

PART

**I**

---

# *MARKET AND TRENDS*

COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL



# THE NATURAL PERSONAL CARE MARKET

Darrin C. Duber-Smith<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Green Marketing, Inc., Denver, CO

<sup>2</sup>Metropolitan State College of Denver, Denver, CO

## 1.1 HISTORY'S "NATURAL" PROGRESSION

"Natural" and "certified organic." For many years, the very words were enough to make a cynical cosmetic chemist scoff and furrow a marketer's brow. Are natural cosmetics a passing fad or an established long-term trend? Can natural cosmetic ingredients ever be as effective as their synthetic counterparts? Will governments ever define the term natural? Will "mainstream" companies ever properly address this opportunity? Well, the jury is in. After two decades, the natural and organic personal care industry continues to grow at double-digit rates, barring the recessionary dip in 2008 and 2009 where rates dropped into the high single digits, and larger cosmetic companies have finally figured out that high growth rates and return on investment for shareholders go hand in hand. Thus, formulating with natural and organic ingredients has moved from a novelty to an imperative for many cosmetic companies.

The origin of the natural and organic products industry, with its roots in healthy foods and beverages, can be traced as far back as the beginning of the last century in recognition of the efforts of the famous health enthusiast Will Kellogg and a handful of early pioneering companies such as lozenge maker Thayer's and vitamin provider KAL. These early visionaries can at least be partially credited with the initial commercialization of natural products on a large scale. However, decades of "better living through chemistry" resulted in the development of tens of thousands of effective, synthetic ingredients that could be easily standardized and manufactured on a large scale. Food and personal care companies were the major beneficiaries of such technological advancements, and consumers appreciated the proliferation of effective product options. Natural products were to take a back seat, at least temporarily.

A peppering of small food and nutritional supplement companies dominated the niche's natural products landscape, as few people were willing to compromise on effectiveness, taste, price, convenience, and other variables, very much preferring the widely available synthetic offerings. The zeitgeist of the 1960s illustrated by books

---

*Formulating, Packaging, and Marketing of Natural Cosmetic Products*, First Edition.

Edited by Nava Dayan and Lambros Kromidas.

© 2011 John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Published 2011 by John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

such as Rachel Carson's environmental bombshell, *Silent Spring*, along with the civil rights movement, helped fuel an increasing consumer demand for effective products that were healthier for people and better for the environment. At that time, natural personal care represented only a small handful of these businesses and the concept of organic agriculture was in its infancy.

A result of this "hippie"-inspired movement was the proliferation of the natural channel, a loose network of independent "health food" stores found in every region of the country, and an important step in getting natural products into the hands of the consumers who needed them. Poorly capitalized entrepreneurs struggled to make effective products for this growing consumer segment, but at least now they had a place to sell them. Most of these stores sold bulk grains and whatever brands they could get their hands on. Personal care items were limited to a variety of salves and balms, but nothing close to the range of sophisticated product offerings we see as of this printing.

The 1970s and 1980s saw huge increases at every stage of the value chain. Since demand for all products and services is ultimately derived from the end user, retailers required more and increasingly effective branded products and manufacturers required the ingredients to produce them. The loose network of suppliers, manufacturers, and intermediaries was transforming into a sophisticated supply chain. More importantly, people were starting to prosper, and early entrepreneurs cashed out their investments to start second-generation firms. Personal care became a bona fide section of the store with the emergence of "supernatural" retailers such as Wild Oats Markets, Whole Foods Markets, Fresh Fields, Bread and Circus, Boney's, Trader Joe's, and dozens of others. Recognized brands such as Aveda and the Body Shop, companies that have traditionally used some natural ingredients, were what passed for natural products in the mainstream channels during that time.

The year 1990 ushered in a new decade of double-digit growth in the food, beverage, functional food, and nutritional supplement segments and saw the beginning of industry consolidation as entrepreneurs implemented their exit strategies and large portfolios of brands were compiled by companies such as the Hain Celestial Group. By the late 1990s, several conferences produced by Natural Business Communications were dedicated to the financial side of the business (as private and public equity players scoped out the opportunity), in addition to a huge proliferation of events all over the world. At that time, the personal care segment, although still dominated by a dozen or so companies generating several million in sales each as well as thousands of crude products made in kitchens and bathtubs, began a sustained growth spurt that continues to this day.

