

The PolMark Project

Policies on Marketing food and beverages to children



Final project report
Summary of Actions
February 2010

<http://www.polmarkproject.net/>

Acknowledgements

This report arises from the PolMark project which has received funding from the European Union, in the framework of the Public Health Programme.

Additional work was undertaken during the PolMark Project supported by the Health Directorate of Norway and by the UK National Heart Forum.

This document is the sole responsibility of the authors.

The Executive Agency for Health and Consumers and the other funding bodies are not in any way responsible for the use that is made of the information contained herein.



Project No 2007325

The results discussed in this report represent the individual viewpoints of those interviewed, and thus are not necessarily representative of the official positions of the institutions or organisations for which the interviewees work.

We were able to undertake the PolMark project thanks to the informants and participants interviewed, who gave so generously of their time; to them we offer our wholehearted thanks.

Websites:

<http://www.polmarkproject.net/>
<http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html>

© 2010

International Association for the Study of Obesity

28 Portland Place

London W1B 1LY, UK

tel +44 (0) 20 7467 9610

www.iaso.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>PolMark Partners</i>	1
<i>Abstract of project proposal</i>	2
<i>Summary report</i>	3
1. Overview	3
2. Specification of the project:.....	4
2.1 General objective of the project:	4
2.2 Specific objectives of the project	4
2.3 Overview of activities for the period covered in the interim report.....	5
2.4 Summary of manpower utilised	7
3 Implementation of the project	9
WP1: Coordination of the project	9
WP2: Dissemination strategy	10
WP3: Evaluation of the project	12
4 Core activities to achieve project objectives	13
WP4: Review of current regulatory controls on marketing to children	13
WP5: Stakeholder views on marketing food to children.....	15
WP6: Mapping for Health Impact Assessment development.....	20

Detailed Reports of PolMark Activities (separate volumes)

Annex 1: Regulatory Review (WP4)

- 1.1: Report on findings: overview
 - 1.1.1: Details of findings for each EU 27 member state
 - 1.1.2: Details of findings for other countries worldwide

Annex 2: Stakeholder views (WP5)

- 2.1. Stakeholder views in each of 11 member states
 - 2.1.1. Belgium (and EU representative agencies)
 - 2.1.2. Cyprus
 - 2.1.3. Czech Republic
 - 2.1.4. Denmark
 - 2.1.5. France
 - 2.1.6. Ireland
 - 2.1.7. Poland
 - 2.1.8. Slovenia
 - 2.1.9. Spain
 - 2.1.10. Sweden
 - 2.1.11. United Kingdom
- 2.2. Cross-national report of views in all 11 member states
- 2.3. Interview protocol and coding sheet

Annex 3: Report on the analysis of quantified impact assessments (WP6)

Annex 4: Report on project coordination, dissemination and evaluation

- 4.1. Report of milestone records and manpower
 - 4.1.1. Milestone records (meeting agendas, minutes etc)
 - 4.1.2. Manpower for the execution of activities
- 4.2. Report of dissemination
 - 4.2.1. Examples of dissemination
- 4.3. Report of evaluation
 - 4.3.1. Evaluator's report of the PolMark project

PolMark Partners

Principal Investigator: Tim Lobstein, IASO, 28 Portland Place, London, UK

Belgium The European Consumers' Organisation

Team members: Ruth Veal, Henry Uitslag, Joelle Come, Axel Jansen

Cyprus Research and Education Institute of Child Health

Team members: Savvas Savva, Michael Tornaritis, Monica Shiakou

Czech Republic Masaryk University

Team members: Zuzana Derflerova Brazdova, Jana Fialova

Denmark Suhr's University College / Metropolitan University College

Team members: Aileen Robertson, Irene Norlund, Lene Ljungqvist, Dorthe Elisabeth Jorgensen, Liselotte Hedegaard, Elaine Jessen-Klixbull, Marielouise Maerkedahl, Nina Norgaard Sorensen.

France Institut de Recherche pour le Développement

Team members Michelle Holdsworth, Sophie Tessier, Francis Delpuech

Ireland Irish Heart Foundation

Team members: Maureen Mulvihill, Barbara Battel Kirk, Janis Morrissey

Poland Association of Polish Consumers

Team members: Grażyna Rokicka, Tomasz Odziemczyk, Iwona Olejnik, Dorota Trzmiel, Sławomir Zaborek, Barbara Eichler, Maria Postelk

Slovenia National Institute of Public Health

Team members: Mojca Gabrijelcic, Nina Scagnetti, Matej Gregorič, Vida Turk, Nina Žaler, Špela Jakob.

Spain University of Alicante

Team members: Rocío Ortiz, Carmen Davo, Carlos Alvarez-Dardet

Sweden Stockholm County Council and the Karolinska Institute

Team members: Liselotte Schafer Elinder, Filippa von Haartman

United Kingdom The International Association for the Study of Obesity (Coordinator)

Team members: Tim Lobstein, Corinna Hawkes, Andrea Aikenhead, Rachel Jackson Leach, Nina Norgaard Sorensen, Una Murray

Collaborators

Susanne Logstrup, European Heart Network, Brussels

Marie Kunesova, European Association for the Study of Obesity – Central European Initiative, Institute of Endocrinology, Prague

Observers

Tim Armstrong, Sophie Randby, World Health Organization, Geneva

Trudy Wijnhoven, World Health Organization, Copenhagen

Abstract of project proposal

Technical details

Contract number: 2007 325

Acronym: POLMARK

Starting date: 15 June 2008.

