1	
2	FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION
3	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES
4	
5	
6	PERSPECTIVES ON MARKETING, SELF-REGULATION
7	AND CHILDHOOD OBESITY
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	Friday, July 15, 2005
13	8:34 a.m.
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	Federal Trade Commission
19	FTC Conference Center
20	601 New Jersey Avenue, N.W.
21	Washington, D.C.
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION
2	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES
3	
4	<u>I N D E X</u>
5	
6	Welcome by Lesley Fair, Federal Trade Commission 3
7	
8	Remarks by Commissioner Thomas B. Leary 5
9	
10	Remarks by Surgeon General Richard H. Carmona 6
11	
12	Panel 4: Current Self-Regulatory and Other Standards for
13	Marketing Food to Children 31
14	
15	Panel 5: What Should the Government and the Private
16	Sector do to Help Make Children's Diets Healthier and
17	Encourage Responsible Marketing 101
18	
19	Remarks by Dr. Michael O'Grady 170
20	
21	Remarks by Lydia B. Parnes 173
22	
23	
24	
25	

PROCEEDINGS

2 - - - -

MS. FAIR: Good morning. And on behalf of the Department of Health and Human Services and the Federal Trade Commission, welcome back to the second day of our two-day workshop, Perspectives on Marketing, Self-Regulation and Childhood Obesity.

My name is Lesley Fair from the Bureau of Consumer Protection. I think most of you are returning from yesterday, but just in case we have some newcomers, let me briefly remind you of a few of our security guidelines. First and foremost, you must wear your nametag at all times in order to remain here. If you leave the building for any reason, you will need to have to go back through the security screening process.

Also, as a number of you realized yesterday, our microphones are very, very sensitive, even in that back soundboard hallway where the sound staff is located, and unless you wish your phone conversations to be on the public record in this event, please step over to the lobby or step outside if you need to make a call.

We will have another open forum session from 10:30 to 11:00 today. If you are interested in signing up, the sign-up period at the registration desk will be from 9:00 to 10:00 this morning. Remember, the three-

1	minute limitation. We ask only one person from an
2	organization to speak. And that will take place
3	immediately after the first panel of the morning. So, we
4	would ask you to sign up between 9:00 and 10:00 a.m.
5	Operators will be standing by at the registration desk to
6	take care of you.

Finally, I don't know about you, but I was pretty impressed with the research that the Sesame Street workshop presented yesterday. They showed some slides and showed that preschool children ate broccoli at only about a 20 percent level, but when accompanied by an endorsement from Elmo, their preference shot up. I think you all remember that.

We did some of our own market research last night. And we found out that in adults over 21, over 37 percent complied with the moderator's request to turn off their cell phones. But when that same request was made with an endorsement by Elmo, compliance skyrocketed. So thank you very much for complying with that right now.

On this second day of this very important workshop, it is my particular honor to welcome

Commissioner Thomas Leary of the Federal Trade

Commission.

(Applause).

COMMISSIONER LEARY: We're going to have

welcomes and welcomes here because the first thing I'm supposed to do is welcome you all to the Federal Trade Commission. And my second delightful chore of the morning is to introduce our first speaker, the Surgeon General, Richard Carmona. And I don't know how many of you know the biography of this guy. In one minute, I'm not going to be able to give you a flavor. Go to the website.

Here's somebody who apparently was too bored to even finish high school, so he drops out of high school and he joins the Army and he goes to Vietnam in the Special Forces and wins a bunch of medals over there and then decides he wants to become a doctor. So, he comes back and he gets a B.S. and a medical degree within two years of each other. I don't know how you do that, quite frankly.

But he not only gets a medical degree but he winds up first in his class, okay? The next thing you know, why, I see he's in some county sheriff's department in Arizona and he's not only a surgeon in the county sheriff's department but also apparently a member of the SWAT team, which is kind of an odd combination. I guess you kind of control your intake. It's very strange.

(Laughter).

COMMISSIONER LEARY: And then he does a lot of

other interesting stuff and winds up the Surgeon General
of the United States. For me, the intriguing thing is I
don't know what to call him. Of course he's a doctor,
been a doctor for 35 years, so we could call him doctor.
If he stayed in the Special Forces, I assume he would
have been a general.

And a Surgeon General, probably some of your friends in social settings call you general and, I don't know, I kind of like to call you Sheriff. That's really not -- I had a great-grandfather who was a sheriff, and it's got kind of a frontier ring to it. I like that title sheriff. And then as you can see, he wears sort of -- wears the uniform of a Vice Admiral in the United States Navy. So, I guess you'd be called Admiral.

I think probably the only thing to do really is I'll call you sir, if you don't mind. And, so, sir, I want to welcome you to the Federal Trade Commission. And I know we want to hear what you have to say. Thank you.

(Applause.)

SURGEON GENERAL CARMONA: Well, thank you for that introduction. I feel like I should go home now. I guess when you find out your Surgeon General was a high school dropout, that doesn't engender a lot of confidence. So, you know, if I had the time, I'd like to explain away a lot of those things, but rest assured that

my high school, 37 years ago I left and I didn't graduate, but last year, they invited me back and I did get my high school diploma, so I am a high school graduate now.

(Applause.)

SURGEON GENERAL CARMONA: And of course I have had many jobs, as you heard. All of them have helped me to be a better Surgeon General, however, generally when those things come out people wonder -- half the people probably think, well, that's pretty cool, this is a very successful person; and the other half wonder if this is just a person that couldn't keep a job. And I think there's probably some truth on both sides.

Well, good morning, and thank you for allowing me to visit with you this morning to deal with some of these very big problems of childhood obesity. As you know, as the Surgeon General of the United States, my job is to protect and advance the health of the nation. I do that through the best science in the world, through all of our operating divisions, many of my colleagues you've heard from, National Institutes of Health, CDC and many other of the 68,000 or so employees within the Department of Health and Human Services who help to move this agenda forward.

But what we know today is that 16 percent of

our children, almost 9 million children in this country
are overweight or obese. Two out of three Americans are
overweight or obese. The clock is ticking as these risk
factors accumulate in this population that continues to
get heavier, risk factors for cardiovascular disease, for
cancer. Now, we can track these trends over the last
several decades. This didn't just happen in a year or
two years or even a decade. But you can go back and look
at epidemiologic trends really beginning around the
second World War and after and see the culture change,
the American culture change, to becoming a little bit
more sedentary, a little less physical activity, a little
bit more indiscriminate eating.

So, when you look back, of course, retrospectoscope is always 20/20. You can say, gee, we should have anticipated this. Well, the fact is that many people spoke about it, but as they say in Washington, it didn't get a lot of traction for a while. And now it's an epidemic, and it really has caught on and is a significant problem.

When we look at the variables that contribute to this problem, there are many, but what we do know is that the average kid is watching TV several hours a day. We know that the average kid spends far more time on Playstations than they do on playgrounds; and physical

activity is a big part -- or lack of physical activity is a big part of this.

What we're seeing is Generation Y is quickly becoming Generation XL.

(Laughter.)

SURGEON GENERAL CARMONA: We must remember that the best role models that a child has are the parents. And I recognize the difficulty in parenting today; and I recognize that almost half the families in this country may have only one parent, but nevertheless, that parent or parents play a very significant role in the life of that child, because even without stating anything, children often model their behavior eventually after their parents. And if parents are inactive, if parents are snacking, if parents are not practicing good health habits, children will inevitably do the same.

I often jokingly say to my colleagues, when we speak about these issues, well, it's pretty easy, if you want to see what this child will look like in 20 years, look across the couch in the living room every night and see what those parents are doing. And if the parent is overweight, if the parent is snacking, if the parent is not practicing good health habits, why would you think the child would do otherwise? So, let's not forget the importance of parenting and role models and mentors with

1 our children.

Children need to get at least an hour of physical activity a day; and adults we suggest 30 minutes. Yet we are plagued with a rash of school districts that are eliminating physical activity. Much of what I do every day is to try and convince health districts, health administrators, principals, large organizations that represent all of the stakeholders that you must think about the untoward consequences of your policies when you decrease physical activities in schools. And children who then spend hours on TV, children who eat indiscriminately, children who don't get any physical activity, which could go on for years at a time, don't be surprised that they may be overweight.

When I became Surgeon General about three years ago, the President, President Bush, challenged me with a portfolio that was fairly wide, diverse, but very strongly evidence-based. The first thing in that portfolio that he passionately spoke to me about was prevention, that we needed to become a nation that embraces prevention as much as or more than we embrace care.

In my own experience, I understand that because before being Surgeon General, as I jokingly say to my colleagues also, I used to be a real doctor, now I just

play one on TV. But when I was a real doctor taking care of individuals and not populations that I have the responsibility for as today, I was a trauma surgeon, an emergency physician. And every day, I would see the gurneys roll into the hospital and two or three out of every four patients that I admitted didn't have to be in that hospital.

It creates a huge disease burden and an economic burden on our society. And it's about people who made bad decisions that day, if you look at the list of reasons why they came in: drunk driving, domestic violence, all of the acute things, crime, drugs, alcohol. But then there were chronic things, people who didn't value physical activity; people who didn't take care of their health over the years; people who engaged in high-risk activities. But the sum total of that was that body shows up in front of you and we're expected to take the most extraordinary science that this country has ever known, apply it to that individual, to save their life at a huge cost, and of course we pride ourselves on saving someone. You come into that emergency room with a pulse, we're going to save you, maybe in spite of yourself.

And of course, as surgeons, our discharge criteria was rather simple: the patient was upright, the patient was afebrile, patient ate, patient had a bowel

movement, we sent them home. But what did we do to change their behavior? Not much. Chances are they're going to cycle back through the system and come back with the same heart attack, congestive failure, co-morbidity of obesity, and that disease burden continues to mount and that economic burden continues to mount, and yet most of it is preventable.

So, from a personal standpoint, I understand it, having been in those trenches. In fact, that's what drove me into public health over a decade ago, seeing how much of what I was caring for was preventable. So, prevention is first on our agenda.

Second is preparedness, and I won't spend a lot of time on that, but suffice it to say that the new world order dictates that we all have to learn, citizens and professionals, that planes can now be weapons; that pathogens are weapons; that the world has changed; that the sense of security and maybe complacency that we had throughout our lives is gone. And, so, the President has directed us to get our citizens ready, train our firemen, train our police, train our soldiers, our sailors, our Coast Guardmen, our airmen, to be better prepared, to prevent, to mitigate, to respond to all hazards and emergencies.

The third area the President was passionate

about that I am so happy he felt as I did was the issue of health disparities. Health disparities, as you know, simply represented, are the fact that generally people of color in this country, what we might call minorities, have less access to healthcare and when they do have that access, typically they have poorer outcomes. But when we look at certain diseases, when we look at obesity, which is what we're speaking of today, we see disproportionate representation, often in the minority populations. And with that obesity comes more cardiovascular disease, comes more loss of quality of life, comes increased cost of care, and the list just goes on and on and on, disproportionately represented.

Now, why am I so passionate about that? Well, I was one of those poor Latino kids. As you heard, I dropped out of high school. I was first-generation born in this country. My grandmother came here with 27 children and no money and settled in a tenement in New York City. And I am her grandson. So, one generation removed, we go from a whole family with no education who are laborers to producing a Surgeon General. It's a pretty extraordinary country.

But yet I understand first-hand the inequities of disparities, having had to go to public hospitals myself, having had to struggle with a mother who was too

proud to take welfare but yet wanted her kids to prosper in this country but she struggled every single day, including her substance problems. So, those issues are really real to me because I lived them and now I feel I have an obligation socially, morally and ethically to try and change that.

As the President has said to me, we really don't want to reduce health disparities, we really should be shooting to eliminate health disparities. We need to level the playing field in this country.

Prevention, preparedness, health disparities, those are probably the three things that take up most of my time, on behalf of the President and Secretary

Leavitt, but there's a common currency that we need to use to be successful in all of those endeavors, and that is health literacy, because we are largely a health-illiterate country. The fact of the matter is is that the average person doesn't understand the health messages we give them. We tell them to eat healthy, yet how many people can go to the store and look at the food label and understand and know the difference between a gram of protein or a gram of fat or how much of this or how much of that I should eat?

Yet my challenge every day is not enough science, because I have an enviable Rolodex. I have the

best consultants in the world in everything. And I have a lot of questions every day, as the Surgeon General of the United States. But I can call the world's expert on almost every subject and within minutes be schooled up on whatever the issue is. What I lack is the translational element, how to deliver the best science in a culturally competent manner to the diverse populations that I have the privilege of serving. That's the bottom line.

And I go back to my own childhood and remember those lessons, because as a little kid going to doctors, going to the Social Security office with my grandmother who spoke no English, with my aunts and uncles who spoke no English, yet as a seven, eight, nine, ten-year-old boy, I was their interpreter. How much could I really understand and interpret to adults who are trying to convey complex social and medical and economic problems? Not likely.

So, I understand those things very well, but we have to figure out a way to better engage the populations that we serve. And paradoxically, what I see every day, the very strength that we have in this country, as the United States of America, which is founded on diversity, is often what separates us and makes it even more difficult for all of us to do our job. That's why we're all here, to come together and figure out what are the

best things to do to make this country healthier, to make this country safer, to reduce the cost of care, to improve the quality, all of those things. And, again, many of those lessons I will tell you as it relates to disparity and cultural competence, I learned from a lady we called our Aleta, who was my grandmother, who had no education, but thinking back to how she purchased her food, how she cooked her food, the best cook in the world, but it probably wasn't healthy, because one of the first things I remember to this day, when she started cooking, it was a big thing of lard in the back of the refrigerator that got thrown into the frying pan.

(Laughter).

SURGEON GENERAL CARMONA: Yet it was great.

So, we must not forget the culture that brings us all together often divides us, because what grandmother taught you, you teach to your children, and that cultural norm continues, from purchasing the food, to cooking the food, to eating the food, and it's a very sensitive issue to go to somebody's culture and say don't do it that way anymore. In fact, there's pushback often. So, we have to be very sensitive in how we do that.

This year, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Health & Human Services released the 2005 Dietary Guidelines for Americans. It's on-line and

it's in a brochure. Hopefully, this will help to increase health literacy. We are doing all we can. I know in every report I do now is a Surgeon General Callto-Action, Surgeon General reports, there is a people's piece that is written at a sixth or seventh-grade level, because my goal is to communicate with the biggest medical population in the world. My practice, 300 million people. And I have to get it to them in the right way so that they understand it. My messages will fail, the science that my colleagues give me to give to my citizens will fail, unless I can engage that public, unless they see this information and feel it and make the changes that are necessary to improve their health.

We have to think out of the box. We have to start using community health workers; we have to use promoters. People with credibility in the community sometimes do far better than advanced-degree health professionals who have no credibility in that community. So, reaching out to the faith-based community, getting the promoters, getting the community health workers. And the literature is very strong in this area that shows you can really change the health and status of a community using community health workers if you do it wisely and apply the science in a culturally competent manner. And this issue of obesity lends itself to that type of a

1 thought process.

This year, we proclaimed it to be the year of the healthy child. Eighty-two percent of our 70 or so million children are pretty healthy, but we shouldn't be complacent, because as you do a gap analysis across the board, you find holes where we still have pockets of increased morbidity and mortality, cost of health care, that need to be addressed.

We're looking at all aspects of a child's life, from body, mind, spirit. We're looking at breastfeeding, we're looking at immunizations, oral health, prevention of drug, alcohol, smoking, injury prevention, which is a big one. If you're a baby and you make it through infections and genetic problems, chances are if you don't make it to your adolescent or teen years, it's trauma that's going to kill you, and almost all of it's preventable.

We started a 50/50 program, where I symbolically go into every state. We pick a school; I try and pick a school in generally the lowest socioeconomic area, the ones with the worst metrics for quality of life; and spend hours, if not a day, there; get on the lunch line with the kids; see what they're thinking; why are they buying this food; speak to the teachers, the school administrators; why do you do things

this way, get a better understanding.