At the end of the first decade in this new century, many of the pioneering brands have been purchased by larger players, as Colgate now owns Tom's of Maine and Clorox owns industry leader Burt's Bees. Organic regulations that were written for food, now for the most part, apply to personal care, although there are still some points of contention. There are no regulations per se regarding use of the word natural in marketing, so there is much liberal use of the term. The practice of "dusting" products with inadequate amounts of active botanicals, for example, is well known. Consumers obviously expect that a product marketed as "natural" contains at least a majority of natural ingredients, but this is often not the case. The question of how to define a natural ingredient is now compounded by how to define and label a natural product,

which is supposed to contain some amount of natural ingredients. The industry has come a long way in the decade prior to this writing, and third-party certifications abound causing much confusion in the marketplace.

The remainder of this chapter will be dedicated to providing the reader with an understanding of the current business environment as well as what to expect for the near future in natural cosmetics.

## 1.2 THE NATURE OF NATURAL

---

That the current situation around defining what constitutes a natural cosmetic product is unclear is a gross understatement. Any effort to define what natural really means must begin at the root problem. In the case of a natural personal care product, one must first decide what constitutes a “natural” ingredient. Once that has been accomplished, one can set standards as to what percentage of natural ingredients must be present in a product as well as what types of ingredients must never be included in a natural product for it to be called “natural.”

Would it be helpful if there were such an accepted standard? Unfortunately this is fantasy, as there exist few government regulations in the area of natural ingredients (except for fragrances and a very loose definition of natural in the United States) and therefore a lack of standards for finished products themselves. As we know, in the absence of government regulations, organizations are “supervised” by a patchwork of stakeholder groups including competitors, supply chain members, the media, non-government organizations (nonprofit organizations, etc.), customers, shareholders, and others. This is generally a model that leads to corporate improvisation and consumer confusion in the marketplace since terminology is not commonly understood and there are numerous opportunities to engage in ethically questionable behavior with regard to product claims.

In the case of natural personal care, it is my opinion that it should be generally understood that a natural ingredient should be neither synthetically derived nor synthetically processed. This means that a natural ingredient must be “found in nature” *and* be free of synthetic additives in processing as well as “overprocessing.” Most definitions of natural mention the idea of “minimal processing,” but this is vague. Abuses are numerous in this area as well because of the highly interpretive nature of processing. Add this to the traditional unwillingness by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration and other government bodies to address this growing issue and the result is a proverbial “elephant in the living room.” Nevertheless, there are a growing number of third-party organizations and industry associations that have developed and marketed various models, certifications, and labeling requirements for natural products. Some of these models are more stringent than others, and this is indeed better than nothing at all, but unfortunately none of these programs is consistent with each other and none has emerged as a standard with a high degree of awareness by industry or consumers. With regard to the “natural” distinction, the most promising as of this writing appear to be the Natural Products Association standard in the United States and the much older BDIH European standard for natural, which among others are listed below.

The following general guidelines may be of preference regardless of the labeling certification used. Any certification should involve the following:

1. A stringent definition of what constitutes a natural ingredient.
2. A list of synthetically and naturally derived ingredients that may not be included in a natural product under any circumstance (examples include many of those identified by various government and third-party organizations, such as the European Union and the California Green Chemistry Initiative, as potentially harmful or actually toxic).
3. A labeling standard that recognizes *four* different levels of a natural product. Water cannot and therefore does not count as ingredient when calculating percentage of the whole numbers since the result would be skewed in favor of a more “natural” product.
  - a. A “100% natural” product claim would include no synthetic or banned ingredients whatsoever, and only 100% natural ingredients are allowed.
  - b. A “natural” product would include 95% or higher natural ingredients and none of the banned ingredients. The remaining 5% could be synthetically derived and/or processed but not any as discussed in item 2 above.
  - c. A “made with natural ingredients” product would contain between 70% and 95% natural ingredients and no banned ingredients.
  - d. A product that has fewer than 70% natural ingredients would be allowed to emphasize such ingredients denoting them as natural on the label but would not be allowed to make any other natural claim on the primary display panel (unlike the previous three scenarios), and would allow even banned ingredients.
4. A standard that has government oversight (both United States and European Union for a start) as well as enforcement.

It seems logical that any future natural regulation would mirror the existing U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Certified Organic regulations as far as percentage content and what claims can be made are concerned. Therefore, a product with 100% natural ingredients could be marketed as “100% natural.” A product with 95% or higher natural ingredients could denote “natural.” A product with 70% or higher natural ingredients could claim “made with natural ingredients.” And the product that has less than 70% natural ingredients could only denote an ingredient as natural in the ingredient panel. These are the rules for USDA Certified Organic and could be used as a framework for natural marketing guidelines.