Duration of the project: 18 months

Reporting period: 9 months

Total project budget: EUR 656,190

EAHC co-funding maximum: EUR 390,700.

Project extension: EUR 27,000

EAHC co-funding: none

Co-funding from other agencies: EUR 23,500

1. General objectives

The general objective of the project is to improve understanding of the influences on children's dietary choices, and to contribute to improving the nutritional status of children in Europe, and counteracting the challenge of obesity and non-communicable disease.

2. Strategic relevance and contribution to the public health programme

The 2006 European Regional Ministerial meeting on the challenge of obesity identified marketing of foods and beverages to children as a public health issue that needed regulation. The European Commission's White Paper 'Strategy on Overweight and Obesity' also recognised this issue and urged industry to take voluntary action, to be reviewed in 2010-2011. The PolMark project is designed to provide specific intelligence resources for policy-makers to assist in these strategic objectives.

3. Methods and means

The project consists of three work packages contributing to the objectives. The first is to update the 'state of the art' review of current controls and regulations on marketing to children in all EU member states, which was last undertaken by the World Health Organization in 2005-6. The second work package will identify over 100 key stakeholders concerned with children's health and with food and beverage production and promotion (at least 10 stakeholders in each of 11 member states) and undertake interviews to assess the stakeholders' views and the likely opportunities and barriers which exist in developing policies in this area. The third work package will utilise the interview material to undertake further assessment of the health impact of food promotion according to the stakeholders' judgements, and to map the quantified health impact data in relation to the stakeholders' positions. This will support the use of health impact assessment techniques as one of the tools available to policy-makers.

4. Expected outcomes

The project's outcomes will advance understanding of current policies and policy options on marketing controls in relation to children's foods and beverages, and extend the methodology available for Health Impact Assessment.

Summary report

1. Overview

The objective of the project is to improve understanding of the determinants of children's dietary choices and health outcomes by investigating the role of promotional marketing of foods and beverages to children. The objective aims to inform the European Commission's work in this area, and the project is designed to respond specifically to the call in the 2007 Commission / PHEA Public Health work plan for '*evidence or tools to support policy-making in the area of marketing of foods to children*' and '*evaluation (health impact assessment/cost benefit analyses) of policies and measures*'.

The objectives are met by the results of three core work packages. The first core work package (WP4) is a review of the current and anticipated controls on marketing foods and beverages to children in all EU member states. An extension of the PolMark project allowed a review of controls in non-EU countries worldwide. The second work package (WP5) provides an analysis of current views on marketing controls through interviews conducted among key stakeholders in each of 11 EU member states. The third work package (WP6) uses the material obtained in the stakeholder interviews to develop Health Impact Assessment (HIA) methodology and provide some quantitative health impact assessments related to marketing foods to children.

This final report identifies the satisfactory fulfilment of the deliverables anticipated in the proposal. In respect of WP4, a set of tables are available on the current and anticipated practices of EU member states and additional countries' policies regarding marketing to children, based on an iterative process for obtaining and independently checking information from a broad set of informants (Annex 1)

The deliverables for WP5 have been fulfilled, with the completion of over 160 interviews with key stakeholders, collated from all 11 partners, interpreted into English and coded for analysis. The results are detailed in Annex 2.

The deliverables for WP6 have been completed satisfactorily, and the results of the Health Impact Analysis showing quantified assessments in relation to categories of stakeholders' organisational interests and influence on policy are detailed in Annex 3.

Besides the core work packages, three horizontal work packages are identified: co-ordination (WP1), dissemination (WP2) and evaluation (WP3). Deliverables for all three of these have been achieved satisfactorily and are detailed in Annex 4.

A financial report submitted to the EAHC shows that actual expenditure fell below the original budget allowed in the EAHC contract.

2. Specification of the project:

2.1 General objective of the project:

The general objective is to enhance the understanding of the determinants of dietary choices and health outcomes, and so contribute to improving the nutritional status of children in Europe, and counteract the challenge of obesity and non-communicable disease.

2.2 Specific objectives of the project

	Title	Indicators	WP
1	Improved understanding of current and anticipated regulatory controls on promotional marketing of foods and beverages to children in European member states.	<i>Internal:</i> consistency and agreement between informants. <i>External:</i> use of results by member states, Community bodies and other organisations.	4
2	Improved understanding of stakeholders' views on the opportunities and challenges for policy development regarding promotional marketing of foods and beverages to children.	<i>Internal:</i> coherence and extent of insights provided. <i>External:</i> use of results in policy debate.	5
3	Improved HIA stakeholder mapping methodology through the quantification of impact assessments, as applied to the marketing of foods and beverages to children.	<i>External:</i> citation and use of the concepts and applications among researchers and policy development workers.	6

Activities in WP4, WP5 and WP6, as detailed in section 2.3, contributed to the achievement of these objectives.