And I wish I could go to every school in the country, but we symbolically pick one. We hope to get enough press and coverage to raise the issue in that state, and a lot of it has to do with obesity and healthy habits and physical activity, engaging the children, engaging the parents and the schools. The 50/50 program has been very successful.

We talk about staying in school, because the fact of the matter is a third of our minority kids drop out of high school -- in some places up to half, depending on which 'hood you're looking at. And yet we want a diversified workforce. The best chance for us to be successful in the future is to have that diversified workforce with culturally diverse people who represent all disciplines, because that's the people that will get into those communities and understand that culture and really shake it up and change it.

Some guy showing up with a couple of degrees who doesn't understand the culture is probably not going to have a lot of effect. So, it's extraordinarily important we keep our kids in school, we get them out of high school and graduate. We have no change of having a diverse workforce, especially in the sciences. Right now, we're graduating about -- about a third of our

doctoral students in this country come from foreign countries. We are certainly helping a lot of people, but not helping ourselves. We've got to keep our own kids in school.

We are supporting the First Lady's efforts to make a difference in youth by bringing together parents, child advocacy groups, policy makers and everybody who has an impact on a child's life. We've created partnerships with the American Academy of Pediatrics, Campbell's Soups, others, and the SAY program, the Shaping America's Youth. My friend and colleague, former Surgeon General David Satcher, has a program with the National Football League, which we've partnered with to promote school-based solutions to obesity.

Nike, LeBron James, Mia Hamm, Freddie Adoo and the Nike P.E. to Go Program provides equipment and expertise to schools, many schools who otherwise wouldn't have P.E. teachers for their children to stay physically active. ESPN and girls and boys clubs, Play your Way program, and focusing on physical activity and health today and for the future. All of these programs have that in common. Teaching our children to make healthy choices, stay physically active and eat a balanced diet.

We must be careful not to stigmatize the overweight or obese youth. Don't blame them; encourage

them to make healthier choices. Set the example yourself. Remember that there are significant mental health consequences. There's loss of self-confidence, self-esteem for those children who are struggling. We see the problem, one epidemiologically, as a number, but this kid has to live that every day and typically they're ostracized, they don't play in the games, they're not the first one chosen, if they get chosen at all, when games are being played. It's a tough life for a kid who is overweight or obese, because they don't fit into this streamlined society that we have today.

So, be sensitive. Help them along, because they are struggling also. They don't want to be that way. The President has given all of us who work for him a charge: Help Americans live longer, healthier lives and do it in a way that maintains our economic competitiveness as a nation.

On behalf of President Bush and Secretary

Leavitt, I want to thank you for coming together to

discuss the best practices and the approaches we should

take as a nation to eliminate this epidemic of obesity.

Together with your help, we can ensure the best possible

health and the greatest productivity and independence for

all of our children. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER LEARY: Well, that's a wake-up,
isn't it? I just want to take a few minutes to give you
some purely personal perspective on what I see the role
of the Federal Trade Commission in this battle, number
one, as a law enforcer; and number two, as an agency that
encourages private initiatives to help cope with this
problem, among many others. And I think maybe the best
way to do that would be to give you some basic scenarios.

The first basic scenario addresses deceptive advertising of any product, whether it's a healthy product or an unhealthy product, or whether it is advertised to young people or the population at large. In general, the Federal Trade Commission has the authority to prosecute cases of deceptive advertising, across the board.

And it doesn't matter as far as the basic authority is concerned whether the advertising is to youth or to the general population. Where the advertising to youth is concerned, there may be some difference in the definition of what is deceptive, because something that to an adult may merely be harmless exaggeration or what we'd say in the advertising community "puffing," to a child may be real. So, the standard for deception can be a little bit different, but the authority is there across the board.

What about private self-regulation targeted at deception? The issue here is a competition/anti-trust issue and it invokes -- what we're talking about now when we're talking about private activity, we're talking about essentially the two wings of the Federal Trade

Commission's authority and the reason why I personally have always believed the Federal Trade Commission is uniquely qualified to deal with some of these issues.

The anti-trust/competition issue reflects a broad suspicion of private law-making because private law-making has been too often historically associated with efforts to repress competition that is disruptive, and the best example I could cite for an audience here would be the codes of ethics of our own legal profession, which finally were addressed by the Supreme Court a little over 30 years ago.

So, that's the source of the suspicion, that private activity, while ostensibly directed at deception, is really directed at aggressive competitive activity, and that was the basis for the California Dental case, which the Supreme Court held against the Commission a few years ago. The Commission brought a case against an ethical code of the California dentists, which was aimed at restricting facially false and deceptive advertising, but which, in its actual application, was much more

broadly directed at disruptive price advertising and quality advertising of all kinds.

So, the lesson from the California Dental case is not that the Federal Trade Commission is going to jump on you if you have an advertising code and enforce it, directed at deception; the lesson from it is that you ought to enforce your code as written and not more broadly to suppress unwanted competition, and as you all know, there are many advertising codes in existence out there that we affirmatively support that address deception, among other things. The Better Business Bureau, the Direct Marketing Association.

A good very recent example close to home are the initiatives that the Federal Trade Commission undertook beginning about two years ago to address phony weight loss products with appeals to the media, through private initiatives, not to run ads that are patently false. And we weren't asking them to apply any high science, we were simply asking them to refuse to run advertising that was so obviously false that anybody ought to know it and be able to recognize it, and they published the booklet on the so-called red flag claims, and we have encouraged them to do it in talks to groups of them. And if they want to do it collectively and if that's the only way to do it, I promise you, they're not

1	going to get any trouble from the Federal Trade
2	Commission, provided it's done, as I said, focusing on
3	the problem at hand and not more broadly.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I remember one time I was talking at a meeting in New York and they were saying -- people in the publishing community, they were saying, well, you're asking us to apply technical science and that's not our job in reviewing ads. I said, it's not technical I said, would you run in a responsible publication an advertisement for some kind of a belt that would offset the law of gravity and enable people to commute to work over the bottleneck, you see. wouldn't run an ad like that, would you? No, of course we wouldn't. Why not? It violates fundamental physics. Same thing is true for ads that you promise you can lose weight without diet or exercise. It violates the fundamental laws of physics. Think of it in the same way and apply the same standards.

Now, scenario number two, a little bit more complicated. Non-deceptive advertising of an unhealthy product, assuming we can define what an unhealthy product is. Generally, the Federal Trade Commission today does not have the authority to bar the advertising, the non-deceptive advertising of a product that may be unhealthy. Now, there's a caveat there again. In some areas, an

advertisement that is literally true can be deceptive if it impliedly makes a health claim. In other words, if you literally state whatever the content of a particular food may be so that you imply in the ad that this is healthy food because it's only got X grams of whatever, but if it has some other unhealthy attribute and you are impliedly claiming it is a healthy food, even through a literally true statement, we may charge you with deception.

Now, what about non-deceptive ads directed at minors? The outcome there may depend on whether or not it is legal to sell the product to a minor or not. If it is clearly illegal to sell a product to a minor, the FTC can and has acted under its unfairness authority. I think of the Camel Cigarette case, for example. Ads obviously targeted at minors, no deception involved. Actually, there was really no content to the ads at all, they were just funny cartoons, but they were aimed at minors or the theory of the complaint was that they were aimed at minors. There was no deception, but it was unfair to advertise an illegal product to minors.

If the product is legal, if it's legal to sell the product to minors, the FTC will act only in extraordinary circumstances. As a general proposition, that is outside the scope of our authority. We did have

a case a number of years ago of non-deceptive advertising encouraging kids to make 900 calls at home without parental supervision and there was nothing illegal about the products that were being advertised. The unfairness was encouraging kids to incur telephone charges at home without the parents knowing about it. It was ultimately folded into -- the principle to that case became part of the 900 number rule, which is now a rule. And so, you do have some regulation there of non-deceptive advertising of products that are perfectly legal with lack of parental supervision. But, in general, we're not in that business.

You may remember -- some of you with long memories may remember the famous KidVid controversy going back about 25 years where the Federal Trade Commission took it upon itself to consider whether or not it would ban as unfair non-deceptive advertisements to kids of unhealthy food like sweet cereals and things like that, and it's a long, painful history. I'll just summarize it. We got our head handed to us and we're not likely to do that again in the near future.

What about self-regulation aimed at non-deceptive advertising or promotion or sale of unhealthy stuff? And, again, if the sales would be illegal, it's an easier case. It is done today -- for example, you

have industry codes. A good example is the liquor industry, which has an industry code directed at limiting the exposure of minors to advertising of alcohol, which, of course, is illegal for them to buy. If the sales to minors would be legal, it's a harder case, but my personal view is that private restrictions are possible if they are carefully tailored to address the problem at hand and there is no obvious commercial motivation.

Now, let me give you an example that will illustrate the difference. We do have advertising codes right now dealing with the promotion of adult video games or R-rated films to children. It's non-deceptive. It's not illegal to sell children adult video games or not illegal to admit children to R-rated movies, but there are nevertheless codes that are aimed at restricting promotion of those products to children and we're not about to challenge them as anti-trust offenses.

But let me give you an example -- even, by the way, we're not going to challenge them even if a spillover effect of self-regulation of that kind might be somewhat higher prices. However, assume hypothetically that a group of sellers got together and said, well, one way to restrict children's access to these legal products is to engage in a price-fixing conspiracy and price the kids out of the market. It might be very effective. We

would attack that as an anti-trust violation. Why?

Because it's not targeted to the problem at hand and there's an obvious commercial motivation.

So, what's the conclusion? The conclusion I want to leave with you is that there is a greater scope for self-regulation than you might think and there are many examples out there of self-regulation engaged in with the acquiescence and encouragement of the Federal Trade Commission. And if you're getting overly cautious anti-trust advice, come to us and we'll give you an advisory opinion that may surprise you.

The second lesson I want to -- my personal -my purely personal view is, and I haven't discussed this
with my colleagues, is I am not all that enthusiastic
about the idea of giving the Federal Trade Commission
greater authority than it has today to regulate in the
area of non-deceptive promotion of unhealthy food to
kids. And maybe that reflects the Libertarian in me, but
I simply am not comfortable with that reach of federal
authority and I really don't want to be part of a nanny
agency or a nanny state. And that's all I have to say to
you this morning. I thank you, again, for being here for
this lively discussion.

(Applause.)

MS. FAIR: Thank you very much, Commissioner

Leary, and thank you to Admiral Carmona for putting things into perspective for us this morning.

I'd like to ask the members of the first panel to approach so we can get started. I would also remind them again to speak directly into the mic, since that's the only way we have to create our public record. The other usual disclaimer, the same reminder of yesterday, that statements of HHS and FTC staff reflect their opinions and are not necessarily the official positions of their agency.

I'd like to remind you that we'll use the same question procedure that we used yesterday. Staff will be coming through with an array of question cards. If you have questions for this panel, please fill one out and we'll do our best to address that.

The final issue is just to remind you that you have until 10:00 a.m. to sign up at the registration desk to participate in the open forum that will happen immediately after this panel.

Let me introduce our two moderators for this panel. First is Dick Kelly, a senior attorney with the FTC's Division of Advertising Practices. Next to him is Dr. Barbara Schneeman, Director of the Office of Nutritional Products, Labeling and Dietary Supplements in the Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition at the

1	Food	and	Dru	g Z	Admi	nis	strat	cior	ı. Th	ney	have	way	better
2	title	es th	nan	we	do,	I	got	to	say.				

Let me turn things over to Mr. Kelly and Dr. Schneeman.

PANEL 4: SELF-REGULATORY AND OTHER STANDARDS FOR MARKETING FOOD TO CHILDREN

MR. KELLY: Good morning. We're reminded again by the Surgeon General's comments about the scope of this problem that we all are here today to try to at least partially address and the many and varied solutions that there are out there to find a way to solve this problem.

Commissioner Leary was wonderful. He helped set up this panel. It's called Self-Regulatory and Other Standards for the Marketing of Foods to Children. He gave us a great overview of FTC's jurisdiction, his own personal comments on what those limits should be or are, and also reminded us of the potential value and reach of self-regulatory programs to do things to solve this problem. We also had a little bit of discussion about limits and there are limits of course to what self-regulation can do and I'm sure we'll get into that as we have our discussion for this panel.

But, you know, three days ago all of us awoke to this headline in the Wall Street Journal, Food Marketers Propose Tougher Guidelines for Children's Ads.

Among the proposals being offered to the Children's Advertising Review Unit by the Grocery Manufacturers of America, we read, were ways to crack down on product placement in TV shows, the use of licensed characters in ads and food packaging and advergaming. GMA was also proposing to boost CARU's resources and staffing and make its monitoring process both public and more transparent.

As Barbara and I considered how this proposal would impact on our panel, it seemed there were at least two possible ways to view this. One as an end to a process, or, two as one company official said yesterday, a good start. And yesterday, we listened to the steps individual companies are taking to adjust their marketing efforts and product lines to deal with the problem of childhood obesity. We also heard about ongoing efforts by media groups and the advertising community to educate children about nutrition and exercise. Those efforts, taken together, present a part, a rather important part of industry's response to the problem of childhood obesity.

But, today, we want to focus on another part of that response, a more than 30-year effort by industry to police itself by setting general principles and specific guidelines that apply to all companies advertising food and beverages to children and that seek to prevent

advertising that is misleading or inappropriate for a child.

DR. SCHNEEMAN: As we've heard from Richard's comments about the panels yesterday and our opening this morning, I think we can compliment the panels yesterday for doing an excellent job in laying out the issues, showing us where the challenges are, the breadth of these issues, and as we move through this morning's presentations, I think we're going to start talking about how can we address those challenges, what are some of the solutions that can help us get to a better place.

Now, at the start of our panel this morning, we will hear from the Children's Advertising Review Unit about those guides and how they are enforced. So, we'll hear it first-hand. We'll then hear two presentations, the first about efforts in Europe and elsewhere to respond to the problem of childhood obesity and the second about a proposal offered by the Center for Science and the Public Interest for a different and perhaps more expansive approach to self-regulation.

And after brief comments from our other panelists, we'll begin what hopefully will be a wideranging discussion of not only the strengths and limitations of what is already in place, but also the pros and cons of expanding that base to issues that go

beyond the current guides and even beyond the proposals that we read about in the Wall Street Journal article.

I'm going to start by doing the introduction of our panel for this morning. First, we will have Elizabeth Lascoutx who is Director of the Children's Advertising Review Unit and a Vice President of the Council for Better Business Bureaus. CARU enforces the self-regulatory guidelines for children's advertising that applies to all food and beverage advertising directed to children under the age of 12. Ms. Lascoutx has been with CARU for nearly 25 years, serving as its Director for the last decade.

Next, we will hear from Charlotte Hebebrand who is from the Food Safety, Health and Consumer Affairs

Section of the European Commission Delegation where she serves as Special Advisor for Agriculture and Consumer

Affairs. Charlotte stepped in at the last second to take

John Bell's spot on our panel. Mr. Bell, unfortunately,

was called away on Wednesday, called back to Brussels

because of a family emergency, and Charlotte, we

appreciate your being here and stepping in at the last

minute.

Then we will hear from Margo Wootan, who is the Director of Nutrition Policy at the Center for Science and the Public Interest, a health advocacy organization

that specializes in issues related to nutrition and obesity. CSPI has proposed a nutrition-based set of guidelines that would apply to food and beverage advertising directed to children under 18. Dr. Wootan co-founded and coordinates the activities of the National Alliance for Nutrition and Activity.

Then our shorter presentations will begin with Patti Miller, who is Vice President and Director of the Children and Media Program at Children Now. Children Now is a national advocacy organization seeking to ensure that children are a top public policy priority. Ms. Miller has testified before the FCC on media consolidation and children's programming, as well as the potential impacts of digital television on youth.

Then we will hear from Kathryn Montgomery who is Professor of Communications at American University.

