

**SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION**

**Sixth plenary meeting of the Public Health Commission**

**09.00 Friday 8 May 2009**

**Tate Gallery, Bankside**

**Attendees:**

Chairman	Dave Lewis
Commission	Baroness Peta Buscombe, Helen McCallum, Professor David Coggon, Mark Leventon, Fred Turok, Jeremy Beadles, Michael Livingston, Lucy Neville-Rolfe CMG, Professor Judy Buttriss, Douglas Smallwood, Paul Kelly, Dr Nick Sheron
Apologies	Professor Simon Capewell
Secretariat	George Gordon, Tom Denyard, Danielle Hayward-Bradley (Unilever); Martin Le Jeune (Open Road)

Item	Minutes	Actions/Recommendations
1 Chairman's Presentation	<p>The chairman presented an analysis covering the work of the Commission so far, the possible response to the Responsibility Deal, and the areas where further recommendations might be made. He invited responses from all members of the Commissions.</p> <p>In response the following points were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was unanimous support for producing a report which went beyond the terms of the original Responsibility Deal</li> <li>• Members welcomed the outline structure put forward by the Chairman although had observations on points of detail</li> <li>• On specific points the following suggestions were made:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ There needed to be more on the ultimate goals and timings of actions</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

	<p>proposed by the Commission</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The Commission should be aware that politicians were likely to seize on a few key recommendations rather than the overall structure – the structure proposed might be expressed in too complex a way for easy assimilation by politicians</li> <li>○ Further work was required on the nature of the partnership between government and business; in particular though should be given to the breadth of partnership required for first-class delivery</li> <li>○ There was an argument for including some sort of quantum in the final report in terms of spending required (via matched funding or otherwise) to effect real change</li> <li>○ Unless properly presented the report might seem insufficiently radical when what was needed was a genuinely different way of approaching important issues</li> <li>○ The report had to offer a genuinely new approach</li> <li>○ The Commission needed both quick wins and a means to remind people that this was a long-term issue in which progress might take many years</li> <li>○ The greatest opportunity to influence children of school age was through a structured approach to curriculum enrichment in which business and the third-sector could play a leading role</li> <li>○ The tone could be considered too interventionist and some language shifts may be necessary ahead of publication and launch</li> <li>○ Being different was less important than producing recommendations of real quality</li> <li>○ Some issues (e.g. alcohol pricing) would require a formula to show that members had agreed to disagree</li> <li>○ It was not accurate to focus on reducing calories in as there were also problems with poor diets, anorexia and other eating disorders</li> <li>○ The Commission had been able to offer novelty in terms not of what had to be done, but how it should be done and that was important</li> <li>○ And in terms of the 'how' the proposed report would offer simplicity, and removal of duplication and a reduction in wasted effort – all of which were</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

		<p>positive messages.</p>	
2	Review of recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Chairman then asked members to look in detail at the proposed recommendations in order to identify those which seemed to offer something genuinely new to the debate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members identified the following elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The emphasis of enhanced partnership</li> <li>○ The recommendation on the communication of alcohol quantity by volume (mls) rather than nominal units</li> <li>○ The emphasis on early years intervention</li> <li>○ The concept of a single vehicle for delivering health messages through all channels and the focus on three only</li> <li>○ The focus on much more action in OOH</li> <li>○ And a similar emphasis on the possibilities of intervention in the workplace, including fiscal recommendations</li> <li>○ The shift in resources to alcohol treatment and intervention</li> <li>○ The emphasis on education and exercise, not just diet</li> <li>○ The suggestions on the use of labelling (which in OOH would be restricted to major companies, not small outlets)</li> <li>○ The role of the government leading by example with its workforce and supply base</li> <li>○ The management of competition law in light of public health concerns and opportunities for business to collaboratively address them</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
3	Other issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some members of the Commission suggested that the report should be categorical about the establishment of a new Department of Public Health</li> <li>• There was no need to list the recommendations in priority order but a timeline would be preferable</li> <li>• The issue of using the tax system to incentivise low ABV drinks would be the subject of a paper by Jeremy beables</li> <li>• There were limits to the extent to which the government should be expected to impose standards on all suppliers</li> </ul>	<p>JB</p> <p> </p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Food signpost labelling issues would be discussed at a separate meeting between Unilever, LNR and PK</li> <li>• The approach to alcohol taxation would be the subject of a discussion between NS, JB, ML and Unilever</li> <li>• The question of appropriate language, tone, and pitch for the final report and recommendations would be picked up in a meeting between PB, LNR and the Chairman</li> <li>• Questions of expenditure and the quantum behind recommendations would be considered in a Secretariat paper</li> </ul>	GG, LNR, PK   NS, JB, ML, TD  PB, LNR, Chairman
4	Summing up	<p>Summing up, the Chairman said a great deal had been achieved in the discussion and a broad consensus had emerged. The secretariat would now work on a paper covering all the main agreed recommendations and circulate that in advance of the next meeting. Proposals for the structure of the final report and its publication would also be brought forward.</p> <p>In conclusion, the Chairman reminded members that a strict embargo on public comment on the report was now in force until publication.</p> <p>The provisional date for publication was currently 1 July 2009.</p>	Secretariat
	AOB	Date and time of next meeting: Friday 22 May, 15:00, 100 VE	