2.3 Overview of activities for the period covered in the interim report

WP	Activities	Milestones/ Deliverables	Date foreseen	Date of achievement	Level of achievement (measured by indicators)	Justification/ Problems encountered	Action taken to overcome the problem
1 Project coordination	Agree communications, procedures and contracts	Mstn 1.1	M4	M4	Fully achieved	--	--
	Construction of website	Mstn 1.2 / Del 12	M5	M6	Some design delays	Design evolved as needs changed	Re-designs now satisfactory
	Interim report	Mstns 1.3, 1.4, 1.5 / Del 9	M9+2	M12	Completed 2 weeks late	Partners' financial reports late	Now reported
	Final report	Mstns 1.6 + 1.7 / 10	M18+2	M18+2	Fully achieved	--	--
2 Dissem- ination	Launch of project to stakeholders and public	Mstn 2.1 / Del 8	M4	M6	Presented at EU Diet & Health Platform, also to European Congress on Obesity and to WHO European Network on Marketing. Some website design delays.	Website design late	Now completed
	Dissemination of WP4 findings	Mstns 2,2 + 2,3 / D8	M15	M11, M13, M14	Presented at European Congress on Obesity and WHO European Network on Marketing. Feature in <i>European Food Law</i> (posted on Circa for EU D&H Platform).	--	--
	Dissemination of WP5 and WP6 findings	Mstns 2.4, 2.5	M17, M18	M14, M15, M16, M18 +	WP5 country reports disseminated from M14 onwards, WP5 cross- national and WP6 reports disseminated after project completion.	WP5 cross-national and WP6 reports were delayed by data mis-coding by one partner.	Re-coding completed
	Dissemination of final (and evaluation) report	Mstn 2.6	M18+2	M18+2	Reports circulated and submitted	--	--
	Publicity for outcome of project	Del 8	M18	M18+3	Publicity to be undertaken in M18+3	Delayed by late Mstn 2.5 completion	In process at date of this report
3 Evaluation	Assess partner agreement on protocols and stakeholder panels	Mstn 3.1	M8	M5	Rapid and consistent agreement on protocols and panels, following pilot run in UK.	--	--
	Logs of comments, minutes and set of process	Not specified	Not specified	M9 and ongoing	Logs and minutes complete to date. Full set of process evaluations of all	--	--

	evaluations of interviews				interviews written, translated and ready for assessment.		
	Interim report evaluation	Mstn 3.2 / Del 9	M10	M10	Interim report drafted	--	--
	Progress summary on interviews and analyses	Mstn 3.3	M16	M14, M15 and M16	Circulated and checked in partner teleconferences	--	--
	Full evaluation report drafted and finalised	Mstn 3.4 / Del 11	M18, M18+2	M18+2	Report submitted	--	--
4 Review of regulations	Formation of network of expert informants	Mstn 4.1 / Del 1	M4	M4 and ongoing	Network continues to expand after initial phase	--	--
	Circulation of draft report to experts, comments collated	Mstns 4.2 and 4.3 / Del 2	M9	M7-10 ongoing	Data gathering complete. Draft discussed by officials at WHO European Network on Marketing, London, June 2009.	Experts and source texts provide contradictory information	Iterations needed – now satisfactory
	Final report	Mstn 4.4 / Del 3	M15	M15	Report submitted	--	--
5 Stakeholder interviews	Partners agree panel of stakeholders for interview	Mstn 5.1 / Del 4	M5	M5	Panel agreed	--	--
	Partners agree interview protocol	Mstn 5.2 / Del 5	M8	M6	Interview protocol agreed	--	--
	Interviews with stakeholders	Mstn 5.3	M13	M9	Interviews completed ahead of schedule. Translations and coding completed M11.	--	--
	Circulation of country reports	Mstn 5.4	M14	M17	Reports completed. One report delayed by mis-coding of data	Mis-coding , recognised in M17.	Data re-coded
	Circulation and delivery of cross-national report	Mstn 5.5 / Del 6	M15	M18 and M18+2	Draft circulated and revised. Submitted M18+2	Delayed by late Milestone 5.4	Completed
6 HIA development	Partners agree protocol for quantitative HIA	Mstn 6.1 / Del 5	M8	M6	Protocol agreed	--	--
	Completion of stakeholder interviews, collation of data.	Mstns 6.2 and 6.3	M13 – M14	M17	Reports completed. One set of data delayed by mis-coding.	Mis-coding recognised in M17	Data re-coded
	Circulation and delivery of final report	Mstn 6.4 / Del 7 (aka Del 14)	M17	M18+2	Draft circulated and revised. Submitted M18+2	Delayed by late Milestone 6.3	Completed
	Draft scientific papers	Mstn 6.5	M18	M18+2	One paper submitted and accepted. Other papers in preparation.	Delayed by late Milestone 6.4	In preparation

2.4 Summary of manpower utilised

The table below summarises the use of staff in the project. Further details are given in Annex 4, section 4.1.2.