Dr. Montgomery currently directs the project on youth, media and democracy through American University's Center for Social Media. She was the co-founder and former President of the Center for Media Education.

And, finally, we'll hear from Wally Snyder, who is President and CEO of the AAF, the American Advertising Federation, the trade association that represents professionals in the advertising industry. Before joining AAF in 1985, he was an FTC staff member and

l former Director of the Division of Advertising Prac	cices.
---	--------

- 2 Then we'll move into our discussion.
- So, let's begin this panel now by hearing from
- 4 Elizabeth Lascoutx of CARU.
- 5 MS. LASCOUTX: Thank you, Dr. Schneeman and
- 6 Dick for having me here, and thank you to the FTC and the
- 7 Department of Health and Human Services.

8 The Children's Advertising Review Unit is a

9 Division of the Council of Better Business Bureaus,

10 created in 1974 at the request of the advertising

industry with a mandate to ensure that advertising

12 directed to kids under 12 is truthful, accurate and

appropriate for the developing cognitive abilities of its

14 audience. Our system is overseen by the National

15 Advertising Review Council, which is called NARC, I'm

sorry to say, a strategic alliance of the AAAAs, ANA, AAF

17 and Council of Better Business Bureaus.

Policy for our self-regulatory system is set by

19 NARC. Support comes from the industry. We are, after

all, self-regulation. But our daily operations are

21 independent of NARC and the industry under CBBB

22 administration.

23 CARU's guidelines are comprehensive standards

for messages targeting children in all media. They go

25 far beyond truth and accuracy and far beyond anything

that could be required by law or regulation. They're
developed and revised with input from our Academic
Advisory Board, experts in the fields of communication,
child development, child mental health and as of last
year, nutrition. We draw further input from industry
experts, where appropriate, and final approval comes from
NARC, and I was supposed to put my slides up. Sorry
about that.

The guidelines are carefully and broadly drawn to be flexible and adaptable to a constantly changing media and marketing landscape. In the mid-nineties, CARU and an industry task group developed guidelines for protecting children's privacy on the Internet which ultimately formed much of the basis for COPPA.

Similarly, this last May, CARU convened a task force to develop an appropriate approach to advergaming and we expect its recommendations later this fall.

Some of the guidelines specifically address food advertising, but all the guidelines apply to all advertising. Dick Kelly asked me to show some specific guidelines that we've applied to food. All right, this first one, copy, sound and visual presentations should not mislead children about product or performance characteristics, including nutritional benefits.

Advertising and packaging for Unilever's Popsicle Juice

Pops contained a statement, real fruit juice pops. CARU determined that children might think they were 100 percent juice when they were about 30 percent and the advertiser eliminated the claim from both advertising and packaging.

Yesterday, we saw an ad showing some fruit jumping into a blender and coming out as candy. We had exactly the same issue with that ad and the advertiser pulled it off the air at our request.

Second guideline, what is included and excluded in the initial purchase should be clearly established. Ads for Burger King and McDonald's children's meals showed the premium toy and the traditional burger, fries and soft drink that had long been the components of those meals. Our concern was that kids might not know that there were now other choices, applesauce, apple slices, milk, juice, that they could order and still get the kids' meals. Both advertisers agreed to show more choices in their ads.

Comparative claims should be based on real product advantages that are understandable to the child audience. An ad for Nutella truthfully claimed that it had less fat and sodium than peanut butter, but since it had more sugar, CARU asked them to modify the claim and they did.

The amount of products featured should be within reasonable levels for the situation depicted. An ad for Pringles showed four youths each with his or her six-serving can. The advertiser agreed to show single-serving cans in future ads.

Representations of food products should be made so as to encourage sound use of the product with a view toward healthy development of the child and development of good nutritional practices. An ad for an online promotion for Heinz Bagel Bites contained the line, the more you scarf, the more you can win. CARU believed this encouraged over-consumption of a snack food and the advertiser removed the line from its ads and its website.

Yesterday, I sat here and listened to some pretty harsh criticism of our self-regulatory system, which I'll assume was uninformed. But Linda Brugler and the panel on changes to advertising and marketing got it right. We're as good as it gets at fulfilling our mandate, which is to scrutinize how products are advertised to children, not what products are advertised.

We monitor over 1,000 commercials every month, along with print, online and radio and we don't miss anything. CARU investigates roughly 100 ads or websites a year. We have a compliance rate of over 97 percent when we ask for modification. And as I said, there's

nowhere we could refer these cases if advertisers refused. Our guidelines go beyond anything required by law. That speaks to the extraordinary support for our system from the business community.

As for transparency, CARU issues a press release at the conclusion of every case, which is also posted on our website. Full decisions are available to the general public on request.

A further indication of industry's buy-in of our guidelines is that most of the ads we see are already in full compliance because the internal reviews at the agency and client level have our guidelines in mind, and we will look at scripts, story boards, rough cuts and websites to ensure that the finished communication complies with the guidelines when asked to by the advertiser.

Our work with the industry isn't just monitoring for the ads that fall through the cracks, though. We work collaboratively with the industry to raise the bar on best practices. This spring, we engaged the major producers of fruit snacks to share our concern that the category name could confuse children as to the actual fruit content. The result is that they've agreed to change the name of their current products to fruit-flavored snacks in advertising and on packaging.

-	1	Lastly, while our industry is well aware of our
2	2 \$	system and guidelines, our outreach to consumers has been
	3	secondary. We've already been easy to find. If you
4	4 9	google kids or children and advertising, we're the first
į	5 ι	up and we've always had a contact us link. But we've
(6	recently taken some steps to increase consumer awareness
•	7	of CARU and our availability. We've redesigned our
8	8 7	website to include an interactive complaint form with
-	9 8	specific instructions on how to lodge a complaint and the
1(.0 1	NARC has created the new position of Communications
1:	.1 I	Director to help in outreach to parents and consumers.

I thank you for your time and I look forward to answering questions.

DR. SCHNEEMAN: Next, we will hear from Charlotte Hebebrand from the European Commission. Charlotte?

MS. HEBEBRAND: Good morning. I bring warm regards and regrets from John Bell who is the head of our Strategy Unit in Brussels and the Director General for Health and Consumer Protection. He had very much looked forward to participating in this very interesting workshop, but unfortunately, as Barbara has said, had to be called away to attend to a family emergency.

It's a pleasure for the European Commission to participate here today and we thank our two hosts. The

Commission is very pleased with the excellent working relationship we have both with HHS and the FTC. I will just speak here a little bit about the fact that obesity is no longer an American problem and also to discuss a little bit to give you a very broad landscape of the marketing of food in Europe. Then I would like to close with explaining the actions that are being taken by the Commission to address the increasing problem of obesity.

So, very clearly, obesity is no longer confined to this side of the Atlantic. The statistics in Europe really speak for themselves. We are now looking at a situation where in the EU, one in five kids is overweight. We have 400,000 annual rise in cases, new cases of overweight or obese children in the EU. That's adding to those that are already overweight, 14 million and three million obese children.

Also interesting to note, seven member states in the EU right now have a higher obesity prevalence than the U.S. So, those are pretty alarming statistics.

Now, what is happening in the EU with regard to marketing of food to children? There are some EU-wide provisions that apply to all of our member states and there are two in particular that I will highlight. One is a very new directive that has just been passed this year. It's called the Unfair Commercial Practices

Directive, and that includes safeguards to ensure responsible advertising to children. For example, it bans ads that encourage children to use what's called pester power to get their parents to buy certain products. It also bans ads that tell children directly that they must buy a particular product. So, those are no longer allowed across Europe.

There is an older directive called TV Without
Frontiers in Europe, which essentially the purpose is to
regulate broadcasting in Europe, but it also includes
provisions on the protection of minors when it comes both
to advertising and tele-shopping.

But, of course, there has been more activity beyond this sort of umbrella at the EU level in the individual member states, and I will just try to give you a flavor for some of those. Some member states have gone to more restrictive measures than the ones I've just outlined. We have one member state, Sweden, which has a total ban on ads aimed at minors, regardless of what type of ad. Another member state, Greece, has a ban on toy ads from 7:00 in the morning to 10:00 at night.

Some member states have legal restrictions on ads around kids programming or detailed rules on the content of ads. Most recently, you've seen this in France and Ireland. And it's important to emphasize that

most of the member state activities aim at reinforcing industry voluntary measures. There has been a lot of action by individual companies. There have been quite a number of industry codes of conduct in member states.

And the governments are really focusing on getting the food and the advertising industry to voluntarily restrict their activities, in particular with regard to having responsible self-regulation, and they are sort of issuing a challenge to the industry to use their social marketing techniques to promote healthier food.

But I think it's fair to say that more remains to be done. A number of studies in Europe have shown that advertised foods differ from what's recommended for a healthy diet and they also show that ads do have an impact on children's diet.

Perhaps the study that's gotten the most attention recently was one which the U.K. Food Safety Agency commissioned in 2003, the so-called Hastings Report, which concluded that food promotion affects children's food preferences, purchase behavior and consumption in two ways. At the brand level it can influence a kid to buy one brand over another, but also at the category level, that is perhaps confectionaries over fruit.

1	I'd like to now speak a little bit more
2	broadly, not just on marketing, but what is the EU doing
3	to address the problem of obesity. We have an ongoing
4	scientific assessment by our food safety authority, EFSA,
5	to look at the issue and to come up with some nutritional
6	guidelines. We also are working on reviewing our
7	nutritional labeling in Europe which for now is still a
8	voluntary measure unless you make a nutrition claim. So,
9	you will see maybe some proposals coming forth in the
10	next year.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Since 2003, we have a network on nutrition and physical activity which is advising the Commission on preparing a strategy to combat obesity. We are undergoing a consultation process, the result of which will be a nutrition green paper, which will then be followed up by an EU Commission communication on nutrition, physical activity and obesity. And very importantly, in order to focus minds, the European Commission has launched a European Platform for Action on Diet, Physical Activity and Health. This was just launched in March of this year by Commissioner Kiprianu. It is meant to be a forum for open and informal discussions on diet and physical activity. The focus here is on self-regulation, but I think Commissioner Kiprianu has been quite clear in saying that if at the

end of the day those self-regulation efforts don't really amount to very much, he will not be afraid to propose some legislative acts as well.

The members of this platform basically include all relevant players that are willing to enter into binding and verifiable commitments that can help to halt and reverse current obesity trends. So, we have the food industry there, the advertisers, retailers, the catering industry, NGOs, as well as scientific experts from WHO and other places.

The aim of this platform is to get the partners to share their initiatives, to gather best practices, but also very concretely for the different players to make very concrete commitments and allocation of additional resources to fight the problem. So, you've had the players already give their baseline commitments for this year, and by the end of this year, we expect to see increased commitments that they're willing to make for the following year.

The platform also includes a number of working groups whose purpose it is to deepen our understanding of the issue. One of them, in particular, will look at the issue of food marketing. It is a working group on informing consumer behavior, education, information and commercial communication.

What we are planning now as part of this platform is a trans-Atlantic platform event. We are hoping this could take place in May of next year because, obviously, we have the same problem on both sides of the Atlantic and arguably, we have the same players on both sides of the Atlantic. Certainly, the food industry is very international.

We are very keen to learn from the U.S. experience and we are looking at inviting around 50 experts from the U.S. This would be from the administration, regulators, consumers and certainly also from the business community. The idea would be for the EU and the U.S. participants to, again, exchange best practices and discuss what could work best going forward in the future.

This event -- and we don't yet have an agenda outlined, but I will be glad to, and my office will be glad to, keep all of you informed about this, but it will be opened by Commissioner Kiprianu, as well as the Minister President of the then EU presidency from Austria and also some key members of the European Parliament. So, we really are very excited about this event and I know that we will see quite a number of you or representatives of your organizations at that event.

So, with that, thank you very much and we'll be

in touch as the agenda for this develops further.

DR. SCHNEEMAN: Margo Wootan will be next from CSPI.

DR. WOOTAN: Well, good morning. Just to start, I guess I'd like to echo what Chairman Majoras said yesterday. We completely agree that obesity and children's poor diets are affected by many different factors, but that food marketing is one of the most important. So, we're very pleased that the FTC and HHS are stepping up their efforts, giving more attention to these issues.

We also want to say, from CSPI's perspective, we don't believe that the food industry or food marketers are intentionally trying to undermine children's health. We recognize that it's just not their goal necessarily to address health. But I think there's no doubt, no question that the goal of food marketing aimed at children is to influence their food choices, their food preferences, what they ask their parents to purchase, and one thing that hasn't been mentioned yet in this meeting, is what they purchase themselves. Since a lot of people are only talking about the little tiny kids, we forgot that many children have lots of money in their pocket, lots of opportunity to make food choices on their own. So, it also affects what they buy themselves.

We haven't heard in this workshop very much about the science behind that, but certainly companies know and parents know and studies show that food advertising works, that it is effective. And if you're not familiar with this science base, I would encourage you to read one of the many reviews that is now available. The Institute of Medicine is currently pulling together a review of the science, which is supposed to be available this fall. We haven't heard a lot about the IOM, though many of us have been following that process very carefully.

There also is a very well done, comprehensive, systematic review of the literature that's been done for the U.K. Food Standard Agency which is quite good, and a number of non-profits, including the Center for Science and the Public Interest have a review of the issue of food marketing. This is ours, which is available on our website. But Kaiser Family Foundation has one, American Psychological Association and others. So, if you are thinking there isn't science in this area, you need to look a little closer because there have been dozens and dozens, hundreds of studies done in this area, looking at food marketing aimed at children.

Now, considering the current political environment, government, as we've heard throughout this

workshop again and again, government is unlikely to require companies to change the way they market food to children any time soon. The steps that Kraft and Nickelodeon and PepsiCo and other companies are beginning to take is very encouraging and we're really feeling very optimistic and hopeful that things around food marketing to kids may change in the near future. But they haven't changed much yet. That if you watch children's television for an hour or two or take a walk down the aisles of a supermarket with a child or surf the Internet, you will see that food marketing aimed at kids is just out of control. There's a lot of it, it's very sophisticated, slick, very enticing and it's almost exclusively for foods of poor nutritional quality. That currently self-regulation through the Children's Advertising Review Unit is not working.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So, we're going to talk on our panel about ways to strengthen self-regulation. In fact, that currently seems like the most promising approach. The Center for Science and the Public Interest developed a set of guidelines for responsible food marketing to help move the issue of self-regulation along to give companies a starting point from which they could work to develop their own guidelines, to help give CARU some ideas of ways that they could strengthen their own guidelines

around food marketing to kids. We thought these are more up-to-date, they're more comprehensive, they're much clearer than much of what's out there today.

Now, also, just one other clarifying point I'd like to make is that we don't think that self-regulation or government regulation is to supplant parental responsibility. Of course, parents are ultimately responsible for what they feed their children. But self-regulation or changes in regulation, changes in food marketing help to support parents to make it possible for them to feed their children a healthy diet. That getting our children to eat a healthy diet would be much easier if we, as parents, didn't have to contend with billions of dollars worth of marketing for almost exclusively nutrition-poor food.

Today's parents are just completely outmaneuvered by food marketers. Companies have
considerably more expertise and persuasive techniques.
They can hire nutritionists and psychologists and market
researchers and other experts where parents have very
little expertise in these areas. Companies also have
cartoon characters, toy giveaways, contests and a wide
range of techniques that we, as parents, don't have. We
saw yesterday how powerful Elmo can be. You know, I
can't get Shrek to come to dinner and sit down and

encourage my daughter to eat her zucchini. All I can do is say, you know, Cameron, please do it, I wish you would eat more vegetables. So, we have to keep in mind the differences in resources and expertise that parents have compared to what companies have. Also, that parental authority is significantly undermined by the wide discrepancies between what parents tell their children is healthy to eat and what companies tell our children is desirable to eat.

So, our guidelines for responsible food marketing address not only how food is marketed, but more importantly or as importantly, which foods are marketed to children. That's in, you know, big contrast to what CARU does or what the FTC looks at, which is mostly looking at techniques.