### 1.3 THE ORGANIC PANIC

---

It is crucial to understand the difference between “natural” and “certified organic,” the latter of which is largely defined and regulated within the United States. When the regulations for “certified organic” were created for foods in the mid-1990s and the USDA tasked with oversight of the third-party certification process, the framers of this groundbreaking legislation did not address personal care. The regulations were

intended only for ingestible and not topical ingredients. Personal care was not addressed until a few years later when larger players began to penetrate the natural space and realized that they had great flexibility with regard to formulation and product claims in the area of organic as well. Companies that had traditionally operated within the organic channel scrambled to address the issue.

As a result, the USDA disallowed the use of the USDA Certified Organic seal on cosmetics for a brief period, reinstated it, and is as of this writing still in the process of finalizing the requirements for such products. The outcome would have great industry impact since a generally accepted standard in the United States is likely to have very large global impact. In Europe, the Cosmetics Organic and Natural Standard (COSMOS) program was instituted in 2008 to harmonize some of the various certifications. These standards, however harmonized, enjoy very little awareness in the United States, and it will be interesting to follow future actions as to which certifications will win the hearts and minds of the U.S. market. It may be that the USDA backing combined with the strength and size of the U.S. market for personal care products gives USDA Certified Organic a competitive advantage.

A certified organic product by definition must be natural, but also much, much more. For USDA Organic certification, the ingredients (which must also be certified in order for the finished product to display the seal) must adhere to the requirements outlined in the USDA's National Organic Program, which include agricultural restrictions such as water usage, crop rotation, use of pesticides and herbicides, and so on. These requirements can be found on the organization's web site, and approved third-party certifiers such as Quality Assurance International provide the actual certification services. The USDA acts as overseer. It is all very neat in theory, and the pending clarification by the USDA and others should rocket this area into the stratosphere as it has for USDA Certified Organic foods.

## 1.4 LABELING AND CERTIFICATIONS

---

There are dozens of certifications related to eco-friendly and wholesome products and services. However, the "eco-labels" we are most concerned with specifically address natural and/or organic offerings. Below is a listing and description of the major natural and/or organic certifications as of this writing:

- *United States* (nonharmonized standards from four different entities)
  1. USDA Organic
  2. OASIS (Organic and Sustainability Industry Standards)
  3. National Sanitation Foundation (NSF)'s Made with Organic Personal Care Standard
  4. Natural Products Association (NPA)

These standards are very different from one another. For example, USDA Organic is for organic products only while the Natural Products Association standards are intended for natural cosmetics, and not organic ones.

- *Europe*

COSMOS (formed of the below listed separate organizations for the purpose of developing one harmonized European standard)

1. ECOCERT (France)
2. Soil Association (UK)
3. Bundesverband Deutscher Industrie- und Handelsunternehmen (BDIH) (Germany)
4. L'Associazione Italiana per l'Agricoltura Biologica (AIAB) and Istituto per la Certificazione Etica e Ambientale (ICEA) (Italy)
5. BioForum (Belgium)
6. Cosmebio (France)

Although it is impressive that six different organizations were both willing and able to harmonize their standards, it would appear that greater adoption of one or more of these standards could be accomplished through merging the six under one European Union moniker. The likelihood of this happening is improbable or it would already have been done when the standards were identified in the first place, so some of the confusion that such harmonization is intended to alleviate remains present. Other European certifications include Organic Farmers and Growers (UK), The International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements, IBD (Istituto Biodinâmico) Certified Organic (Latin America), and IBD Natural Ingredients. It is interesting to note that IDB has separate certifications for natural and organic, and this could be a good model for certifying organizations to follow, as it is easier to gain awareness of one brand name as opposed to more than one.

If the reader is confused, it is because of the current state of affairs in marketing natural/organic cosmetics. As of this writing, other than the COSMOS effort for a single European organic standard (albeit under six different certifying names), there has not been much in the way of advancing the harmonization of natural/organic cosmetics. The USDA organic standards for food, which may be applied to cosmetics and will experience several future adjustments, continue to be the predominant organic standard in the United States. ECOCERT is perhaps the most recognized standard for both natural and organic in Europe. It is likely that a major marketing effort funded by cosmetic companies would dramatically increase awareness, and perhaps demand, among the general population for any certification the organizations choose. Such a program could be facilitated by government and the certifiers themselves.