Acronym of beneficiary organisation	Country Code	Function/Category	Days worked
BEUC	BE	Supervisor in 2008	3.25
BEUC	BE	Supervisor in 2009	1.50
BEUC	BE	Supervisor in 2009	15.25
BEUC	BE	Admin	2.00
BEUC	BE	Admin / Finance	2.00
BEUC	BE	Admin / Finance	1.00
BEUC	BE	Press	1.00
BEUC	BE	Researcher	35.20
BEUC	BE	Researcher in 2008	21.55
BEUC	BE	Researcher in 2009	9.00
REICH	CY	Supervisor/Researcher/Administrator	47.00
REICH	CY	Administrator	4.00
REICH	CY	Researcher	64.00
MUNI-CZ	CZ	Supervisor	30.00
MUNI-CZ	CZ	Admin and bookkeeping	25.00
MUNI-CZ	CZ	Press, communication	10.00
MUNI-CZ	CZ	Research	55.00
SUHRS	DK	Supervisor	10.10
SUHRS	DK	Administrative Supervisor	5.70
SUHRS	DK	Researcher/Administrator	41.20
SUHRS	DK	Researcher/Administrator	175.60
SUHRS	DK	Special account administrator/Press officer	17.40
UA	ES	Main researcher, in charge of WP4 and supervision	40.00
UA	ES	Researcher in charge of WP5 & administration	25.00
UA	ES	Researcher in charge of WP6 & administration	10.00
UA	ES	Scientific Fellow in charge of WP 2 & 4	52.00
UA	ES	Scientific Fellow in charge of WP 5 & 6	35.00
UA	ES	Technical Logistic Support - Press Communications	5.00
UA	ES	Technical support for data processing and interviews	10.00
UA	ES	Technical Support for logistic matters; Scientific Fellow in charge of WP 5 & 6	37.00
IRD	FR	Researcher	10.50
IRD	FR	Researcher	59.50
IRD	FR	Researcher	106.00
IHF	IR	Supervisor	30.00
IHF	IR	Administrator	25.70
IHF	IR	Communications Officer	5.50
IHF	IR	Researcher	60.00
SKP (APC)	PL	Project coordinator	23.70
SKP (APC)	PL	Administrative Officer	17.40
SKP (APC)	PL	Financial Officer	11.30
SKP (APC)	PL	Food Officer	22.00

SKP (APC)	PL	Media Officer	7.80
SKP (APC)	PL	Researcher	11.00
SKP (APC)	PL	Researcher	66.30
SCPH	SE	Supervisor	28.00
SCPH	SE	Administrator	26.00
SCPH	SE	Researcher	118.00
IASO-IOTF	UK	Supervisor	111.23
IASO-IOTF	UK	Administrator	106.69
IASO-IOTF	UK	Researcher	150.00
IASO-IOTF	UK	Researcher	37.17
IASO-IOTF	UK	Researcher	107.83
IASO-IOTF	UK	Temporary researcher	100.00

3 Implementation of the project

WP1: Coordination of the project

Activities undertaken

All partners listed in the project proposal have participated in the project and completed the tasks required. One partner re-located from one institution to another during the reporting period, and the project work was transferred successfully.

The proposed management structure was established and has been successful. The lead partner is responsible for all management activities, advised by a Management Committee comprising the supervisors of the teams formed by each of the partners. The Management Committee agreed the financial budget proposals, the project methodology, the management procedures and the dissemination and evaluation procedures. The Management Committee also agreed the procedures for internal communication.

Internal communications centre on routine meetings of the Management Committee conducted by tele-conference, supplemented by direct calls, emails, postal mail and a dedicated website. All Management Committee conference calls are open to the Collaborating Partners and the EAHC liaison officer. Conference calls have been conducted as shown below, and minutes from these are attached in Annex 4 (section 4.1.1).

Conference call meetings of the Management Committee

11 th September 2008	3 rd October 2008
13 th November 2008	16 th December 2008
10 th March 2009	21 st April 2009
2 nd July 2009	27 th July 2009

Problems encountered and resolved

One of the partner teams (UAPH-ES) reported that their supervisor was taken ill. His role was replaced by a colleague in his institution and the work continued without disruption. Language differences have been found and have been resolved by including additional team members into the conference call Management Committee meetings. It was agreed that all Management Committee conference calls could be joined by all partner team members.

WP2: Dissemination strategy

Activities undertaken

Dissemination plans in the project proposal included press releases to the general media at the start of the project, towards the end of the project for preliminary findings and at the end of the project with the public report. A website has been developed (www.polmarkproject.net) and will be continually updated over the period of the project. Additional dissemination was designed to target specific stakeholder groups, including the informants for the core work package on regulations, the key stakeholders interviewed in the second core work package eliciting opinions on marketing practices, and policy makers and researchers at meetings including the EU Platform on Diet, Physical Activity and Health and the WHO European Region Network of member states concerned about marketing to children.

Press releases were issued by partners and media publicity was generated in several member states in November 2008 when the project was publicised at a meeting of the EU Platform on Diet, Physical Activity and Health. The PolMark project was presented to the DG Sanco Platform (November 2008) and the WHO European Network on marketing to children (September 2008, updated in January 2009, with early results disseminated in two sessions at the meeting of June 2009, and a final dissemination is scheduled for March 2010). PolMark was also presented to a meeting of officials and NGO representatives in the WHO Geneva headquarters (November 2008) and subsequent reports have been circulated to the WHO officials responsible for policies on non-communicable diseases. The PolMark project was also presented at the "Meeting of EC co-funded projects in the area of nutrition and physical activity" which took place in Luxembourg on January 26 and 27, 2009, to a meeting held jointly by the UK Department of Health and the UK Association for the Study of Obesity in London, 16 September 2009, and to a meeting of the European Child Obesity Group, in Dublin, 17-19 September 2009. The PolMark project is also a registered Commitment made by IASO to the EU Platform on Diet, Physical Activity and Health, and information about its work is available to members through the EC's Circa website.