Those approaches really fail to address the heart of the problem with food marketing today, and that problem is not so much that marketing is bad. I wish we had more marketing for broccoli and bananas and other healthy foods. I'm glad to see some movement in that area. But simply changing the way a sales pitch is couched is often irrelevant because the real problem is that the food itself undermines children's diets and health.

So, CSPI is urging companies not to market

soda, caffeinated drinks, other sugary drinks, sports drinks, imitation juices and other sugary beverages, and we have nutrition standards for foods that limit the amount of saturated and trans fat, sodium, added sugars, limits on portion sizes, and also to make sure that the food contains some nutrients. Sometimes people forget, you know, the main reason we're supposed to eat, in addition to calories, is to provide nutrients in children's diets.

So, our marketing guidelines, set nutrition criteria that would limit the marketing of many products that are currently marketed to children, but it doesn't limit it to only the ideal foods. It's not that our nutrition standards would only allow the marketing of fruits, vegetables and whole grain, low fat milk, but it's a compromise, though maybe some in the food industry don't see it that way. But we allow for the marketing of some nutritionally improved versions of foods that we know children are going to eat. So, maybe some low fat cookies or baked chips that maybe aren't the healthiest things in the world, but are certainly better than many of the options that are currently being marketed to kids.

Now, just to give an example of the difference between the way we deal with the techniques by which foods are marketed compared to what CARU does, the

language that CSPI uses is much more specific, more
actionable. That while there's a lot of overlap between
the principles and guidelines of CSPI's and CARU's
guidelines, ours are, on the whole, much more specific,
much clearer, much more actionable.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

For example, the CARU quidelines point out that the mere appearance of a character with a product can significantly alter a child's perception of a product. However, CARU's quidance suggests that character endorsements should reflect the true experience and belief of the endorser and that the character shouldn't be shown in both an ad and a show at the same time. You know, as if the biggest problem is like when the character is shown as opposed to the use of the character to promote an unhealthy food. Also, cartoon characters, which are often shown with food, don't ever eat. know, it never reflects the true experiences of that character. In contrast, CSPI's quidelines urge companies not to use marketing tie-ins with movies or television shows, cartoon characters or celebrities with foods of poor nutrition quality.

So, our guidelines deal with many of the same kinds of techniques and issues, nagging, product formulation and reformulation, toys, contests, games, club memberships and advergaming. They also provide a

lot of guidance about in-school marketing, which is very
important, and our guidelines call on companies to
support healthy eating in schools and to support parents'
ability to feed their children a healthy diet for those
many hours that our children are outside of our control
and at schools and ask companies not to market, to sell
or to give away low nutrition foods or brands anywhere on
school campus. So, that includes selling sugary soft
drinks, as well as the many different kinds of marketing.

So, our guidelines for responsible food marketing, I have some copies with me if anybody would like some. You can also find them on our website at cspi.org/nutritionpolicy. Thank you.

MR. KELLY: And next will be Patti Miller from Children Now.

MS. MILLER: Good morning. Thanks for having me here today. Over the last day-and-a-half, there's been a good deal of focus specifically on television advertising and there's also been several panelists who have urged the audience to focus more broadly on interactive media and the ways in which interactive media are being used to market products to children.

I'd like to take this opportunity this morning in my brief remarks to talk again about television, but specifically to focus on how television is changing and

what the implications are for the ways in which children are going to be marketed to and why this is going to be a very great concern to the nation's parents.

As television transitions from analog to digital, children will soon be able to view television and access the Internet from the same platform with a simple click of a mouse. Young viewers may be able to link to the Internet during a TV show to access information about a program, surf a website or even purchase merchandise. As television changes, questions arise about how children are going to be targeted and marketed to in an interactive world and how these emerging advertising practices will affect young viewers, especially when you consider the fact that the majority of this advertising is for fast food, junk food and sugar cereal.

Imagine this scenario, for example. Little
Joey is watching Scooby Doo on television and he's able
to click on Scooby's head where he's immediately
transported to a website where he can be exposed to more
marketing or even purchase Scooby Snacks or even the
Scooby doll. Children Now and the Children's Media
Policy Coalition are increasingly concerned about this,
about the ways in which kids will be marketed to in a
digital television environment, especially when you

consider their inherent vulnerability to commercial persuasion.

We know how interactive media, specifically the Internet, is already being used to entice children through, what we've heard a lot about over the last day or so, advergaming, and I won't go into specific examples of advergames since I know we've talked a little bit about that in the last day. But as we heard yesterday, the average amount of time that a child spends with an advergame is 26 minutes, and that's clearly much more than a 30-second commercial, which provides ample opportunity to expose children to specific brands.

Now, many companies are starting to investigate the potential of interactive advertising on television. Digital advertisers believe that the transition from the web to TV should be smooth given children's familiarity with computers. As one executive remarked, children already have been communicating with the brands through the web which should make it easier to build a dialogue through interactive television. Kentucky Fried Chicken is experimenting with interactive TV to reach young consumers. During a TV program targeted to 4 to 11-year-olds, KFC encourages young viewers to enter designated areas by clicking on a remote control when prompted by presenters on the show, and they have a special section

that features the company's logo, offers games and provides information about menu and restaurant locations.

We're also really concerned that interactive advertising is going to be used to track the viewing habits and interests of viewers without their knowledge or consent. Eventually, interactive television will allow advertisers to target individual viewers with personalized ads and they'll be able to target children according to gender, age, household income and race by tracking the history of their individual television viewing habits.

It's essential that children are protected, especially when considering the role that advertising of unhealthy foods plays in their short and long-term food preferences and consumption habits. Currently, we have rules about the amount of advertising allowed in children's programming and we have rules about the separation of programming and commercial content. It's essential that these rules are updated for the digital age, especially when you consider kids' unique vulnerability to commercial persuasion, the fact that they will be exposed to and will be interacting with advertising for undefined periods of time and the individualized ways in which children will be targeted in a digital television environment. The bottom line is

self-regulation is not going to be sufficient. Children
will need greater protections.

Last fall, the FCC tentatively concluded that there should be no commercial links embedded in children's television programming. The Children's Media Policy Coalition is working to bring this issue to a conclusion to ensure that there are policies in place to protect the health and well-being of our nation's children in a digital television environment. Thank you.

MR. KELLY: Thank you. Dr. Montgomery from American University.

DR. MONTGOMERY: Thank you, and I'm very, very happy to be here. The last time I was at the Federal Trade Commission was in the late nineties. At that time, I was representing my organization, the Center for Media Education, and the topic was children's online privacy. And some of the same people who are here today were there then, the conversation was somewhat similar. I think there was a great deal of concern about the issue and many proposals to do something about it. The industry was very, very interested in promoting the concept of self-regulation and in resolving the problems through self-regulation. Industry came forward, individual companies with very good initiatives for responsible data collection practices to children and CARU also came

forward with some proposed additions to its guidelines for children.

Ultimately, however, what we needed and what we were able to get was a law, the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act of 1998, which most of you are familiar with, and that law gave the FTC the authority to develop some rules and to bring the parties together, the stakeholders together to work out some rules in a very narrowly tailored way, to create some safeguards around data collection to children in the online environment. And our effort from the beginning was to try to create a level playing field and a set of rules of the game for marketing to children in the digital media environment.

CARU is one of a number of self-regulatory initiatives that are part of the Safe Harbor Rule. So, CARU in the area of COPPA and also, I would say, in the area of children's television advertising, operates, in these cases, within a framework of law and rules, federal rules.

I think we're in a very similar situation now with perhaps even a great deal more at stake, and I see the workshop that the FTC has convened as a very, very good first step in bringing today's stakeholders together. But I believe that we will need more comprehensive approaches and a stronger role by

government to ensure really adequate safeguards for children in the future, particularly. And I think it's particularly important, as several others have said over these two days, that we take into account not just television but this expanding digital media landscape that our children are growing up in.

I also wanted to urge us to think about not just small children but about adolescents as well. I'm the mother of a tween. She has all of the characteristics of a tween, I can tell you. You guys have figured her out, and she'll soon be a teen. And I, like many other mothers, many other parents, know very well that she may not have the same cognitive issues, she may be able to cognitively figure things out, but there are emotional issues she deals with as an emerging teenager and she deserves to be treated fairly in the marketplace.

So, Patti's laid out some of the issues in the new media landscape, I want to just give you a couple more. I have a printed statement I'm happy to share with you that sort of illustrates where digital marketing is going and what we've got to look at. We've talked about advergaming, branded environments, integration of advertising and content, that is where everything is going in digital media. We must take that into account.

I got an email the other day from mycoke.com urging me to come back to the site and to create a blog that I could send to all my friends and fill out surveys where I could win some points that I could use. I could also win them by drinking lots of Coke. Viral marketing, I think many of you have heard about that. And then web-based promotions and integrated marketing campaigns.

I have a couple of examples here, and I don't have time to share them all, but Nick -- Nickelodeon, who's done some very, very good things, also last year had a campaign with Fairly Odd Parents where they put codes in Pringles Snacks Stax and the packages enabled kids to go to Nick.com and insert the code numbers and then watch the show and do all kinds of other things, and that was coordinated with a retail campaign where the products were supposed to jump off the shelves, as one marketer said, and as many of you know, Nick is going to have a souped-up website called TurboNick that will feature "leave-behind ads" that won't disappear from the screen until a new ad comes up.

Then, also, there are all kinds of things going on in the area of wireless technology with text messaging. There's some work going on with McDonald's and Kellogg, many, many more. These are just a handful. They're happening under the radar of parents and

policymakers as well and they're kind of hard to keep track of. I mean, as a parent, it's hard for us to know what games our kids are playing, you have to talk to them, I agree. You have to tell them you want to know where the games are, you have to join, you have to be a member. So, it's very challenging for parents.

Here's what I think. I think that if the FTC is going to do research, and I believe it should, they really ought to be doing research on the contemporary food marketing practices aimed at children and teens in the digital media to determine what safeguards are needed. Some of these new practices in the interactive media environment may well violate existing government rules against deceptive advertising, which the FTC currently has the full authority to regulate.

We may need to have a requirement, as we do with COPPA, where companies will disclose, as they do their privacy practices, what their marketing practices are, you know, how they target children, what kinds of market research they do to probe the psycho-social and the cultural practices of children and teens. At any rate, we need to continue this dialogue and I look forward to participating. Thank you.

MR. KELLY: Thank you. And last, Wally Snyder from the American Advertising Federation.

1	MR. SNYDER: Thank you very much. I want to
2	echo the comments in all the panelists in thanking the
3	FTC and HHS for holding this workshop. I think the
4	tonality is excellent. These are very open and this is a
5	great time to exchange ideas and join issues, quite
6	frankly.

I am President of the American Advertising
Federation. I want to disclose to you, at this point, I
am also a lawyer. I do that in the ad industry all the
time. I want you to know, also, I'm a member of the
National Advertising Review Council which does oversee
the activities of CARU. I believe that CARU has, for
many years, demonstrated its commitment to effective
self-regulation of advertising directed to children.
CARU has been enormously effective in helping to maintain
the truthfulness and the appropriateness of advertising
directed to children.

Now, some have said CARU has no teeth. CARU does have teeth and there's a tremendous compliance record to show that fact. Of all the cases that are brought to CARU, well over 95 percent are resolved voluntarily, and another very important point to remember is, if they're not resolved voluntarily, they can come to the Federal Trade Commission for final resolution.

Secondly, it's an organization which I think

really wants to reach out to the public and learn much more. One of the distinct advantages of the CARU guidelines is that they are not static. The guidelines evolve as necessary to address emerging issues. And I can tell you as a member of the Board of NARC that the Board of Directors and CARU remain committed to strengthening the children's advertising review process and it is always part of CARU's purview to be thinking about how to improve the process.

We understand that there are many stakeholders in this arena and so we really want to make sure that we hear from them and CARU hears from them. The recommendations that are coming from GMA will be carefully reviewed and they're, again, a great example of helping CARU to move on in its effectiveness. All of them, I think, will be given a great deal of attention.

You also heard Elizabeth mention we want more interaction with the public and particularly parents so that they understand how CARU works and that they can complain to us. Finally, the consumer groups certainly use CARU. CSPI, a leading consumer group, has, itself, asked CARU to take action on numerous occasions against particular advertising.

Now, CARU is evolving. A few years ago, CARU was at the forefront of reviewing child-directed

advertising on the Internet, and you heard how many websites are actively reviewed by CARU. CARU will also continue to evolve by adding more academic representation to its Advisory Task Force, and very importantly, you heard Elizabeth say and others that CARU is going to strengthen its review on the issue of advergaming and examining what role self-regulation will play in this area.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, I believe that CARU, however, is only part of the fabric of self-regulation. It is only part. The process begins at the point of creation of an ad. Advertising and agencies also have guidelines for ensuring the appropriateness and truthfulness of These are based upon the CARU quidelines advertising. and they're often even more stringent than the CARU In addition, commercials must withstand the scrutiny of the standard departments of the broadcast and now many cable networks that have standards. And, again, these standards are based upon the CARU quides, but often go further. This review process is ongoing from conception to execution and every day pouches of scripts and commercials are sent to the networks for their Once a commercial does make it on the air, it is subject to the CARU guidelines and to the scrutiny of consumers and competitors who speak or complain to CARU

1	about	the	questionable	advertisements
---	-------	-----	--------------	----------------

In conclusion, I believe CARU is judged unfairly by those who feel that CARU should evaluate what foods are advertised to consumers. CARU's expertise is in the message, not what foods, and CARU needs to stay focused on the advertisements and not on foods, the good foods/bad foods debate which will only be inappropriate and unworkable. Thank you very much.

MR. KELLY: Thank you. Barbara and I want to frame the discussion we'll have in the last about 23 minutes about the reach, scope, visibility and enforcement of the existing guidelines and basically proposals for change. I want to start first with a guestion for Elizabeth.

As you see in the definition under the CARU guidelines, the CARU guidelines apply to advertising directed to children under 12. The directed to children concept, how is that determined under the CARU guidelines?

MS. LASCOUTX: Well, it used to be a lot easier, obviously, when there was traditional kid programming in the morning and afternoon and weekend mornings, but we generally look to -- we still look at those day parts, but we also look at obviously media that are specifically designed for kids, like Nickelodeon,

except for Nick at Nite, and Disney, Radio Disney and websites that are specifically targeted to kids. But other than that, we have a kind of internal working rule that -- which we've borrowed from other industry codes, that if there is a 35 percent under 12 demographic in programming before 9:00 at night, we will look at it and consider it within our purview.

Now, if it's a program that doesn't look like it has any appeal to kids and the ads, except for one, which is for a drink or a candy are for insurance and automobiles, we will assume that is not kid-targeted, but rather team-targeted.

MR. KELLY: Thank you. The next question is the -- and this is for -- not just for Elizabeth, but for everyone on the panel. When you look at the definitions that are there, it also applies to advertising directed to children under 12. That includes, in its listing from the CARU guidelines, print, broadcast, cable, et cetera. The first question is sort of the reasonableness of having that standard as a standard under 12. It's already been mentioned here about the issue of those younger teens.

And the second question is, what about the new forms of marketing that are out there? A lot of them, it has been mentioned today, licensing, product placements,

- viral buzz marketing, advergaming, in-store promotions.
- 2 So, I'd like to focus the panel discussion sort of

looking at these limits that are in place on the reach of

4 the CARU guides and a discussion about what would be the

5 pros and cons of going beyond them.

acceptable.

Wally, why don't we start with you?

MR. SNYDER: I think we've always used the standard of 12 and under. I think it's been one that this country has sort of embedded in culture. We believe that that is a turning point. We know that that's not the perfect turning point. It seems to me that as far as the age restrictions, 12 and under are really workable,

I do believe as I said in my remarks that all of these methods of marketing need to be reviewed. And the example we started with was advergaming with that task force now looking at that at CARU, and I know that the NARC Board will be certainly open to looking at recommendations for other areas that we should be looking at.

