

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION**Seventh plenary meeting of the Public Health Commission****15.00 Friday 22 May 2009****100 Victoria Embankment, London (Unilever House)****Attendees:**

Chairman

Dave Lewis

Commission

Baroness Peta Buscombe, Helen McCallum, Fred Turok, Jeremy Beadles, Michael Livingston, Lucy Neville-Rolfe CMG, Douglas Smallwood, Professor Simon Capewell, Professor Judy Buttriss, Dr Nick Sheron, Mark Leventon (by phone)

Guests

Apologies

Paul Kelly, Professor David Coggon

Secretariat

Unilever: George Gordon, Tom Denyard, Danielle Hayward-Bradley; Open Road: Martin Le Jeune

	Item	Minutes	Actions/Recommendations
1	Chairman's Welcome		
2	Introductions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The subject, format and scope of the meeting were discussed Chairman gave a situational report to the Commission, outlining the key milestones on the critical path to launch 	
3	Working methods	<p>Chairman highlighted 4 key sections to the meeting, focusing on specific areas for discussion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Substantive issues: i) Change4Life, ii) Labelling, iii) Alcohol: Minimum Pricing and Taxation, iv) The public expenditure implications of our recommendations Other recommendations: Issues to be raised by exception Response to the Responsibility Deal: Issues to be raised by exception Launching the report The format of the report 	
4	1. Unresolved issues	<p>i) Change4Life</p> <p>Agreed that objectives need to be set by Government for Change4Life so that partnerships can be built in pursuit of deliverables that are absolutely clear for all parties. These deliverables should guide the focus of evaluation</p>	<p>Proposed that Project 10 (now known as the <i>Campaign for Smarter Drinking</i>) and</p>

Item	Minutes	Actions/Recommendations
	<p>Change4Life should be kept as two separate vehicles in the short term, but with the aspiration of moving them under one banner in the longer-term. Recognition that Change4Life would need to be treated quite differently to accommodate this</p> <p>Highlighted the importance of Government of no single stakeholder 'owning' Change4Life and the role of business4Life in delivering a degree of continuity</p> <p>There was support for the language of a healthy, balanced diet to address Salt, Fat, Sat Fat, Sugars & Calories in the context of dietary variety</p> <p>Outlined that there has not been any thorough-going evaluation of Change4Life yet and agreed that certain aspects might need to be altered as a result of evaluative work when it is completed</p> <p>ii) Labelling</p> <p>Agreed the importance of nutrition information being implemented across a broader range of environments than just in supermarkets</p> <p>Agreed that it is necessary to implement a consistent food labelling system that functions across all environments – the need for practicality was outlined as of utmost importance</p> <p>The limitations of implementing traffic lights across all sectors was explained and discussed</p> <p>Agreed that a disproportionate amount of time was spent on labelling discussions and that a consensus of some sort should be reached to avoid media focus on an area of disagreement rather than on the report as a whole</p> <p>Realistic portion size and extension to provide nutrition information out of home highlighted as a novel areas</p> <p>Agreed that the final report should highlight that food labelling should strive to achieve maximum intelligibility for the maximum number of consumers and that further research is required in order to better understand behaviour change in the consumer</p> <p>Agreed that in the longer-term a collaborative approach to developing more sophisticated nutrient profiling could help guide consumer choice and positively influence consumer</p>	

Item	Minutes	Actions/Recommendations
	<p>behaviour.</p> <p>iii) Alcohol: Minimum pricing and taxation</p> <p>It was agreed that the final report would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make clear that the PHC had not been established to review the issue of alcohol pricing in detail and had not • Comment that 2 policy options had been discussed: minimum pricing/cl of alcohol and fiscal incentives to promote the production and sale of lower %ABV alcohol within defined categories • Conclude that due to the complexity of the issue and time constraints under which it was operating, the PHC drew no firm conclusions with regards the appropriateness of introducing these measures. The Commission did, however, agree that Government should very deliberately review what role they might play as part of a comprehensive suite of measures in addressing the public health implications of hazardous and harmful drinking <p>It was also acknowledged that funding for alcohol services was inadequate, and a clear recommendation outlining the need for enhanced investment should feature in the final report</p> <p>iv) The public expenditure of our recommendations</p> <p>Agreed that Government should establish what it spends on public health and should monitor and review this on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>Outlined the importance of specific interventions on cost of prevention against cost of cure.</p> <p>Where there were potentially long-term implications for public expenditure, these were subject to piloting and evaluation (e.g. school lunches).</p> <p>As an incentive to business matched funding could be introduced at relatively low levels at first, before being expanded in the light of valid results</p>	
5 Other recommendations	<p>The removal of industrial trans fats in Out of Home environments was highlighted as important for inclusion in the final report.</p> <p>Called for the need to emphasise the reduction of energy dense foods in the report</p>	

Item	Minutes	Actions/Recommendations
	<p>Highlighted the importance of making it clear in the report that curriculum enrichment remain unbranded</p> <p>Proposed that a mention of the continuation of best practice methods rather than coming up with new ideas was preferable</p>	
6 Response to the Responsibility Deal	<p>Requested that the response was aligned to the recommendations that had been discussed and agreed</p>	
7 Launching the report	<p>Andrew Lansley to be invited as a guest to the launch on 1 July</p> <p>Agreed the importance of maintaining the independence of the PHC up to and including the launch of the final report. Request to add 'independent' into the Public Health Commission's name was raised to emphasise this point at publication</p> <p>Agreed that the Secretariat should prepare 3-4 key areas of focus and a briefing sheet to support Commission members at launch</p> <p>The format of the report to be left to the Secretariat's discretion</p>	
8 Conclusion	<p>In conclusion, the following comments were made:</p> <p>Specific guests for invite to the launch should be emailed to the secretariat by Thursday 27 May</p> <p>Venue for the launch – tbc (but should be held in central London)</p> <p>Response from each Commission member to the three questions for media use to be returned to the Secretariat by June 19th</p> <p>Decided a conference call should be held after 1 July re: PHC future actions</p>	
9 AOB		