Copies of the country reports have been circulated to stakeholders and are reproduced in Annex 2 (section 2.1). Public media reports and specialist journal reports on PolMark have been collated and are reproduced in Annex 4 (section 4.2.1).

The results of the project are being prepared in summary form for the general media and in detailed form for the EAHC and for key stakeholders including the Commission (e.g. DG Sanco, DG Information Society and Media) and distributed to other EC-funded projects researching into obesity and diet-related chronic disease. The HIA results will be reported scientifically, at the International Obesity Congress (Stockholm, July 2010). A scientific paper describing the cross-country findings will be prepared for publication in an academic journal. Individual partners are also planning to submit their detailed findings for publication.

Problems encountered

Public media interest is unpredictable. The best publicity occurs when the theme of marketing to children is being raised as a policy issue locally, which may occur at different times in different member states. Public dissemination therefore has to be flexible and

responsive to context and opportunity. Good coverage was obtained for the launch of the study. Coverage was patchy when the individual country reports were issued over the period August-October 2009. Coverage of the regulatory review was achieved through a feature in European Food Law, in September 2009. Coverage of the final public report of the PolMark project cannot be known at the time of writing, as the press launch occurs after submission of this report.

WP3: Evaluation of the project

Activities undertaken

Details of the evaluation procedures are included in the main project proposal and include records of agreements and discussions, evaluation of stakeholder interviews (including process evaluations for each interview and at the end of the series of interviews by each partner) and a record of each informant's comments on draft reports of the review of regulations.

During the period of the project, all records, minutes and process evaluations have been completed for the relevant tasks. These sources of information have been assessed by the partner leading the evaluation and are reported in detail in Annex 4 (see section 4.3).

Summary findings:

RATING: Good to excellent project (The project has fully achieved its objectives and technical goals for the period and has even exceeded expectations)

The PolMark project is an excellent project which has achieved its general and specific objectives. The research has improved understanding of health determinants of marketing of children's choices and health outcome, and of the broader health determinants in national and international settings. The research is based on analysing policies towards marketing of food for children in EU and globally: stakeholders in 11 European countries were interviewed to identify their viewpoints on the level of obesity and the need for increased regulations and/or self-regulations to counteract the rate of obesity in children. Research methodologies included interdisciplinary research tools, combining qualitative and quantitative research approaches and Health Impact Assessment methods. Furthermore, studies at the national level included interviews from 11 countries using the same methodology.

The technical organisation of the project is exemplary and the results provided a timely comprehensive report this report include three parts: Regulations of marketing of food and beverages; analysis of stakeholder perception of marketing for children; Health Impact analysis and documentation about the performance of the project. The project is carried out at a reasonably low cost, due to the internet based coordination of activities. However, the project might have benefitted from 1 or 2 face-to-face meetings. The aim of these meetings would be: to improve the discussions among the national partners, exchange experiences, and learn about preparation and implementation of interviews and the analysis,

Problems encountered

The project was challenged when a letter of concern from a commercial organisation representing the advertising industry was sent to DG Sanco officials. The EAHC assisted DG Sanco in their response. The substance of the letter indicated that the commercial organisation had not fully understood the nature of the project or the need to ask 'difficult' questions during the stakeholder interviews (see text in WP5 and WP6, below). No further complaints appear to have been made. No other significant problems were encountered.

4 Core activities to achieve project objectives

WP4: Review of current regulatory controls on marketing to children

Methodology applied as planned

The process of forming a group of informants (referred to in the project proposal as a Network of Experts) and asking them to update the previous reviews of regulations in member states was completed satisfactorily, following the methodology indicated in the original project proposals. A listing of the authorities and organisations consulted for this Work Package is included in the report of the work package in Annex 1. As anticipated in the project proposal, it was necessary to repeatedly issue revised drafts to the various authorities and agencies consulted. This process of repeated iteration of drafts was essential for ensuring a reasonable degree of consistency and reliability of information.

Additional funding was obtained to extend the PolMark project to undertake a similar review of regulatory controls in countries outside of the European Commission. This was also undertaken successfully.

Involvement of partners and target groups

All partners have participated in the review of regulations. Informants in government offices, industry, NGOs and other bodies have participated in providing data and reviewing the material collected.

Coordination with other projects or activities

The research undertaken for this work package was described and discussed at meetings of the WHO European Network on reducing marketing pressure on children, and participants in the Network assisted in the design and fulfilment of the work project.

The results of this work package will also form a key part of the StanMark Project (Standards on marketing food and beverages to children) funded by DG Relex, 2010-2011, being co-ordinated by the PolMark lead partner (the International Association for the Study of Obesity, IASO-IOTF).