## 1.5 THE INDUSTRY

---

For many years, numerous marketing research companies have produced reports based on limited understanding of the natural and organic products industry. Such is the case with most of the larger, global organizations that analyze multiple industries such as Packaged Facts and Datamonitor. Two research companies that specialize only in natural products and have both produced numerous reports since the late 1990s are therefore chosen for discussion. The consumer market for natural products will be



described later with special recognition given to the Natural Marketing Institute (NMI) of Harleysville, PA. The purpose of this section, however, is to describe the supply chain and provide some very revealing industry data provided by *Nutrition Business Journal*, a publication of New Hope Natural Media, the largest and perhaps the most important organization in the natural products industry due to its dominance in print, in person, and online media and communication in the natural and organic space.

The natural and organic personal care industry is served by a wide variety of generalized and highly specialized suppliers and service companies. These organizations are responsible for the ingredients and components of the products consumers buy and range from large global chemical companies that offer a few natural and/or certified organic ingredients to very small regional players that may offer only one or two niche ingredients. Service companies range from insurance and legal to strategic planning consultants and associations. Natural ingredients are usually found in good supply, but certified organic ingredients are less available. Traditionally, demand for many of these ingredients tends to be greater than the supply, which can be a major barrier to adoption on a large scale.

Branded product manufacturers, the most visible of all supply chain members, are now dominated by a small number of larger companies. Many branded product manufacturers have been acquired by either large personal care companies or smaller investment interests and have grown exponentially since the infusion of capital and expansion of distribution have allowed them to do so. A huge number of smaller organizations are still able to compete adequately, enjoying relatively large profit margins, healthy growth rates, and all of the entrepreneurial perks (and headaches) that come with private ownership. The highly publicized acquisition of industry leader Burt's Bees by Clorox and the Colgate-Palmolive's purchase of strongly branded Tom's of Maine in the latter part of the last decade epitomize the recognition by all stakeholders that the health and wellness trend is not merely a fad and will continue to affect the ways by which business operates.

Table 1.1 shows a 2008 list of branded product *natural* personal care manufacturers, their estimated sizes, and estimated share of certified organic sales.

It is obvious that a smaller revenue base is most certainly correlated with the likelihood of offering certified organic products as part of a brand's natural offerings, and the reasons for this are unclear. It should also be noted that the list in Table 1.1 does not include the many hundreds of smaller players offering products through a variety of distribution channels. So, the question remains, as we make our way downstream through the supply chain, how do branded product manufacturers deliver their products to the growing base of natural and organic cosmetics consumers.

Natural and organic products are still offered in the original "natural channel" consisting of literally 10,000 plus independent health food stores, pill shops, and small chains. These stores, which source products directly from manufacturers and from small wholesalers, are present in most communities in the United States and areas of Europe, and tend to be the primary channel for the smaller branded product manufacturers who cannot handle large distribution and who serve the core natural products user. This channel is still very strong, and the criticism with the natural products industry that smaller stores would lose out as stronger distribution channels enter the marketplace has been dramatically overstated.

**TABLE 1.1    Largest Natural and Organic Personal Care Companies [1]**

Brand/company	Size (millions of dollars)	Certified organic sales (%)
Burt’s Bees (Clorox)	250–350	0
Aveda (Estee Lauder)	250–350	0
Aveeno (Johnson & Johnson)	150–200	0
The Body Shop (L’Oreal)	150–200	20
Nu Skin	150–200	0
Hain Celestial Group	150–200	5
N.V. Dr. Perricone, MD Cosm	150–200	0
Bare Escentuals	100–150	5
Jurlique	100–150	0
Tom’s of Maine (Colgate-Palmolive)	50–100	0
Dr. Hauschka	30–50	20
Dr. Bronner’s	30–50	40
Yes to Carrots	30–50	15
Nature’s Gate (Levlad)	30–50	20
Avon	30–50	0
Weleda	30–50	20
Giovanni	30–50	60
Aubrey Organics	30–50	100

Whole Foods Markets remains the leader in the “supernatural channel” consisting of larger supermarket-style “gourmet crossover” format stores that buy products from larger manufacturers and serve a more mainstream and higher income natural products consumer. Other examples include Trader Joe’s and Larry’s Markets on the west coast.

Larger manufacturers now offer products through big discount retailers such as Target and Wal-Mart and mainstream grocery stores, and smaller ones through spas, salons, gift shops, and other specialty stores. Examples of direct channels include television, radio, Internet, and even the controversial multilevel/network marketing channel that popularized companies such as Avon, Mary Kay, and Amway. A myriad of opportunities await the well-funded brand!

