

consumer.
now you know

**BELINDA CASTLES
SUNSCREEN SUMMIT
19TH MARCH 2018**

ABOUT CONSUMER NZ

- We have over 50 years' experience of providing trusted, independent and accurate advice.
- We're free of advertising and commercial pressures.
- We serve just one audience – consumers.
- We work to improve the standard of goods and services available to consumers
- We work to persuade governments and businesses to change laws or practices that disadvantage individuals.
- We're a not-for-profit that exists largely through membership, revenue from contracts (mainly with government departments) and various business endorsement programmes.

PUBLICATION

- **Consumer magazine**
 - distributed to 24,000 members
 - available on newsstand in key supermarkets, bookstores and newsagents. About 2500 copies are sold each month



consumer.
now you know

CONSUMER.ORG.NZ

19 Dec 2017

Sunscreens

Our latest test of 20 sunscreens found 2 “natural” products only gave low sun protection. Another had to be pulled from the market because it failed to provide the high protection it claimed. In a country with one of the highest rates of skin cancer in the world, how do you know you can trust a sunscreen delivers on its claims?

In summer, it's important to slap on sunscreen to reduce UV radiation damaging your skin. The sun exposes you to 2 types of UV rays:

- UVA penetrates deeply into the skin and can cause wrinkles and age spots.

Off the market

Up to standard

Conflicting results

Time after time

We say

Share

Comments 34

Save

My radar

WHY SUNSCREENS?

- New Zealand has one of the highest rates of skin cancer and melanoma in the world.
- **No regulation** – in New Zealand sunscreens are classified as cosmetics. Products that meet the Australian/NZ or other international standards can be sold in New Zealand. But products that meet **no standard at all** can also be sold.
- CNZ has been testing sunscreens for around 10 years and we're still getting products that don't live up to SPF label claims, don't meet broad spectrum requirements and haven't undergone any testing at all.
- Consumers want to know – our last sunscreens report generated a huge amount of traffic – 64,000 views on the website.



Consumer NZ

Published by Consumer NZ · 4 December 2017 ·

Do you know sunscreens are classified as cosmetics in New Zealand? They also don't have to be tested before they're sold. We don't think that's good enough, given we have one of the highest skin cancer rates in the world.



Only 9 out of 19 sunscreens meet SPF label claim

Find out which sunscreens measured up in our latest test.

CONSUMER.ORG.NZ

[Learn More](#)

71,847 people reached

Organic **57,352**
Paid **20,763**

[Boost Post](#)

Recent activity

Boosted on 4 December
Audience: New Zealand, 18-65+, People who like C...
By Consumer NZ · Completed

[View results](#)

Cuzzy Bro and 402 others

132 Comments 388 Shares

[Like](#)

[Comment](#)

[Share](#)



Performance for your post

71,847 People Reached

1,812 Reactions, comments & shares

720 Like
On post

294 On post

426 On shares

3 Love
On post

2 On post

1 On shares

2 Haha
On post

2 On post

0 On shares

110 Wow
On post

48 On post

62 On shares

17 Sad
On post

9 On post

8 On shares

82 Angry
On post

63 On post

19 On shares

483 Comments
On Post

187 On Post

296 On Shares

397 Shares
On Post

388 On Post

9 On Shares

11,751 Post Clicks

0 Photo views
Link clicks

7,290 Link clicks

4,461 Other Clicks

NEGATIVE FEEDBACK

32 Hide Post **1** Hide All Posts

0 Report as Spam **0** Unlike Page

Insights activity is reported in the Pacific time zone. Ad activity is reported in the time zone of your ad account.

“GETTING BURNT” – 2017 SUNSCREENS TEST



- 20 products tested against the Australian/New Zealand standard AS/NZS 2604:2012
- Tested each sunscreen’s SPF and broad spectrum protection. Test laboratory Eurofins Dermatest
- Combination of chemical sunscreens and physical sunscreens – often marketed as “natural alternatives”
- Funded by Ministry of Health.

NATURAL PRODUCTS OFF THE MARKET



- Pure South – no SPF claims, raspberry oil noted as having SPF of 28-50, tested SPF 5
- Pure Blend – claimed SPF 15++, tested SPF 4
- Snowberry Family+ Sunscreen – claimed SPF 30, tested SPF 20, failed broad spectrum requirement. Relied on test results for a similar product.

IS THIS THE TIP OF THE ICEBERG?

“GETTING BURNT”

- Only 9 products (out of 20) met their SPF label claim and met broad spectrum requirements. Products ranged in price from \$5.60 - \$44 per 100ml.
- One product met SPF claims but failed broad spectrum
- One product claimed to provide up to eight hours’ protection from one application – not allowed according to the A/NZ standard.
- Six other products didn’t meet SPF label claims and when we asked for evidence there was a mixed response
 - ❖ Test results from US laboratories showing products had been tested on 10 human subjects and met their claimed SPF
 - ❖ Test results from Dermatest showing products tested on 10 human subjects and met claimed SPF – report from 2015
 - ❖ SPF based on test results for similar – but not identical products.

“NOTHING NEW”

- **In 2014 Consumer NZ tested 12 sunscreens (some marketed for children).**
 - ❖ Only 4 sunscreens met SPF claims and passed broad spectrum requirements.
 - ❖ Eight products failed either one or both tests.
 - ❖ Same issue with conflicting results from test laboratories.
- **Similar findings from overseas consumer organisations**
 - ❖ CHOICE tested six SPF 50+ sunscreens in 2015 and only two met the label claim of 50+
 - ❖ Consumer Reports (US) tested sunscreens in 2017. It found 23 (out of 62) tested at less than half their label SPF.

WHY THE VARIATION?

- Lack of consistency between labs – big differences in test results when products have supposedly been tested the same way.
- Lack of consistency between batches – some companies may only test a product when it's developed. There's no need to check different batches.
- Change of ingredient supply – especially an issue for sunscreens containing titanium dioxide or zinc oxide.
- Storage conditions – sunscreens deteriorate over time, especially if kept in hot places. Although this shouldn't affect our test as products were all new off the shelf.
- Testing on humans – people burn at different rates, which may give different results in small sample sizes.

DESPITE THESE POSSIBLE REASONS THE END RESULT FOR CONSUMERS IS THE SAME – CONSUMERS ARE CONFUSED ABOUT WHAT PRODUCTS TO BUY AND IT'S ERODING CONSUMER CONFIDENCE IN SUNSCREENS.

CONSUMER NZ ACTION

- 2015 – complaint laid with the Commerce Commission regarding the variability of sunscreen testing. Variability means consumers can't have confidence in label claims because of conflicting results and are being misled about the protection they are getting from sunscreens.
- Positive outcomes from Consumer NZ complaint
 - ❖ In 2016 the CC found Green People risked breaching the Fair Trading Act because it didn't have sufficient evidence to support its claims. The New Zealand distributor stopped selling the sunscreen and destroyed remaining stock.
 - ❖ In 2018 Johnson & Johnson signed court enforceable undertakings that all its products would now meet the A/NZ standard. This was three years after the initial complaint.

WHAT WE WANT

- New Zealand government to make the A/NZ standard mandatory. The current situation where compliance is voluntary isn't good enough for a country with one of the highest rates of skin cancer in the world. This would capture the natural products being sold in New Zealand that have undergone no testing at all.
- Companies to test each new formulation of a product, especially if it contains different active ingredients.
- Companies to regularly test products to ensure different batches still meet their label claims.
- Testing the testers – our tests has raised concerns about the variability of testing facilities and this needs to be investigated.