Outcomes and deliverables achieved

The network of regulatory experts that served as a set of informants for this work package was agreed upon and contacted in late 2008. Draft descriptions of each country's regulatory framework were sent for evaluation and comment and the resulting information was used to re-draft the country descriptions. A report and tables summarising the information have been completed and are presented in Annex 1 (see section 1.1.1 for results in the EU27 member states, and section 1.1.2 for results in non-EU countries).

The results have informed the WHO consultation on marketing of foods and beverages to children (see <http://www.who.int/dietphysicalactivity/marketing-food-to-children/en/index.html>) and the WHO European Network on reducing marketing pressure on children (see www.helsedirektoratet.no/marketing). The results will be presented to the EU Platform on Diet, Physical Activity and Health, as a report of one of the Platform

members' commitments, and the report will be posted on the EC's Circa website resource service. The report is also being submitted to DG Information Society and Media, the European Audiovisual Observatory, and to other pan-European and member state policy bodies.

Problems encountered and resolved

The quality of information provided by informants, even by those in senior government offices and industry associations, was remarkably uneven. Information provided was sometimes contradicted or substantially qualified by other informants. A process of review and cross-checking and further review was required in order to ensure a high level of quality of information. This problem had been anticipated in the project proposals and time had been allowed for the repeated dissemination of drafts to the authorities and agencies consulted for this Work Package.

WP5: Stakeholder views on marketing food to children

Methodology applied as planned

As described in the original project proposals, this work package required the involvement of partners in at least 10 EU Member States to conduct interviews with key stakeholders concerned with marketing of foods and beverages to children. In all, 11 partners were recruited, as follows:

International Association for the Study of Obesity, UK
Suhr's University College / Metropolitan University College, DK
Research and Education Institute of Child Health, CY
University of Alicante, ES
Institut de Recherche pour le Developpement, FR
Institute of Public Health of the Republic of Slovenia, SI
Stockholm County Council / Karolinska Institute, SE
University of Masarykova, CZ
Association of Polish Consumers, PO
Irish Heart Foundation, IR
The European Consumers' Organisation, BE (to include EU-wide agencies and organisations)

The project proposal anticipated a series of stages for this work package, and these were all undertaken and completed satisfactorily. The stages involved: (i) agreement on the key stakeholders to be interviewed, (ii) agreement of the interview protocol, (iii) contacting, arranging and interviewing stakeholders, (iv) checking stakeholder satisfaction with their responses, (v) transcribing, coding and translating interviews, (vi) submitting these to the coordination team, (vii) drafting national reports for circulation to stakeholders, (viii) publishing final country reports, (ix) drafting a cross-national report for circulation and (x) publishing a cross-national report.

(i) Stakeholders: the partners agreed that a broad range of stakeholders, including commercial operators, should be included to ensure a fair spread of opinions and positions are represented. The categories identified are listed here, and in each case the partner attempted to identify a senior representative in a widely recognised agency to be approached for interview:

1. Food and beverage industry trade associations and confederations
2. Advertising and media associations and federations
3. Consumer organisations and associations
4. Advocacy organisations concerned with policies on obesity, heart disease or diabetes
5. Organisations representing families
6. Organisations representing children
7. Professional organisations for teachers
8. Professional organisations for children's health (family doctors, paediatricians)
9. Nutritionists, health promotion professionals
10. Academic experts and researchers in public health, psychology, policy research
11. Media workers, such as health and consumer correspondents
12. Government officials in health, media and other relevant ministries

13. Representatives of political parties, parliament members
14. Scientific or policy experts on government advisory and technical committees
15. Other bodies cited in the national media regarding food marketing to children

(ii) Interview protocol: The design of the interview protocol went through several steps, including pilot interviews conducted among stakeholders in the UK prior to other partners using the protocol. Questions were designed to elicit several dimensions of information:

* Views on the nature and intent of advertising: the impact in terms of inducing brand switching and /or inducing increased overall category consumption, among the child population.

* Views on the strengths and weaknesses of different approaches to regulation: these were characterised as three forms: voluntary, self-regulatory and statutory. In order to achieve some consistency of understanding of these three categories, a set of descriptive sheets was produced (see Annex 2.3?) and these were circulated to stakeholders in advance of their interviews, and were also brought to the interview location for reference during the interview.

* The interview protocols included questions necessary to obtain data for the mapping of each interviewee's responses in relation to their perceived assessment of the exposure effects of advertising on children's preferences and diets. These quantified exposure impact assessments were included in the protocol so that they could be evaluated in terms of stakeholder positions. The purpose was to explore the relative positions of stakeholders in terms of the type of organisation and the organisations' influence in association with their responses to the quantitative impact assessments.

* Views on the nature and seriousness of the problem of child obesity in the relevant member state and types of influence on childhood dietary choices.

* Assessment of the stakeholders' influence in the current debate on marketing foods and beverages to children: their size and the size of their media departments, their contribution to consultations and to policy formation in the member state.

* Assessment of the perception of stakeholder influence and trustworthiness in the public's eye, according to ratings by the other stakeholders.