Table 1.2 shows a breakdown of the 2008 U.S. natural and organic personal care market by sales channel in 2008. The six categories described in Table 1.2 are very

**TABLE 1.2    Natural and Organic Personal Care Channel Breakdown [2]**

Sales channel	2008 sales (%)
Natural/specialty retail	30
Network marketing	21
Mass market/beauty	20
Other direct (TV, Internet)	11
Dept store/salon/spa	10
Specialty personal care	8

**TABLE 1.3 Natural and Organic Personal Care Channel Breakdown [2]**

Product category	Total conversion sales	NOG sales/penetration	NOG growth (%)
Cosmetics	\$15.1 billion	\$419 million/2.8%	10.1
Feminine hygiene	\$2.76 billion	\$100 million/3.6%	15.1
Hair care/color	\$10.01 billion	\$1.72 billion/17%	11.3
Baby care	\$623 million	\$159 million/25.5%	18.4
Nail care	\$730 million	\$24 million/3.2%	9.2
Oral hygiene	\$4.91 billion	\$605 million/12.3%	7.3
Bath items	\$659 million	\$147 million/22.2%	6.3
Deodorants	\$1.61 billion	\$217 million/13.5%	9.5
Shaving	\$1.81 billion	\$138 million/7.6%	8.7
Skincare	\$9.20 billion	\$3.05 billion/33.1%	6.6
Soap	\$3.53 billion	\$998 million/28.2%	7.8
Fragrances/aromas	\$5.91 billion	\$352 million/6%	6
Total personal care	\$56.98 billion	\$7.92 billion/13.9%	8.4

broad but provide the reader with an idea as to how and where these products are sold. Of particular note is the continued dominance of the natural channel and the surprising share the multilevel/network marketing category enjoys in the United States.

The growth rates shown in Table 1.3 suggest growing revenue and penetration rates for natural and organic products into the conventional area. Also notable are the high natural penetration rates in skincare, bath items, soap, hair care, and baby care suggesting that a growing number of consumers prefer natural/organic options to conventional offerings. Clearly, there remain myriad opportunities for growth in this not yet mature market.

## 1.6 THE NATURAL AND ORGANIC CONSUMER

As there are many marketing research companies that study the industry trends, many as has been said from the outside looking in, there are a number of companies that specialize in tracking the trends of consumer demographics (describing consumers in terms of size and structure), geographic location, and psychographics (behaviors and attitudes). The most prolific such study, the LOHAS segmentation (as described below), is one that is developed and fielded by the NMI and now has over 10 years of history in identifying and tracking consumer preferences and characteristics through market segmentation studies.

The first such study was conducted by Natural Business Communications, a producer of industry news and conferences, in 1999 and spawned an annual convention, quarterly, publication, web site, and the important study mentioned above. The pioneering work (yours truly was on the development team) was institutionalized by NMI, while the former parent of Natural Business Communications now operates the event, publication, and web site. It is important that research continues year after year so that outlying data and fads can be separated from the statistically important information, so this study is the one the author has chosen.

*LOHAS* stands for lifestyles of health and sustainability, and the study is commissioned primarily to identify appropriate target markets for natural, organic, and environment-friendly products and services. Natural personal care represents one of the fastest growing segments of this marketplace. Natural Marketing Institute considers a natural personal care user to be one who has purchased at least one product during the previous 6 months. In 2007, according to NMI 38% of general population consumers have classified themselves this way.

The LOHAS segment breaks down the U.S. population into five market segment categories based on demographic, geographic, and psychographic characteristics reflecting attitudes and behaviors with regard to natural products.

The primary target for most natural products is the aptly named LOHAS segment, consisting of 19% of the general population. Consumers in this segment tend to live a healthy lifestyle and will go out of their way to purchase natural and organic products. They are early adopters, opinion leaders, and avid users of green products. They aren't necessarily high-income group and tend to be higher educated. While concentrated more heavily on the coasts, they are actually located throughout the United States.

*Naturalites*, another attractive market segment, representing 19% of the general consumer population, are more interested in health than they are in the environment, and they are primary users of natural and organic personal care. They are higher income group and tend to be better educated than the general population. So far in our discussion, the target market for natural and organic personal care products stands at 38% of U.S. adults, but we have an even larger segment to include in our marketing planning.