MR. KELLY: The Wall Street Journal talked about that the recommendation was coming in from GMA to look at product placement in TV shows and use of licensed characters. Do you have any sense of what those recommendations might exactly be and what changes they

- might at least be contemplating for the guidelines?

 We'll start with Wally and then anyone else can come.
- MR. SNYDER: Well, I know, first of all, we're
 going to be receiving the letter today. I think they had
 been fairly characterized, very positive and I think we
 need to look at the details as we go forward.
- 7 MR. KELLY: Well, let's open it up to the other 8 panelists both in terms --
- 9 MS. LASCOUTX: Can I --
- MR. KELLY: Yeah, sure, go ahead, Elizabeth.
- MS. LASCOUTX: I just wanted to speak to the 12 and under.
- MR. KELLY: Yes.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. LASCOUTX: When we were established, and we were established with an advisory board of developmental psychologists and experts in child development, and the whole rationale for setting up a separate CARU from the NAD, which looks at truth and accuracy in non-kid-directed advertising was that there was a recognition that truth and accuracy wasn't enough with kids and it was specifically based on their developing cognitive abilities. And the wisdom at the time, at least, was that, you know, 12 was kind of when you stopped being a kid and started being a teenager and you could understand. It didn't mean you were going to behave

well, but you could understand. So, it made sense as the kind of developmental divide.

The other thing is, of course, that it's also the age that's used to kind of demarcate children's programming if you look at the Nielsen. So, it was just sort of a perfect fit.

DR. WOOTAN: Can I add to that? I think one thing that we, as scientists or advertisers or public health whoever -- whichever perspective we happen to come from in this room or on this panel, don't really get to decide what a kid is, that that has been decided by others way above our pay grade, that children are children under 18, and that we have to look at those children as having different vulnerabilities.

I think one mistake that a number of people have made is looking at marketing to kids only on the basis of whether it's deceptive, misleading, whether kids can understand it. There's been a lot of focus on, do kids really understand persuasive intent, and I think that's a part of the equation. But more importantly is the question of does their marketing have a negative effect on the children's health or well-being? You know, deception is bad, but, you know, giving a child a disease is something totally different.

So, I think we really need to focus the whole

discussion differently around marketing. Yes, let's talk about persuasive intent and understanding and all that, But as a more minor secondary point, the main point of consideration should be does the marketing have a negative effect on the child's diet, health, wellbeing, risk of disease, risk of disability, potential health care costs? And if we look at it in that way, sure, young children possess unique vulnerabilities in terms of their understanding of marketing, but older children possess vulnerabilities that might be even more important, that children -- older children have an opportunity to buy foods when their parents are not there to guide them and they have money. You know, I don't have to worry about my seven-year-old buying any goods, she never has money. She doesn't have any opportunity to buy food, but teenagers do and they buy a lot of food that their parents don't know about.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So, we need to look at junk food marketing and sales in schools, and while there's been momentum aimed at younger children because of the way, I think, that even my colleagues in the public health and advocacy community have framed this, they've framed it wrong and they've framed it too narrowly. It's the high school students who are more vulnerable and the middle school students to junk food marketing in schools, just as one

1	example.
---	----------

MS. KELLY: Charlotte, in Europe, is there an older age that seems to be set in some of these self-regulatory programs?

MS. HEBEBRAND: On the self-regulatory, I'm not sure what the age cut-off is. I know on the legislative efforts, in Sweden, for example, it's kids under 12. In Greece, where there's only a toy ad ban, I believe it's directed at all minors. So, I think it varies quite a bit.

MR. KELLY: The issue of going beyond advertising and covering some of this new marketing that is occurring, I'd love to hear some comment or discussion about the pros and cons of expanding beyond looking just at advertising and going into marketing itself.

MS. MILLER: I think you have to expand it to more than just advertising. When I was looking yesterday at the study when they were talking about TV ads decreasing, if that, in fact is true, we're not talking then about marketing, and that's what I think is changing. You're talking about branded environments, you're talking about the advergames, you're talking about product placement, on and on and on and on, viral marketing as Kathy mentioned.

I mean, the whole field has changed, and I

think for us to actually look at the amount of types of advertising that kids are exposed to, that really means marketing. So, I think in terms of what kind of guidelines are going to be set, it has to be expanded to include new interactive technology, the way that television is changing and the whole nature of the branded environment.

DR. MONTGOMERY: Obviously, I agree with that. But I also want to point out that I think CARU does an admirable job and often under not easy circumstances in terms of resources and so forth. Elizabeth may remember, however, the issues of Internet advertising was an issue that my organization, the Center for Media Education, really made more prominent through the release of our report in 1996 called Web of Deception. And that, I think, generated a great deal of debate and controversy and discussion, healthy discussion I think ultimately, and also prompted the industry to take some actions.

The point I'm making is that self-regulation is generally reactive and it is often narrow and somewhat, I would say, minimalist. That is if there's a controversy that comes up, the latest one, as you hear, is advergaming. Oh, my god, there's advergaming, what are we going to do about that? Then, an incremental change is made in the list of little problem areas that the

Τ	industry has had to deal with, and that becomes the next
2	thing that they make some corrections on. And I think
3	that's good, I'm happy that the industry does that. But
4	I do think we're at a moment with this incredibly
5	changing media landscape and at a point where we're
6	facing a health crisis with our young people where it's
7	time to revisit these issues and not to get caught up
8	hopefully, not to get caught up in the polarized debates
9	that characterize
10	MR. KELLY: Wally, you want to talk about
11	DR. MONTGOMERY: But to build some consensus.
12	MS. LASCOUTX: I would just like to respond
13	very briefly.

MR. KELLY: Elizabeth, and then --

MS. LASCOUTX: Not to devolve into a debate here, but the industry and CARU were not reactive back in the mid-nineties. At the time that the CME petitioned the FTC to regulate the kid space on the Internet, CARU had an active task group of its advisory board and people who were not on the board who were, in fact, much more knowledgeable than we about this new medium, kind of looking at this new medium, figuring out what was different about it, identifying privacy as really the only really new thing that we didn't cover, and we were at the point of kind of scratching our heads and figuring

out what the approach was at that very same moment.

I mean, there were a lot of different groups that had just -- that had focused on it. And when we came out with our guide -- we came out with our first set of guidelines in 1996.

DR. WOOTAN: Dick, actually before Elizabeth moves on --

MR. KELLY: We have a lot of things to cover, so I would like to move on. If we have some time, we'll come back to this issue, but there's a very important area that we need to discuss and make sure we get in and then we can come back.

DR. SCHNEEMAN: Right. I want to shift the discussion of the panel to the suggestion that there should be some sort of nutritional profile that's incorporated into guidelines. So, I'd like the panel members to address some of the pros and cons of using industry-wide nutrient standards like those that have been proposed by CSPI. Are those standards reasonable? Are there other criteria that we should be considering? So maybe if we could focus on that topic for a while. I think it's something that we could have a perspective from each of the panel members. I can start -- Wally, I can't see you, but I know you're down there.

MR. SNYDER: I'm down here. Well, I think the

question you said, are the guidelines reasonable goes to one of the ultimate questions here, is what's the consensus that these are the right nutritional standards? And when you're dealing with the food product -- the product rather than the ad, you raise a lot of central questions. I mean, would the government set these standards? I don't think the government's going to do that. I don't think the government should do it.

So, how do we understand that these standards are going to be effective in terms of this obesity issue? I think a much better approach is to make sure that the ads directing you to the foods are appropriate and fair and non-deceptive. That is a workable area and I think it will have the greatest impact. I have great concerns about nutritional standards and what its ultimate effect would be on the public and on children.

DR. MONTGOMERY: I would say I think this is a conversation we need to have. I don't think we should side-step it. I don't think it's necessarily going to be easy, but we know that the food industry's created special food categories targeted at kids and teens in the late eighties and nineties responding to demographic changes where teens were making more decisions and spending more money in the family. Now, industry's actually responding as well by creating new products in

1	response	to	the	concerns	over	health	that	could	shift
2	that bala	ance	€.						

So, I think a lot of companies within the food industry are already on board in terms of trying to make those changes. So, I think we need to be able to have that dialogue and try to figure out how best to do it.

MS. MILLER: I would echo what Kathy said. I think it would be very difficult to operationalize, but I think parents and kids need more information. They need to know what's in the food that they're eating and then how these products are then being marketed to them. So, I would say, actually, the idea of it is a really great idea and it's, I think, a question of how to operationalize. But if we could start that conversation and move it along, it would be very helpful.

DR. WOOTAN: I've already said what I think, but one thing is is that if we don't address the nutritional quality of the product, we miss the main problem with food marketing today. It's not so much that there's tons of deception, lots of misleading ads, although there's a little of that, it's mostly that overwhelming majority of ads and other marketing aimed at children are for foods that they should be eating less of. They're for foods of poor nutritional quality.

For The Record, Inc.

It is definitely possible to do this. People

(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

1	talk about how it's impossible, but states have
2	regulations with nutrition standards for food sales and
3	marketing in schools. The Federal Government has some
4	standards around school meals, that there are models to
5	look to. Kraft has a model that can be looked to.
6	PepsiCo has some nutrition standards for its marketing
7	practice. So, I just don't see how we can have
8	responsible food marketing aimed at children if we don't
9	address nutrition because that is the core of the issue.

MS. HEBEBRAND: There is actually a very pertinent debate occurring on this topic right now and it may be instructive to follow that as it goes through the process. The Commission has put forward a proposal on health and nutrition claims. Again, this is more on the legislative side, certainly not on the self-regulatory side. But it may be instructive in any case.

The proposal does argue that for some foods, such claims maybe should not be allowed, certain foods that have certain nutritional profiles, and it's been a big, big discussion in Europe. The end is not yet clear, but I think it will be instructive for all of us maybe to look at the outcome of that.

MS. LASCOUTX: Well, to the last point that was just made, any claims that are made for any product, food, otherwise, targeted to kids or otherwise has to be

substantiated. So, there's no -- I mean, you can't make a health claim for a food that you can't substantiate it.

My own feeling is that the determinations about nutritional standards are best left to the companies that manufacture the foods or the government, but the government doesn't seem to be likely to do that. But we're not experts in nutrition. I don't know how one would go about evaluating the nutritional properties of every single food that was advertised to see if it were appropriate. And I think one of the suggestions of CSPI is that for a certain brand or restaurant advertising, it would have to be -- you'd have to evaluate the nutritional composition of every single product in the brand or menu component, and I just think the practicalities would be pretty much insurmountable.

DR. WOOTAN: We can help you with that.

DR. SCHNEEMAN: I'm curious if anyone on the panel would like to speculate whether if there were a nutrition standard, would it increase or decrease advertising to children or would we wind up in about the same place? Would it --

DR. WOOTAN: Well, if you look at Kraft as an example, it probably wouldn't decrease the amount of marketing to kids. It would shift the marketing from certain products to other products.

MS. LASCOUTX: But as has been pointed out many
times, it's not just Kraft. I mean, a lot of the quick
serve restaurants and the other food manufacturers are
also making improvements to their products, involuntarily
pulling back on the products that they're marketing to
kids. So, I don't know that an across the board imposed
from outside standard is even going to be necessary.

DR. SCHNEEMAN: I'd like to, once again, shift the discussion a bit to talk about the role and responsibility of parents. Maybe bring forward some of the concerns that parents are expressing, what are their opportunities to get those concerns out into the forefront so that they can be addressed. And maybe Patti and Kathryn, I'll have you start out with this and see if other panel members --

MS. MILLER: Sure. To echo what Margo said earlier, I think parents are being out-maneuvered. I mean, clearly -- I mean, kids are exposed to 40,000 ads on TV alone and most of them are for fast food and junk food and sugar cereal and that's not taking into account all the other forms of marketing we've been talking about.

In a recent Kaiser poll, half of parents said that their children's food habits and food choices are influenced a lot by the TV ads that they see, and more

than a fourth said that they were influenced somewhat.

More than a third said that they had to deal with the nag

factor of their kids, someone was saying yesterday in the

aisle four of the grocery store having the temper tantrum

because they can't get the sparkling package of sugar

snacks that they want. So, parents have a really tough

job, I think.

One of the things I'm concerned about is really getting information into the hands of parents. I mean, I can't imagine that many parents know about CARU and that it's out there for them, and so I'm glad to hear that you guys are thinking about more public education efforts so the parents, if they want to file a complaint about an ad, would know where to go, because I think most parents don't and I think most parents don't know what to do. I mean, again, this is so powerful. As we saw yesterday with Elmo, that parents are competing against some pretty incredible marketing powers and they're losing the battle.

This is not to say that I don't think parents have a responsibility because I think parents do and there are things that parents can do. They can take TVs out of the bedroom and set up rules for TV viewing and try and model healthy eating habits. I think those are all really good things. But I think parents need some

help so they can make informed choices about what their kids are eating and they're just being bombarded and their kids are being bombarded.

DR. MONTGOMERY: I would agree, obviously.

Parents do need help. I think sometimes it's very complicated for us in this new media landscape to understand everything that's going on and even I, who study it, have to consult with my daughter sometimes to find out things that I didn't know about it. She's a very important source of information.

But I think as we did with COPPA, we were able to create a situation where parents got some help with their disclosures of privacy policy. So, if I go on a child's website, for example, I can click on the privacy policy and it appears in fairly understandable English so that I know what actually is happening on that website and can help make a decision about whether I want my child to venture there. And I think we need more information for parents and for kids. I mean, I think they all need -- we're helping to train these kids to be good consumers in our society as well and we need to do what we can to help them.

So, it's not just parents -- especially as they get older. It's parents and kids being able to get this information and for all of us to play a role in helping

click to be very cricetive combaniers	L t	them	to	be	very	effective	consumers
---------------------------------------	-----	------	----	----	------	-----------	-----------

MR. SNYDER: I think parents are desperate for more information and you heard what was being done by the companies yesterday, the different formulations and so forth, and yet, the research is that parents want more, they don't know enough. And I know there's a real opportunity here to really make sure that parents are informed.

As to the segment of self-regulation, as I mentioned, we really want to open that up to parents so that they can comment so we know what we're doing and what the guidelines are.

MS. MILLER: I think if parents, though, are going to get the help they need, I think one thing that they need are policies that have to be in place.

Because, again, I don't think that self-regulation is going to be enough to make sure that parents can feel like they can put their kids in front of the TV without just being exposed to excessive advertising. There have to be rules.

DR. WOOTAN: But if you listen to industry and government officials talk about parental responsibility, you know, parents are supposed to work with their school board to get soda and junk food and junk food marketing out of schools, we're supposed to get fast food companies

1	to provide nutrition information on the menu, we're
2	supposed to work with CARU and work with multi-billion,
3	multi-national corporations to get them to change their
4	marketing practices and the kind of products that they
5	make, all the while while we take care of our family,
6	take care of our home and work full-time. I mean, let's
7	talk about parental responsibility but let's put it in
8	perspective of, you know, what parents are facing, the
9	resources and the expertise that they have.

I mean, I've been lobbying D.C. Public Schools to try to improve the nutritional quality of school foods. I have a Ph.D. in nutrition, I'm a leading advocate on food marketing to kids, school foods. It is tough to do and I can do it during the work day. You know, the average mom or dad trying to do this, this is crazy what we're asking them to do.

MR. KELLY: Elizabeth, one last comment and then we're going to go to the questions from the audience.

MS. LASCOUTX: You can go to the audience questions.

MR. KELLY: All right. We have lots and lots of questions and, Margo, you're the winner just so you know. You have gotten the most questions of any of the specific panelists.

1		DR.	WOOTAN:	It's	probably	that	I'm	more
2	unpopular	than	popular.					

MR. KELLY: No, it's an interesting mix of questions. But why don't we start. There's one question that was raised about the issue that you set up this proposal for guidelines directed to children and the question was, well, do you think those same kind of provisions ought to be directed to advertising directed to older folks, perhaps to me or to parents, because there's a lot of advertising that's directed to older folks that also is for the same kinds of products?

