to retailers. Armour has done this. This way, retailers can display the information about it or around it, but it is not directly on the package as part of the label. There are some processors who have provided some material that could be displayed with the product.

D. Schafer: Do you have any intention of carrying this into the merchandising of variety meats as well? Is that a special merchandising problem?

Flaherty: That is a very good point. We have the information on variety meats. We can certainly offer that information.

Cholesterol – Wow! We have not had the demand for that, but there is no reason why we could not offer that. We will do that for this whole area of expanded cuts. We have it. There would be no reason that we could not offer it.

R. Waldem: Have you had an opportunity to present this kind of program to dietitians and physicians so you can talk to them directly?

Flaherty: That is what Janet was talking about – the dietitian seminars.

Williams: Some of their concerns were pretty much what we are hearing here. Principally, because if you look at the make-up of the Society for Nutrition Education, for example, you would have people who would say 3-ounce servings are not appropriate. You have to counter that with the fact that you have to choose something and we chose 3 ounces. If the nutrition community says it should be 5, we will change it to 5 ounces. They say this is a good idea. It is the only fresh food that has provided nutrition information in this way. So they are positive in that regard. They would like to see some modifications.

We are working with the American Heart Association now to try to develop something they can endorse.

P. Carpenter: We have had positive comments on the program in Florida, but nothing new for the record.