It can be understood that some interviewees felt uncomfortable with the content of some of the questions in the interview protocol, particularly those that asked for quantitative assessments of the impact of advertising. In these cases the interviewees were assured (a) that their answers would be anonymised before dissemination and (b) that the answers were not tests of accuracy or of understanding but of their relative position compared with other stakeholders – the intention was to locate stakeholders relative to each other on the dimensions being examined, not to make absolute statements on quantitative impact. Most stakeholders were reassured by these statements but some, notably a few members from commercial sector organisations, preferred not to answer those questions. (See also the section on process evaluation, in the final project evaluation report, in Annex 4, section 4.3.)

(iii) Contacting and interviewing stakeholders: All stakeholder organisations selected were contacted and asked to provide the name of an interviewee able to represent the organisations' views. A standard letter of introductions was agreed between partners and this was sent to the potential interviewee. In some cases it was passed to a colleague or referred to another agency or department. (See also the section on process evaluation, in the

final project evaluation report, in Annex 4, section 4.3.) The letter also included the standardised descriptions of categories of regulatory control on marketing to children referred to above.

Interviews were held face-to-face, using a laptop to take notes of the responses, and a voice recording as back-up. The voice recordings were used for expansion on the notes taken in the interview and to check for nuances in the responses and understanding of the questions. Interviews were conducted with representatives of a wide variety of agencies and organisations, and for the convenience of the present report these have been grouped as follows:

Academic experts	18
Advertising industry representatives	18
Child/family/school representatives	24
Consumer advocates	16
Food producer representatives	25
Government officials	25
Media representatives	13
Public health advocates	30
<i>Total</i>	<i>169</i>

(iv) Checking interviewees' satisfaction with their responses: At the end of the interviews the interviewees were given the opportunity to review their answers and amend any details. Interviewees were also reminded that they would have a further opportunity to contribute later in the process, when they were sent the (anonymised) analyses of the compiled interviews for their information. Although some interviews were incomplete, all stakeholders signed off their interviews at the end of the session.

(v) Transcribing, coding and translating interviews: Each partner team prepared summary interview results, including comments and further information supplied by the interviewee, for each stakeholder interview and converted these into English for submission to the project leader coordinating the analysis. Data were also summarised into a narrative document and into a spreadsheet for further analyses. The narrative documents form the core of a country report from each partner, to be submitted to the project leader and to be disseminated to the media after final consultation with stakeholders involved.

(vi) Submitting results to the coordinator. All coded data and translated interviews have been submitted to the project leader. All partners have also undertaken interview process evaluations, and these were submitted to the partner leading the evaluation work package.

(vii) Drafting national reports for circulation to stakeholders. A draft report was written by each partner and circulated for comment.

(viii) Publishing final country reports. National reports were published and issued to the national and local media with a press release. Copies of the reports were made available to download on the public side of the PolMark website. Country reports are also attached to this report in Annex 2 (section 2.1).

(ix) Drafting a cross-national report for circulation. The cross-national report was drafted and circulated for comment.

(x) Publishing a cross-national report. This has been undertaken and is attached to this report in Annex 2 (section 2.2). A version of the cross-national report will be designed for general public readership and published after this report.

Involvement of partners and target groups

Partners agreed to interview as many categories of stakeholders as possible, from the list identified above. The target number was ten interviews from eight different categories of stakeholder (a total of 110 interviews, including the pilot interviews in the UK). As can be seen from the list below, all but one partner achieved this number, and in many cases partners were able to obtain many more interviews than were required. Interviews were arranged and undertaken as follows:

Belgium	13
Cyprus	15
Czech Rep	15
Denmark	13
France	16
Ireland	28
Poland	7
Slovenia	14
Spain	14
Sweden	14
UK	20
<i>Total</i>	<i>169</i>

Coordination with other projects or activities

Some of the material collected within this work package will be passed on as a contribution to the activities within work package 6.

The work undertaken in work package 5 builds on previous EC-funded projects which included work packages identifying and reporting on key stakeholders' views on obesity policy, conducted by the European Heart Network (EHN-CHOB, funded by DG Sanco 2004-2006) and Sussex University (PORGROW, funded by DG Research 2005-2007). The findings of the current project are also being used to inform the work of current EC-funded projects including HOPE (DG Research 2007-2009) and EURO-PREVOB (DG Research 2007-2010). Participants in all four mentioned projects are involved in the current PolMark project.

The results of this work package have contributed to the WHO European Network on marketing to children and the WHO Geneva headquarters consultation on recommendations for marketing food and beverages to children. They will also be presented to the EU Platform on Diet, Physical Activity and Health, as a report of one of the Platform members' commitments, and the report will be posted on the EC's Circa website resource service. The report is also being submitted to DG Information Society and Media, the European Audiovisual Observatory, and to other pan-European and member state policy bodies.

The results will also form a key part of the StanMark Project (Standards on marketing food and beverages to children) funded by DG Relex, 2010-2011, being co-ordinated by the PolMark lead partner (the International Association for the Study of Obesity, IASO-IOTF).

Outcomes and deliverables achieved

The agreed panel of stakeholders, the agreed protocols and the completion of each interview were all successfully fulfilled according to the original plan. As noted, the work package has delivered 169 interviews, substantially exceeding the number anticipated in the original project proposal.

Subsequent national reports and the cross-national report have been drafted, circulated and published. These are all reproduced in Annex 2 of the present report.