DR. WOOTAN: No. Our guidelines for responsible food marketing are aimed at children, that we take, as a society, many steps to protect children, that we see that in the same vein. You know, if we want children to sit in car seats and wear helmets, they also should be protected from heart disease and diabetes and other diseases that kill and cause disability. So, these are clearly guidelines for children.

MR. KELLY: There's another question about what are the specific reasons not to advertise diet sodas to kids?

DR. WOOTAN: Our guidelines do not exclude diet soda. They only exclude the marketing of soft drinks -- well, actually, that contain added caloric sweeteners.

- 1 So, that's just incorrect.
- 2 MR. KELLY: There was a specific question --
- DR. WOOTAN: Unless it's caffeinated.
- 4 MR. KELLY: There was a specific question about
- 5 what percentage of manufactured food would you think
- 6 would qualify under the CSPI proposal.
- DR. WOOTAN: You know, I haven't done any kind of percentage, but one hope is that if companies were to
- 9 really adhere to responsible marketing practices, that
- there would be a real explosion in healthier, better for
- 11 you products that could be marketed to kids. You know,
- 12 clearly there are huge categories of foods like fruits
- and vegetables and many whole grains that could be
- 14 marketed. But there are also like Kids Cuisine frozen
- dinners, there are options, there are a number of
- 16 cereals, there's lowfat milk, there's juices, seltzer,
- 17 flavored waters, a number of different kinds of crackers,
- granola bars, a bunch of different kids of chips and
- nuts. There's, you know, a range of products that could
- 20 be marketed under our quidelines.
- 21 MR. KELLY: We got a vote from one of the -- it
- looks like here. It's a suggestion, I think, for all of
- us. How about the old-fashioned solution for parents,
- just say no to your kids.
- MS. MILLER: You know, again, I think that just

1	really I want to echo, of course, we all have a
2	responsibility in this issue, but I think when that kind
3	of frame comes up, it really is putting the onus on
4	parents and I think taking the responsibility off of all
5	the different constituencies that have to play a role in
6	this, including the industry. I think parents, again,
7	it's like David versus Goliath and what are parents
8	supposed to do in this onslaught of advertising. So, I
9	just don't think it's a fair frame to put that burden on
10	parents. Clearly, they have a role to play, but there
11	need to be policies in place to give parents that added
12	help. So, you know, there have to be limits, I think, on
13	the amount of this kind of advertising.

MR. KELLY: And there's been no question that over the day-and-a-half, we've had a lot of discussions of ways that all of us can reach out to parents to help them in this effort. Barbara?

DR. SCHNEEMAN: This is a question that I don't think we've really touched on in the panel discussion so far and it's a question about how self-regulation integrates the evidence that there are environmental, contextual and personal characteristics that affect the way ethnic minorities are marketed to and respond to marketing. And so, I think it would be important to have some comments about the role of self-regulation with

respect to the issues we heard yesterday on ethnic minorities.

DR. MONTGOMERY: Elizabeth, if you don't want to respond, I'll say something. I'm sorry. I would just say I think it's important. We ought to take that up. I mean, I think it is important. I don't think we probably have said enough about it and we tend to talk, all of us probably, myself included, as if the child audience, the child consumer population was homogeneous and that's not the case. So, I think it's a very important issue that also should be part of the -- what I see as a conversation that we are beginning now.

MS. MILLER: Forty percent of youth today are youth of color and that number is dramatically growing, and then when you also think about, as was mentioned yesterday, African American and Latino kids are spending more time with media. So, when you think about the ways they're specifically being targeted, that's an area for great concern.

MS. LASCOUTX: I agree, and I think it's an important area for us to look at further. I mean, we have not -- that's not part of our expertise and perhaps that's one of the areas that we should be expanding our advisory board. We have, recently, or a year ago, added bilingual staff so that we can, in fact, at least monitor

the Spanish language media and we're doing that. But as
we are looking to broaden our advisory board, that might
be a very good idea.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. KELLY: There's a question from those watching us. Panel, please comment on the usage or relevance of the food label as a regulatory tool for companies to use as a ranking mechanism for their products.

DR. WOOTAN: I would address that because actually, you know, people say it's impossible to set these kinds of limits or nutrition standards for marketing or for the sale of foods in schools. But if you look at the kinds of standards that individual school districts, states, legislators, regulatory agencies, individual health groups come up with, they're amazingly I think actually if you look at the nutrition quidelines for marketing that Kraft and CSPI have, they're a lot more the same than they are different, because when you look at the science, you come to a similar conclusion. It's not that we copied off each other, it's that we all looked at the same science base and you come up with similar numbers and many of those numbers come from FDA.

So, our cut-offs for fat, for saturated fat come from the label. All of our cut-offs for sodium come

from definitions from the FDA. We use definitions for claims, as well as cut-offs for disclosure and disqualifying levels of nutrients. Portion sizes, ours are based on FDA standard portion sizes. Added sugars, since the FDA has failed to provide a daily value for added sugars, though hopefully some day they will, that we use the recommendation from the Institute of Medicine's DRI Report, which is very well grounded in science and accepted by consensus. So, I think if you -- and the problem nutrients that we look at are based also on what's recommended by the dietary guidelines and our cut-off for what a whole grain is is based on FDA.

So, if you look at our nutrition standards for food marketing to kids, they are largely based on consensus numbers, many of them from the FDA.

MR. SNYDER: Can I just comment, also? I mean, the conceptual scheme for regulation and self-regulation in this country has always recognized the importance of labels, and labels, as providing more complex information to parents and consumers. There were good examples of that yesterday on the labels that were shown in those presentations. I think the question was really the role. I think labels are very important. They're a source of information for consumers and parents. Advertising plays a bit of a different role there, but it can never be

inconsistent. And I think that both are very important.
DR. SCHNEEMAN: This question asks if the panel
could discuss what or give some perspective on what is
the industry's standard definition of deceptive
advertising to children. How would industry define that?
MS. LASCOUTX: Well, obviously, if it's false,
it's deceptive and so that my colleagues at the NAD have
a much easier time because all they have to do not all
they have to do, but they have to look at the
truthfulness or accuracy of expressed or implied claims.
With kids, we also have to add kind of misleading to what
is deceptive and I think the Commissioner was talking
about that earlier, that, you know, something that is
factually true can be misleading to children.
So, it's really that's why we have these
very specific guidelines that go beyond truth and
accuracy. So, you know, anything that will imply that a
product will confer certain prowess on you can deceive or
mislead a child. So, the definition of deceptive for
children is far broader than that for older kids.
DR. SCHNEEMAN: Wally, did you want to comment
on that question, also?
MR. SNYDER: No, I think that's what I would
say.

For The Record, Inc. (301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

MR. KELLY: We have a question for Margo. What

25

would be the CSPI's position if a major fast food chain, quick serve, was using a popular kids movie or character in brand advertising where no specific foods or menu items are mentioned? Really the point of the question is, should fast food chains never use licensed kid properties in any promotions?

DR. WOOTAN: Our recommendation about advertising that doesn't show a product, which just promotes a brand, is that that brand should include a large number of healthy options, at least half of the options should be healthful.

So, if McDonald's was to use a branded character and showed a Happy Meal that had chicken nuggets, apple dippers and apple juice, that would comply or be consistent with our guidelines because it would show a healthful meal, a balanced meal. If they just did generic branded advertising for McDonald's with a character, that would not comply because the overwhelming majority of choices at McDonald's are still of poor nutritional quality. It's nice that they've added salad, yogurt, a chicken sandwich, some apple dippers, but still, if you look at McDonald's menu, overwhelming the choices are poor nutritional quality and the children's entrees still are just hamburger, cheeseburger and deep fried chicken nuggets that have plenty of trans and

1	saturated	fat.

DR. SCHNEEMAN: Okay, a question I think again addressed to several people on the panel, can a campaign that promotes healthy food succeed without reducing or restricting campaigns that promote junk food? So, sort of looking at the balance between these two.

MS. MILLER: I think public education campaigns are very, very important, but I believe, as Vicky Rideout said yesterday, they have to have the reach and exposure in order to actually have a chance against the competing messages that are out there. I mean, if you have one PSA promoting carrots and then you have 100 ads for various sugar cereals, you know, it's hard for that message, I think, to resonate. So, that's why I think public education campaigns need to have the resources committed to them because I don't know that they can be successful in this barrage of other advertising.

So, my sense is we need more public education messages, but we also need a reduction in some of this really unhealthy advertising for foods that are not good for kids.

DR. WOOTAN: But it seems like that question is grounded in the idea, and I hear a lot of industry critics of addressing junk food marketing to kids, thinking about addressing this issue as a ban on all

1	marketing to kids, and that's what we're not
2	recommending that, by any means, though I know some
3	advocates are. That responsible marketing can allow for
4	the commercial marketing of healthful foods. We're
5	thrilled, Marva, to see SpongeBob and Dora and other of
6	your very popular characters, which our children love, on
7	spinach and oranges and carrots, that we can use
8	marketing to promote healthy eating.

It's not that marketing is good or bad.

There's no inherent evil in marketing. The problem with marketing aimed at kids is that it encourages children to eat an unhealthy diet. The balance of messages is way skewed toward unhealthy foods that our children should be eating much less of, not be encouraged to eat more of.

MR. SNYDER: I wonder if you could push the fans up this way.

MR. KELLY: We're going to be ending in just a second, but here's some fans for you to take with you.

(Laughter.)

MR. SNYDER: What I wanted to add was, I think in America we really are used to this informational complexion. You're going to hear more about the Ad Council and what it's done, you heard about it yesterday. Very effective campaigns are coming out from the Ad Council and they're well-funded and they really have got

a tremendous media base to them. At the same time, the products that Margo's been referring to are getting attention by companies and are being advertised, and at the same time, all food products are being advertised, but it has to be done appropriately and fairly and I think that's really the standard we have to make sure is working.

DR. SCHNEEMAN: As anticipated, we have far more questions than we have time, but I think it's good that we have these questions and it helps give a sense of some of the issues that are being raised as a result of the panel discussion. I did want to give Charlotte one last opportunity. You might feel you're in the middle of a U.S. food fight here, but if there are some perspectives you have from the EU and what you see happening there, I did want to give you an opportunity to comment on some of these issues.

MS. HEBEBRAND: I think it is difficult to weigh on this self-regulation versus legislative action. I mean, I would just point out the obvious, I guess, that legislative actions take a long time on this side of the Atlantic, but certainly also in Europe. For any kind of proposal to go through the European Union, we're talking at least two, three years.

So, I think the focus on the issue -- and

1	certainly this conference, I think, has done that very
2	well. In a way, that's the idea behind that platform
3	that the European Commission has launched. I think self-
4	regulation can certainly work. It should be given a try,
5	it should be increased. But I think the important issue
6	is to keep the focus on it and to make sure that you can
7	actually monitor what self-regulation achieves. This is
8	something we hope to do in Europe. I think it remains to
9	be seen whether it's ultimately successful. But I think
10	in the big picture, self-regulation certainly is
11	something that perhaps could be done more quickly. It's
12	not to say that it's the best way to do it, but I would
13	just point out that obvious fact.

MR. KELLY: This brings an end to our discussion. I think we, literally and figuratively, have been on the hot seat.

(Applause.)

MR. PAHL: Thank you. If I could ask everybody to remain in their seats for a moment, we're going to go directly to the open forum part of our agenda.

Another thing, as well, I'd point out to everyone is they're working very hard on getting the air conditioning back up and running and I would ask everyone to be as patient as you can be.

(Whereupon, there was a brief pause in the

proceedings.)

MR. PAHL: Could the people at the head table move and take seats so that we can begin with the next part of our program? Thank you very much.

We have one person who has expressed an interest in speaking during our open forum, and that's John Warden from the Kids Fitness Challenge, who will be at the microphone located at the other end of the platform.

MR. WARDEN: Thank you very much. I know how hot it is in here, so I'll be very brief. The Kids Fitness Challenge tries to take a positive approach to the issue of child obesity. We focus on nutrition, physical activity and positive mental health. Something that hasn't been talked about too much in this discussion is the need of depression and anxiety and the role it plays in overeating and inactivity.

Our program has special events in communities throughout the country where we engage parents, teachers, kids and community leaders and special events that promote healthy eating, active lifestyles and enables schools to raise money to promote nutrition education and physical activity and after-school programs in their schools. We've funded, for example, full-time P.E. teachers in elementary schools through the Los Angeles

Unified School District.

We are going to be doing a big pilot program and we'd like to thank Bill Dietz at the CDC and the folks at the President's Council on Fitness. We are going to launch a school lunch pilot program featuring fresh fruits and vegetables, healthy snacking in vending machines and pilot program physical activity programs for kids in elementary, middle school and high school and we're going to study the results of the physiology change of the kids, as well as the effect on test scores, physical fitness scores, attendance and discipline.

We're very excited about this program and our program is going to be completely funded by corporate support.

We take the position that we would like the marketers and advertisers at this council to take a more positive approach, to be bolder and more ambitious in your plans to develop healthy items for kids and parents. As a father and a consumer, I know that there's not enough choice for my son or my family and that the demand is there. All you need to do is look at the rising market share of stores like Trader Joe's, Whole Foods and Rolled Oats and see how their products are flying off the shelves to know that there is market share to be gained.

We urge you to be more bold, take a positive approach and try to help us solve the rising rates of

1	obesity.	Thank	you.

2 (Applause.)

MR. PAHL: Thank you, John. We'll now take a

15-minute break and we'll begin with our next panel at

11:10. Thank you.

(Whereupon, a brief break was taken.)

MS. FAIR: Thank you for taking your seats, please. Thank you very much. Actually, the air conditioning works fine. We were using this as good a justification as any to advertise our new OJO campaign at the FTC, which is fighting fraud, including health fraud aimed at the Hispanic community. So, we have also been told that the compressor has been fixed, it turned on about five minutes ago. I think we're down two-tenths of a degree in just five minutes, so we hope this is a step in the right direction.

The final panel of the day, before we receive closing remarks, is going to cover the obvious topic, the next steps that should be taken. What should the government and the private sector do to help make children's diets healthier and encourage responsible marketing?

Our moderators for this panel, we're pleased to have Dr. Michael O'Grady, who is HHS's Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, and Mary Engle,

Associate Director for Advertising Practices with the FTC's Bureau of Consumer Protection.

PANEL 5: WHAT SHOULD THE GOVERNMENT AND THE PRIVATE SECTOR DO TO HELP MAKE CHILDREN'S DIETS HEALTHIER AND ENCOURAGE RESPONSIBLE MARKETING

DR. O'GRADY: Thank you very much and thank you very much for coming. I wanted to talk for a little bit before the panel gets started, especially given the other panels we've heard both this morning and yesterday to set a little bit of the perspective, especially from the way we view it at HHS.

As I think we heard very forcefully and eloquently from our Surgeon General this morning, our perspective is that this is a public health crisis and you've seen our various speakers that have been here over the last couple of days and the organization overall, the Centers for Disease Control, NIH, FDA and the Office of the Secretary. That we view this as something that is really a public health concern that we need to move forcefully in. You saw the statistics, you heard the motivation coming from the Surgeon General.

What we're looking for in a number of different things is really the evidence-based prevention that we can move in here and how does marketing fit into that kind of a context. So, what we're really doing is we're

1 moving on a multiple -- let's call it a multi-variate

2 approach whereas this is one of those variables involved.

And so, we're really moving across -- we're bringing our

best talent to bear here, you've heard a number of them

5 over the last couple of days, and we really are trying to

figure out how to do things. We're trying to figure out

7 how to empower parents, not blame them, and we're very,

very interested in the disparities and what the

9 implications are to those overall.

So, you've heard these different panels, we're coming up on the last panel now. I think all of us here have been to different conferences. Sometimes, boy, it was a good conference, what comes out of it? Two years later, there's another conference. We'd like this to be different. We'd like to really think about solutions. We'd really like to think about next steps that are going to be doable and effective in this area. We want to think about what works and there's a number of different things -- and my job working with the Secretary cuts across the entire breadth of HHS from welfare to work to Medicare, all across.