*DRIFTERS*, the largest market segment at 25% of the general population, tend to be much younger and have yet to develop their own values structures and ingrained purchase patterns. They are motivated by the latest trends and shift on commitments to many issues, but it is probable that the majority of these drifters will become LOHAS or Naturalites as they get older.

The other two segments, *Conventionals* (lower income folks motivated by price and practicality) and *Unconcerned* (the nomenclature reflects the general attitude), are not primary targets, but the ongoing proliferation of natural/organic cosmetic product availability coupled with the growing health and wellness trend might change this. These segments are ignored in the targeting process for now, but must still be monitored as the growing popularity and availability of natural products will surely bring some of these consumers from these two segments into one of the other three segments. The bottom line is that about 50% of adults are in the primary target for natural and organic personal care products through the LOHAS segmentation model.

Again, this is only one example of many studies dedicated to studying this field, and the author's own personal bias coupled with the consistent findings of the study over a long period of time makes it a very appropriate example for this book [4].

## 1.7 A LOOK AHEAD

---

The natural and organic personal care industry itself, together with the behavior of consumers, represents a large part of strategic marketing planning, but marketers must also consider other factors in the external business environment all of which will affect

the nature of the product, its pricing, the optimal channels of distribution, and the most effective methods and messaging with regard to promotion.

For instance, the economic environment, a factor completely out of the control of the marketer, affects all aspects of business, from the upstream members of the supply chain down to the consumer at the very end. The question has always been, “To what degree does a recession affect the sales of personal care products?” The so-called lipstick effect is a phenomenon identified decades ago when researchers discovered that sales of personal care products actually ticked up when there was a recession. The reasons for this have been a subject of great debate for many years, ranging from an increase in “pampering” behavior due to economic and personal malaise to a desire to look your best when unemployment is high. In the most recent recession (2007–2009), the results indicate that the conventional category of personal care products took a pretty big hit as sales and revenues dropped off at industry giants such as L’Oreal. The natural personal care industry, on the other hand, dropped from growth rates in the high teens to growth rates around 8–10% annually. This is a true indicator of the power of this market and the necessity to meet demand by formulating appropriate products.

*The legal, regulatory, and political environments*, also out of the control of the industry, must be monitored by the marketers as they are ever changing and not always favorable to the industry. In the case of natural and organic personal care products, it has been said that few regulations are in place. Rather, industry is a patchwork of association regulations, third-party certifications, and haphazard government attempts at clearing the confusion. Some organizations take advantage of this with misrepresentations, since most consumers cannot differentiate between natural and organic products. Consequently, the organizations that are truly addressing the needs of this market are losing their competitive advantage. Perhaps the most important threat to this industry is the lack of guidelines and oversight.

There is little doubt that the decades long social trend of consumer attitudes and behavior toward health and wellness bodes increasingly well for ethical companies that are producing truly natural products and therefore addressing the basic consumer need for products that are healthier for them and the environment. The target markets will continue to grow, the penetration rates of natural and organic into conventional will increase, the number of players will proliferate, and numerous opportunities for long-term success can be enacted. “Green washers” (those who position products as “green,” but whose commitment to social and environmental responsibility is questioned by stakeholder groups) will be fingered by competitors, activist consumers, supply chain members, the media, and so on, so misrepresentation of products as natural or organic is never an effective long-term strategy.

Government regulation may eventually occur in the natural area, an area that is still much larger than the better defined and regulated organic space. It will take time, but the industry is light years ahead of where it was 10 years ago. In general, any uniform standard for a natural product most likely will require at least 95% natural ingredients for a natural product claim to be made. Obviously, with the notable exception of an all-organic product, a 100% natural product, labeled as such and protected by regulations, will enjoy a competitive advantage over all others.

The challenges inherent in working with these interesting ingredients are indeed surmountable, as many cosmetic chemists have recently chosen to specialize in this area as a way to differentiate themselves from other, less progressive chemists. The question is no longer “why” one should produce natural products, but rather “how.” Your organization will reap myriad benefits through addressing the growing need in the marketplace with ingredients and finished product. Failure to recognize this important shift in the personal care marketplace will result in repercussions that will last a very long time.

## **REFERENCES**

---

1. *Nutr. Bus. J.* 2009;XIV(2):7.
2. *Nutr. Bus. J.* 2009;XIV(2):5.
3. *Nutr. Bus. J.* 2009;XIV(2):1.
4. *LOHAS J.* 2009;(Spring):17.