Problems encountered and resolved

One partner (Poland) had difficulty finding stakeholders in senior positions willing to be interviewed for the project. This partner achieved seven interviews. Other partners achieved well in excess of the minimum anticipated, and the total is well above the minimum for the project as a whole. Interpretation of the results of this work package should note the uneven number of interviews when making cross-national comparisons.

The project also faced a challenge when a commercially interested organisation wrote to DG Sanco raising concerns about the project and the questions asked in the interviews. EAHC officials and the project coordinator reassured DG Sanco that there was no reason to doubt the high quality of the project and its methodology. It is possible that the concerns that had been raised were based on a misunderstanding of the nature and purpose of the questions asked, which were largely designed to elicit the relative positions of stakeholders compared with each other, and not their absolute positions out of context (see Methodology described above, and see also discussion of work package 6).

WP6: Mapping for Health Impact Assessment development

Methodology applied as planned

The methodology for this objective depended on data acquisition carried out in the previous objective, and the success of that work has ensured the success of this work package also. Information collected in interviews with stakeholders included data which allowed quantitative impact assessment, the results of which can be mapped against other information gained in the interviews and from contextual sources.

This approach is used in policy assessment and health impact analysis based on stakeholder assessment (see for example the EC-funded PORGROW project reported in Millstone et al¹ and see a review of quantitative health impact assessment in Veerman et al^{2 3}). The intention of this part of the PolMark project is to have evidence to help understand the relationship between the quantitative assessments of health impact and the policy-related interests, and the policy-influencing power, of the organisations employing the stakeholder who provided the assessment.

The approach required stakeholders to respond to a number of difficult questions concerning the quantitative impact of advertising on dietary choices. Sufficient data was obtained to ensure that the analysis could proceed (see 'Problems encountered' below). An example of one of the more difficult questions in the interview protocol was Question 19, which asked a series of sub-questions seeking to elicit the interviewee's estimates of the likely increase in the amount of food consumed as a result of different advertising methods. As expected, interviewees refusing to answer this question were found more commonly among food producers and food advertising companies. Refusals to respond were distributed as follows:

Academic expert	4 refused out of 18
Advertising industry	9 refused out of 18
Child/family/school rep	2 refused out of 24
Consumer advocate	4 refused out of 16
Food producers	12 refused out of 25
Government officials	6 refused out of 25
Media reps	3 refused out of 13
Public health advocates	2 refused out of 30
<i>Total</i>	<i>42 refused out of 169</i>

The original proposal envisaged obtaining 10 interviews from each of 10 partners. In total 127 stakeholders provided responses for analysis in this work package, amply exceeding the amount of material anticipated.

Involvement of partners and target groups

¹ Millstone E, Lobstein T. The PorGrow project: overall cross-national results, comparisons and implications. *Obes Rev.* 2007;8 Suppl 2:29-36.

² Veerman JL, Barendregt JJ, Mackenbach JP. Quantitative health impact assessment: current practice and future directions. *J Epidemiol Community Health.* 2005;59(5):361-70.

³ Veerman JL, Van Beeck EF, Barendregt JJ, Mackenbach JP. By how much would limiting TV food advertising reduce childhood obesity? *Eur J Public Health.* 2009.

All partners were involved in the collection of data and the coding and translation of the material obtained. The further analyses to evaluate the quantitative health impact assessments were undertaken jointly by the lead partner for the project (IASO-IOTF) and the lead partner for the work package (SCPH-SE, now KI-SE) in consultation with the other partners.

Coordination with other projects or activities

The data used in this work package were obtained through the activities of work package 5.

The results of this work package have contributed to the WHO European Network on marketing to children and the WHO Geneva headquarters consultation on recommendations for marketing food and beverages to children. The results of the analyses will also contribute to the ongoing development of health impact assessment methodology, and will be relevant to the Commission's implementation of Health in all Policies and related policy evaluation strategies. The results will also be presented to the EU Platform on Diet, Physical Activity and Health, as a report of one of the Platform members' commitments, and the report will be posted on the EC's Circa website resource service. The report is also being submitted to DG Information Society and Media, the European Audiovisual Observatory, and to other pan-European and member state policy bodies.

The results will also form a key part of the StanMark Project (Standards on marketing food and beverages to children) funded by DG Relex, 2010-2011, being co-ordinated by the PolMark lead partner (the International Association for the Study of Obesity, IASO-IOTF).

Outcomes and deliverables achieved

All milestones and deliverables described in the project proposal were fulfilled. The report of this work-package is attached in Annex 3.

Problems encountered and resolved

The main concern at the outset of the project was the anticipated difficulty of soliciting answers to questions that asked for assessments of the impact of advertising on children's behaviour and consumption. In pilot interviews run in the UK, resistance was shown by several stakeholders and as a result it was found necessary to provide additional assurance to interviewees that the results were not being used as an *absolute* estimate to compare with some objective figure but as a *relative* estimate to be compared with estimates made by other stakeholders. This reassurance helped elicit more responses, and the approach was adopted in the subsequent implementation of interview protocols by all partners. As shown above, however, some interviewees declined to answer questions that were deemed sensitive, for which they felt unable to make any useful response, or which put them in a difficult position or which led them to reveal information they were not happy to share (see also the process evaluation, Annex 4, section 4.3).