And there's a number of things you can see in common between policies that move forward, become mobilized and are effective. They tend to be practical, they tend to be achievable and they tend to be flexible,

and it struck me, especially that last one, that when we've talked about a market like this, when we talked about not only how it's changed within television but we've moved across into the Internet, that the idea of how flexible, how in effect self-correcting you would need to be in this particular policy to be able to -- you know, because this market is going to move clearly, quickly, agilely, probably much more agilely than the government can ever move, if other policy areas are any indication.

So, how do you do that? If we're in a situation where we're simply regulating or legislating after the fact, it will always be catch-up ball. When we think about what are the really practical solutions, how people can work together, where those lines need to be drawn and how you build this infrastructure to solve this problem, I really want to make that emphasis as we talk about things to the panel about how you make something that really can work.

For our last panel, we have brought a group of stakeholders together to give us their thoughts and where we go from here, and that is clearly the theme here.

We're asking the panelists to help us think about concrete next steps, public, private sector, how they can work together to help make sure that children's diets are

healthier and encourage responsible marketing. We are
hoping that our panelists will be able to react to things
they have heard over the last day or so and to bring
their individual expertise to bear and their perspective
on this broader question.

We will hear from the GMA on the proposed changes to the current self-regulatory framework they are announcing today and we will hear reactions to this and how we can continue to move forward together.

There is a lot to be done and I look forward to the discussion, and now, I'll turn it over to Mary Engle, my able colleague from the Federal Trade Commission.

MS. ENGLE: Now, it's my pleasure to introduce Vivica Kraak of the Institute of Medicine who will make a 10-minute presentation on three IOM studies regarding childhood obesity. Vivica is a Senior Program Officer in the Food and Nutrition Board of the Institute of Medicine. She staffed the IOM study that produced the report called Preventing Childhood Obesity: Health in the Balance. This workshop is partially a response to some of the recommendations in that report.

MS. KRAAK: Thank you. On behalf of the Institute of Medicine, I'd like to thank the HHS and FTC for inviting me to share the perspective of the IOM and the various studies that we're involved in right now that

are related to the topic of this workshop and also
commend both institutions for responding so quickly to
one of the key recommendations embodied in the Preventing
Childhood Obesity: Health in the Balance report. So,
the Committee on Preventing Childhood Obesity is very
excited about this event, particularly to bring together
various perspectives in a very constructive environment.

The Institute of Medicine is a non-profit independent institution that has the mission to advise the nation to improve health. What I'd like to talk about just in the 10 minutes I have is a brief background of the IOM study background, the process and the key conclusions from the Preventing Childhood Obesity Report. The three recommendations I'd like to specifically highlight are those related to the food, beverage and restaurant industries, as well as advertising and marketing guidelines to children and a third that focused on advertising quidelines in schools.

There are a number of other recommendations, and I don't want to diminish the importance of those, I'll just gloss over them, but you're able to get a copy of the report or the executive summary if you contact us. And then I'll wrap up with a brief overview of the food marketing and the diets of children and youth study that's in process right now. We hope to release that in

early November to the public and a Progress in Preventing Childhood Obesity Report.

The Preventing Childhood Obesity: Health in the Balance study was a Congressional request in 2002, and we had a number of sponsors. Within DHHS, we had CDC, several NIH Institutes, the Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, as well as the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. It was a two-year study and the task for the Committee was to develop a prevention focus action plan to prevent the number of children in the United States, and youth, who were not yet obese. What we did is convene a 19-member multi-disciplinary expert committee at the IOM which met six times over the course of the two years to address the scope of work and also review the relevant scientific evidence to develop findings, conclusions and recommendations for the report.

Before the report was released, there was a rigorous blinded peer review process. There were 19 committee members, but we had 21 reviewers, and that just strengthens the report. So, we made sure that each recommendation and all the evidence that's reviewed is strongly, soundly supported and defensible before the report goes to the public.

The key conclusions of that Obesity Prevention

Report were that childhood obesity is a serious

nationwide health problem with multi-factorial causes and it requires a population base prevention approach as well as a comprehensive response. The goal is energy balance for children and youth to promote both healthful eating behaviors, as well as regular physical activity for them to achieve a healthy weight, while also protecting their health and normal growth and development.

The third key message is that preventing childhood obesity is a collective responsibility. There are multiple stakeholders and sectors that must be involved in changing society at different levels.

So, what is needed is leadership at all different levels. We need to build an evaluation into existing obesity prevention intervention and any new ones that we initiate. There needs to be a commitment for adequate resources to make that happen. Efforts need to be coordinated at all levels and what we need to move toward is a societal norm where we have behaviors, both eating behaviors and physical activity behaviors that contribute to obesity, which are currently the social norm and we need to move in a direction where healthful eating behaviors and physical activity become the new societal norm.

And a good comparative reference point for you is that the Surgeon General's report on smoking and

tobacco was released a year after I was born, which is a little bit over 40 years ago, and at that time, the smoking prevalence in adults was as high as 30 percent, and we've been working on that issue for over 40 years and look how far we've come. But we've still had to work on that. So, when yesterday a point came up, how far into the future do we need to be strategically planning about obesity, in our committee, our chair had said to me very insightfully one day, this is going to be on our public health agenda for the next 40 to 50 years. So, all of us need to be prepared to work on this issue for that length of time, and to use an example that Marva gave yesterday, this is not a sprint, this is going to be a marathon. But we need to think about this as a megamarathon it's going to be 40 or 50 years.

The key stakeholders involved are parents, families, schools, communities, health care, industry, media and the government, and the action plan that was developed, which is a blueprint for the country for obesity prevention developed a series of recommendations for government to make obesity prevention a national public health priority. There was a series of recommendations for creating a healthy marketplace, one for a healthy media environment, healthy communities, a healthy school environment and a healthy home

L	environment	

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

For the purposes of today, I'm just going to focus on three recommendations in the marketplace and the school environment. What the Committee concluded is that young consumers and their parents will need to change their food and beverage preferences and engage in regular physical activity and fewer sedentary pursuits in order to achieve energy balance. The food, beverage, restaurant, entertainment, recreation and leisure industries, so industries very broadly can be instrumental in changing consumer behaviors, and there are many opportunities to influence consumers' purchase decisions at different points. We're looking at product development, packaging, labeling, promotion, distribution through multiple channels and pricing strategies.

So, the first recommendation for creating a healthy marketplace is focused on industry should make obesity prevention in children and youth a priority by developing and promoting products, opportunities and information that will encourage healthful eating behaviors and regular physical activity. Now, we're just dealing in this workshop with the energy input side of the equation, but that's what I'm going to focus on.

So, for food and beverage industries, the Committee recommended that we should develop product and

packaging innovations that consider energy density,
nutrient density and standard serving sizes to help
consumers make healthful choices. For the full-service
and quick serve restaurant sectors, they should expand
healthier food options and provide the calorie content
and general nutrition information at point of purchase.
And although it didn't end up in the formal
recommendation, there was some carefully worded text in
the report that the Committee encouraged the restaurant
sector to enhance or adapt the food guide pyramid or
develop a new food guidance system and relevant education
materials that would convey how portion sizes should be
distributed throughout the day for children of different
age groups at restaurants.

The second recommendation about creating a healthy marketplace focused on industry should develop and strictly adhere to marketing and advertising guidelines that minimize the risk of obesity in children and youth, which you've seen a few times over the course of the last day-and-a-half. And in order to achieve this, the IOM Committee recommended that the DHHS Secretary should convene a national conference, which is what we're at today, to develop guidelines for or to begin the dialogue to develop guidelines for the advertising and marketing of foods, beverages and

sedentary entertainment directed at children and youth
with attention product placement, promotion and content.

Industry should implement the advertising and marketing
guidelines that are developed at this conference and the
FTC should have the authority and resources to monitor
compliance with the food and beverage and the sedentary

entertainment advertising practices.

And the third recommendation in the report is that schools and school districts are urged to develop and implement and enforce school policies to create schools that are advertising-free to the greatest extent possible.

There's one other recommendation that focuses on creating a multimedia and public relations campaign to promote obesity prevention of children, youth, families, as well as society at large, and that relates to one of the panels we had yesterday, but I didn't include that in what I'm going to show you today.

I'm going to just wrap up with two other studies that are in progress. I can't talk much about them, so you're not going to get any sneak previews other than when they are anticipated to be released, but it's been 25 years since there's been a comprehensive review of the literature in the United States on the influence of marketing on children's diet and health. And so, at a

Congressional request, the CDC asked the Institute of Medicine last year to review the effects of food and beverage marketing on the diets and health of children and youth in the United States, including the characteristics of effective marketing of foods to children and youth to promote healthy food choices.

And also to provide in that report recommendations for public/private stakeholders to foster healthy food and beverage choices.

We anticipate that report will be released in early November. So, stay tuned.

And there's a third study that was initiated just a few months ago, which is supported by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. The purpose of that study is to implement the obesity prevention report recommendations as well as to go out and organize three regional symposia to really go out into the communities and understand better what we need in terms of evaluation. So, we have a newly convened committee. It's a 13-member committee that is charged with developing an evaluation approach to assess whether or not we truly are making progress in obesity prevention actions for various sectors.

We were in Wichita, Kansas, for our first regional meeting three weeks ago where we convened about 110 different stakeholders who discussed how you create a

1	healthier school environment. We're in the midst of
2	organizing a regional meeting in Atlanta in early October
3	that will bring together people around the IOM
4	recommendations for communities and government. And of
5	particular interest, we're in the process of organizing a
6	meeting in early December in Irvine, California, for

So, if you are interested in being involved and being considered for that meeting, please contact me after this meeting.

industry.

And then the product is that we hope to release the report about the evaluation approach in 2006. Thank you.

MS. ENGLE: And now, I'd like to introduce the panelists for this last panel of our workshop. Mark Berlind of the Kraft Food Company. Mark is Executive Vice President, Global Corporate Affairs at Kraft.

Dan Jaffe. Dan is Executive Vice President of the Association of National Advertisers.

Dr. Penny Kris-Etherton of the American Heart
Association's Nutrition Committee. Dr. Kris-Etherton is
Distinguished Professor of Nutrition at Penn State
University.

Brock Leach with PepsiCo. Brock is Senior Vice
President, New Growth Platforms and Chief Innovation

1 Officer at Pe	psiCo.
-----------------	--------

Dr. Susan Linn, a psychologist, is Associate

Director of the Media Center of the Judge Baker

Children's Center, as well as Co-Founder of the Campaign

for a Commercial-Free Childhood. And I couldn't help but

note a very interesting part in Dr. Linn's bio is that

she is an award-winning ventriloquist and children's

entertainer who has pioneered the use of puppets in child

therapy.

Manly Molpus is President and Chief Executive
Officer of the Grocery Manufacturers of America.

And, finally, Dr. Donald Lee Shifrin is a
Fellow of the American Academy of Pediatrics and
currently serves on its National Task Force on Obesity.
A practicing pediatrician, Dr. Shifrin is Clinical
Professor of Pediatrics at the University of Washington
School of Medicine in Seattle.

Our first panelist -- we're not going to be quite in alphabetical order, close to it, but I'd like to have Dan Jaffe.

MR. JAFFE: Thank you very much. Also, I want to thank the FTC, HHS. I think this has been a very important and successful workshop. I don't know why I was given the honor of speaking first, but what I'd like to try to do in the next minute or two is try to cover --

try and put together what's been happening for the last
two days, because instead of coming up with new
recommendations, I think that what has been proposed here
and what has been put forward here will make a
substantial difference in beating these issues and I
think it's useful to see what we -- at least as I
understand it, what has happened in the last couple of

days.

First, I think it should be clear to anybody who has been listening to the companies that have spoken at this conference that the marketplace is working. Most importantly, the marketplace is working because they are responding to consumers who are demanding products that are healthful, nutritious and low in calories. They are competing in the marketplace. It makes a difference to their bottom line and that suggests that this type of development is going to continue.

What's important is that the companies that spoke are representative. If we go down any aisle in the supermarket, if you go to any restaurant in this country, you will see there are new options that have come into play just in the last year or two to provide people more nutritious and low-calorie foods. So, I think that the marketplace will work and we should not stand in the way of the marketplace and suggestions to try to ban or

1 restrict advertising would be counter-productive, and

2 certainly those types of efforts that would try to say

3 that you could have only certain foods advertised are

4 almost certainly unconstitutional, because it's not bad

foods. There is no bad food, there is bad diets.

Also, this is not a do-good, feel-good activity, as I said. This has become an integral part of the whole process.

Now, second, we have a strong interlocking system of industry self-regulation, but more importantly, not only is CARU operating effectively with 97 percent compliance decade after decade by companies, but it is moving forward to meet the new challenges. And so, there are proposals already underway before the National Advertising Review Council, of which our association is one of the members and others. But there are going to be proposals, as you'll hear from Manly Molpus, to go forward. This is a living, breathing, effective organization and it does have teeth. I can certainly tell you that I have heard companies scream when the CARU comes around and cracks down on their ads. They certainly think that it is not just a watchdog that barks, but a watchdog that bites.

Third, and I think this is very important and I don't know how much attention it has really gotten so

far, we do believe there has been a gap in our handling of these issues with kids. It's the whole question of media literacy. Dick O'Brien yesterday talked about launching this program. This has been accepted by the Executive Committee of the Ad Council, our public service We're going to make a big program to try to help kids navigate more effectively and with greater understanding through the media and advertising

environment.

And, fourth, the Ad Council has a whole series of programs. You've heard about the Small Steps Program, which has over \$106 million worth of public service ads in just the first 10 months. So, they've just launched this coalition to try to help everybody else's marketing views and they have shortly to launch a program specifically dedicated to children in regard to nutrition.

And, fifth, I believe is a very important component, one that has not been discussed for government to play. ANA supports efforts by government to provide funding for research, partnerships and education on nutrition and physical activity. We think it's an outrage, frankly, that in only one state in this country is physical education required in the lower schools. Senator Frist's Impact Legislation S-1325 provides this

type of comprehensive approach and we strongly endorse
this proposal and we believe that the industry will get
behind it because we think that this is only going to
work if everybody in industry and government are working
in the same direction.

I believe people feel passionately about this issue, want to help and will help. We are committed to this issue. We will see that we will do whatever is needed to be done to make our self-regulatory system effective, our communication system effective, and if people from any side have suggestions, we will listen to them. That doesn't mean we will necessarily agree with everything that is put forward, but we are open to hear. I would be able to go and discuss some of these things in more detail, but I see a fairly long line of people behind me and so I will step down at this point. Thank you.

MS. ENGLE: Dr. Kris-Etherton.

DR. KRIS-ETHERTON: Well, I'd like to start by thanking representatives from the FTC and Department of Health and Human Services for the opportunity to represent the American Heart Association Nutrition Committee at this very important conference that is being held to address the topic, Perspectives on Marketing, Self-Regulation and Childhood Obesity.

American Heart Association has a long-standing
commitment to fighting heart disease and stroke.
Cardiovascular disease still remains a leading cause of
death in the United States. Yearly economic toll is
staggering. Just last year, the direct and indirect
costs associated with cardiovascular disease were about
\$400 billion. The astonishing conundrum that confronts
us is that we can prevent most heart diseases with
healthy lifestyle practices, including good dietary
practices, regular physical activity, not smoking

cigarettes and regular medical check-ups.

There are many American Heart Association programs and activities that are aimed at controlling risk factors for cardiovascular disease. One new initiative is targeting childhood obesity, and I think that it's one model that illustrates a next step that could be taken by other organizations, the government and private sector to help make children's diets healthier and including responsible marketing.

So, the program I'm going to describe is the Clinton Foundation and the American Heart Association Alliance to Create a Healthier Generation. Governor Mike Huckabee from Arkansas also is a member of the Alliance. This is a 10-year relationship that's championing the fight against the nation's fastest-growing children's

epidemic, obesity.

There are two goals of the Clinton Foundation-HA Alliance, and they are, one, by 2010, halt the increasing prevalence of childhood obesity in the United States. Two, by 2015, reduce the prevalence of childhood obesity by 10 percent.

Well, how will the goals of the Alliance be reached? The Alliance hopes to foster an environment that helps all kids pursue a healthy lifestyle. To do so is going to speak to a variety of audiences, consumers, industry, health care providers, schools and the media, and focus on several key areas that have a major impact on lifestyles and behaviors of children. So, I'd like to just quickly go through the activities that are planned for these different targets.

In terms of consumers, the consumer group that's targeted is kids and the Alliance is going to launch a for kids by kids movement to mobilize kids, especially those ages 9 to 13 to take charge of their own health and lead healthier lives. Tools will also be developed for parents to help families incorporate hearthealthy habits in their daily routines. And the Alliance is looking at how we can get kids to drive the market toward better health.

In terms of industry, a target that's going to

be addressed right away, the Alliance is going to work with restaurants, manufacturers of consumer packaged foods, food service companies and the fitness industry to make changes that encourage healthier eating and more physical activity. And the first focus in terms of the industry target is on children's meals at fast food establishments and restaurants.

And then, in terms of the media, a target that's going to be hit on right away, the Alliance is going to collaborate with media outlets on a public education campaign to encourage healthy lifestyles and increase understanding of the benefits of good nutrition and physical activity. The campaign will focus on for kids by kids messages to children and disseminate information to parents and educators.

And two other groups that are going to be targeted down the road are health care providers. The Alliance is going to work with professional associations and other health care organizations to create tools and continuing education opportunities that can help providers better recognize, prevent and treat obesity in children. And then another target is schools. The Alliance is going to develop innovative approaches to encourage more healthy food options in schools and increased physical activity during and after school, in

collaboration with school leaders and community groups. 1

2 Tools will be developed for educators to include in classroom activities.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So, you can see that this is a broad-based comprehensive program that is being driven, in large part, by children. It's being set up to have farreaching effects and a very big impact. And this is what has to happen. We must all come together, government, industry, professional organizations, using a multipronged approach to see a big impact.

So, in summary, the conference we've attended has shown that we're tackling a very complex topic, childhood obesity. It's clear that we need to combat it from many angles. Public health groups need to work with industry to develop healthier products and consistent health messages to create a big healthy food marketplace. Likewise, public health and government groups need to be working with children, parents, other family members, teenagers, coaches, et cetera, to improve health literacy and increase interest and demand for healthy products and other behaviors. The industry can help improve children's behavior and children can play an active role in quiding industry's behavior.

In summary, the best model for moving forward is one where public health, government, industry,

1	caretakers and children children who are very
2	important members of this effort all work together to
3	move our nation towards better health. Thank you very
4	much

MS. ENGLE: Dr. Linn.

DR. LINN: Thank you. Well, I want to thank the FTC and HHS for inviting me here today.

(Laughter.)

DR. LINN: Actually, it's a real honor to be here today and I really do want to thank the FTC and HHS for inviting me here to speak. And what I want to talk about today, I want to talk about rights and freedoms, the rights of children to grow up and the freedom for parents to raise them without being undermined by corporate interests.

The Surgeon General spoke earlier today about our social, moral and ethical responsibility to ensure public health. With that in mind, I'd like to say that there is no social, moral or ethical justification for marketing junk food to children. And given the projected costs of obesity to American taxpayers, there appears to be no economic justification either.

Speaking for myself and my colleagues across the country, I want to ask the FTC not to abandon children to the financial interests of the food industry.

I was saddened to hear Commissioner Leary say that he didn't want the FTC to be a nanny agency. We heard in the earlier panel how overwhelmed parents are. When parents are overwhelmed, children need nannies, they need help.

The question that we should have been asking at this workshop is what's best for children, not how can we improve self-regulation. Self-regulation has failed.

When CARU -- the head of CARU endorsed what amounts to General Mills' latest campaign to sell sugar cereals, that's evidence of failure. When Coca-Cola claims that they don't market to children under 12, yet their product placement is rampant on American Idol, which is consistently in the Nielsen ratings a top-rated program for children 2 to 11, and when -- if you go to Toysrus.com, you can find toys, Coca-Cola toys for children as young as four. That's evidence of failure.

When the advertising industry, which spent about \$100 million marketing to children in 1983 is now spending \$15 billion and a significant portion of that on food advertising, that's evidence of failure. When McDonald's pays rap artists to shout out Big Mac in their songs and there's no action from CARU, that's evidence of failure.

We're going to hear proposals from the Grocery

Manufacturers Association for tweaking self-regulation, but let us remember as we listen that the GMA is on record for opposing just about every state bill that would restrict the sale of junk food or soda in schools and that the comments they submitted for this workshop today deny the link between marketing and childhood obesity. These proposals may sound good, but they won't address the fundamental issue.

By relying only on voluntary self-regulation, we have turned our children over to an industry that generates profits by selling them junk food. As documented in comments by the Center for Informed Food Choices, companies like General Mills and PepsiCo routinely violate the existing GMA guidelines. Without the threat of real consequences from an outside agency whose first allegiance is to children and families, the incentives for business as usual, no matter what is said here today, are just too great.

My colleagues and I are not naive about the current political situation. Although we know that this administration is loathe to regulate corporations, we offer the following truth. That it is the government of the people, by the people and for the people who should be the guardians of public health, not corporations, not the food industry whose allegiance is first and foremost

1 to their stockholders. Thank y

MS. ENGLE: Manly Molpus.

MR. MOLPUS: Thank you very much, Mary, and thank you for this opportunity to be here. I was just asking Susan Linn if she would like to read my remarks and I'll just mouth them up here.

DR. LINN: I'd be happy to.

(Laughter.)

MR. MOLPUS: Here it is. But we're delighted to be here and real congratulations to HHS and FTC for putting together such a constructive two days of dialogue with a wide array of views, of which you're about to hear some of those. But I can tell you that for the companies that make the products that Americans eat and drink every day, there is no issue more important than obesity. As you've heard from GMA members here at this workshop, there is truly an extraordinary industry-wide effort underway today to meet this challenge.

Let me give you just a few examples of what our industry is doing. This fall, GMA will sponsor a nationwide education campaign with Weekly Reader to promote the new food guide pyramid to students, teachers and families. We'll distribute a My Pyramid Education Kit that will reach more than four million students. The American Council for Fitness and Nutrition, a non-profit

organization established by food and beverage companies, is now in the process of going from city to city across

3 America to showcase programs that are effectively

4 addressing obesity at the community level and helping

5 Americans, especially kids, live healthy lifestyles.

And just yesterday, we released the results of a survey of our members. We learned that companies participating in the survey have introduced 4,500 new or reformulated products with improved nutrition, including reduced saturated and trans fats, reduced calories, less sugar and less sodium. These companies are also using multimedia, including advertising, product labeling, websites, brochures and education initiatives in schools and communities to provide consumers with health and nutrition information.

GMA members want to provide, and it's in our interest to provide, a wide array of food and beverage choices and we want to market these products responsibly and we're committed to do so. But I am here today to talk to you specifically about the important issue of self-regulation in children's advertising. The self-regulatory system, in our judgment, in place today works and it works extremely well. But because it is good doesn't mean that we can't and shouldn't try to make it better, and I'm encouraged that CARU is already working

1 to do	just	that.
---------	------	-------

GMA member companies who are supporters of CARU have spent a good bit of time working very intensely to develop a series of recommendations to strengthen the self-regulation of advertising to children. Our goal is to help CARU even be more responsive to parents' concerns, which we recognize, and to reflect changes in the marketing and media environment that we've talked about here about the last two days. The GMA members that support CARU are committed to providing the financial support required to implement these steps. So, I ask you not to prejudge our effort. Let's look at the recommendations, let's implement the recommendations, let's watch the results.

Here are the seven recommendations. First, public access. We believe consumers, especially parents, should have immediate and direct access to CARU to express concerns about specific ads and about children's advertising in general. We recommend establishing a toll-free consumer response line and website, publicizing the existence of both and responding to consumers directly.

Two, transparency. We believe a summary of CARU's regulatory activities should be available to the public on the CARU website and should include the kind of

information that is now provided in written reports to subscribers. The website ought to provide the public with easy access to an overview of the scope of CARU's regulatory activities.

Three, expanded expertise. We support expanding CARU's external advisory boards to provide more expertise on matters related to health, wellness and nutrition, including educators, nutritionists, fitness experts, behavioral experts and experts on FTC and FDA policy.

Four, pre-review. We support enhancing the existing mechanism for pre-review of advertising with the goal of preventing advertising that is not consistent with CARU's guidelines from reaching the marketplace. This voluntary mechanism could be enhanced by an expanded staff and use of the advisory board.

Five, expanded scope. We believe CARU's guidelines should address advertising contained in commercial computer game, video games and other interactive websites, commonly referred to as advergames. We would also recommend that paid product placement on children's TV programming be prohibited and that CARU guidelines be expanded to ensure that third party licensed characters in advertising are used appropriately.

Sixth, collaboration. We believe that robust
self-regulation requires effective support from both
industry and government. To that end, we would encourage
the FTC to look for ways to strengthen its relationship
with CARU.

Seven, resources. To ensure adequate enforcement capacity, to improve its effectiveness and improve consumer access, we believe that CARU staff must be substantially increased. And as I said earlier, our members are prepared to provide the resources to implement these steps.

The measures I've detailed are more than words, we are committed to working with all stakeholders to make these recommendations a reality. In addition to changes to CARU, we believe that government can play a role in helping support private sector initiatives to promote healthy lifestyles. In that regard, we have two recommendations. First, we think that HHS could develop an awards program that recognizes companies for promoting healthy lifestyles, perhaps modeled on the Baldridge Awards, which have been very successful, and available to all industries. This would be an excellent way to showcase and incent best practices in the obesity issue and what the private sector can do.

Second, the government should maintain its

support for healthy lifestyle communication programs,

2 like the HHS-Ad Council Small Steps campaign and the

3 CDC's VERB Program. In fact, GMA has urged Congress to

fund these important initiatives and we invite our fellow

5 stakeholders to join us in that effort.

At the beginning of this workshop, Chairman Majoras challenged us all not to just share ideas but to take action. Over the last two days, we've learned much. But the important work now lies ahead and it's time to turn our ideas into actions and GMA members are prepared to do just that. Thank you.

MS. ENGLE: Mark Berlind.

MR. BERLIND: This has been a very important workshop and really we think presents an opportunity for significant progress on the important issues that it raises. There's been a lot of good discussion, all the issues that I think are the important ones have been put on the table and been discussed, and there's a lot of information out there for all of us to consider.

We really think at Kraft that this is the kind of workshop and the beginning of the kind of dialogue, exactly the kind of dialogue that the IOM Report that Vivica mentioned recommended, and we'd emphasize that a dialogue is an ongoing thing. We don't see -- and we hope that this workshop is not a one-time event where

people get together for two days and that's it. As Manly
just said, there's lots of work to be done, and as

Assistant Secretary O'Grady said earlier, the real test
is going to be what are the actions and the specific
concrete reforms that emerge from this process? But
we're very encouraged by what we've seen over the past

7 couple of days.

Chairman Majoras did frame the issue very well yesterday. In her opening remarks, she said, on the one hand, bans of advertising of products are not appropriate and are not likely to be pursued on the one hand, but on the other hand, the status quo is unacceptable and change has to occur, and we at Kraft and as part of the food industry definitely want to be part of that change.

Our company believes that in order for selfregulation to be credible and effective, our consumers
need to have confidence in us and that it's important for
companies to take their own steps, their own meaningful
steps to move the ball forward in the absence even of
industry action or self-regulatory action, and we have
tried to do some things and I think you've heard in the
past couple days that many companies are doing things,
each in accordance with their own business model and in
accordance to what they think is the right thing to do.
But we think that the steps that each company takes

contributes to the whole and it contributes to an overall climate where consumers will have confidence that the industry is, indeed, being self-regulated in an appropriate way and that its actions are responsible.

The industry is also taking steps together jointly, which Manly just described for the group, and we think there's a lot of important suggestions there and they deserve serious consideration, even by folks who are initially skeptical perhaps of what the industry would put forward, and we would also say that we are very encouraged and very happy that so many companies have specifically signed up for these proposals in a very short period of time and that there's a lot of momentum behind this process. This is not something I think that you would have seen six, eight or 12 months ago, a group of companies coming together relatively rapidly to try to move the ball forward. So, we think that's important.

I did want to say something about the whole discussion and the debate over the numbers and how many ads are being seen and whether it's a lot, whether it's a little, has it changed. The data is very important to many of you and it's important that we all proceed based on the facts, but I just wanted to make the point that to Kraft, at least, those are not the numbers that we focus on the most because irrespective of whether 5,000 ads or

4,000 ads or 10,000 ads are being seen per year, we're a consumer focus company, we listen to our consumers and we have heard loud and clear from them that they see an issue with the advertising that is going on of food products to kids, especially younger kids now. So, irrespective of what the data shows, we think that this is an issue that needs to be addressed, which is why we're so happy about the progress made at this workshop.

By the same token, as Dr. Dietz pointed out in his presentation yesterday, obesity and weight gain is a serious problem in this country. We can quibble about how many deaths, how much illness, how much weight gain and all the rest, but our consumers are telling us that they think it's a serious problem, so we feel the need to act. So, the most important data to us is what we hear back from our own consumers.

I think that there's a lot of common ground that has emerged from this workshop, perhaps more than some people might realize. To take just one example to illustrate that, I think if you look at the very challenging but very concise and specific principles that Senator Harkin articulated yesterday on the one hand and the proposals that Manly just put forward on the other hand, there is a fair amount of similarity and congruence and I think hope for everybody reaching a place where

there can really be a significant consensus on this issue.

Senator Harkin, for example, called for stakeholder input; the GMA proposals call for augmenting external advisory boards for CARU. Senator Harkin called for compliance and an independent monitor; the GMA proposals called for building enforcement capacity, improving transparency and having a closer relationship between CARU and the FTC and the HHS. And we think that it would be very valuable if the FTC and the HHS could take a look at how we're doing and perhaps issue a report. I don't know how it would work, but maybe a year from now, let's take a look at how well these proposals are being implemented and let's have that closer relationship.

Senator Harkin's principle number three was to look at the cumulative effects of advertising and that's not specifically mentioned in any of the GMA proposals that Manly mentioned, but we specifically have put forward the principle of broadening the involvement and advice to CARU on matters of children's health. So, that is a very important principle that perhaps a lot of people could agree on.

Senator Harkin's fourth principle was that self-regulation should cover all advertising vehicles.

You just heard Manly specifically say that we want to make sure that the CARU regulations and rules on things like advergaming and licensed characters and paid product placement are strengthened and specifically added into the mix.

Picking up on what Commissioner Leary said today, we need some advice, I think, from the FTC about how to move forward as an industry, how to craft these standards appropriately, how to get into the details in a way that addresses those concerns. But we are encouraged by the progress that has been made here today.

So, I would just close by saying that beyond the whole issue of self-regulation and how to strengthen it, which I know the focus is here, we think the most important thing that the industry can do and that Kraft can do as a food company is to continue to come up with products that give consumers the better nutritional profiles that they increasingly want, but combines it with the great taste, the great convenience and the fun that they continue to demand. And to the extent that we can all work together from whatever side of the perspective, of the equation that we come from, to foster a climate where companies can be encouraged to do that, where the market can be encouraged to change those societal norms that I think Vivica mentioned earlier and

encourage everybody, whether it's consumers and
companies, and give them the incentives to market those
products successfully and to consume those products,
that's what's going to ultimately make the biggest
difference to address these issues. Thanks very much.

MS. ENGLE: Brock Leach.

MR. LEACH: You got to hear from me yesterday so I'm going to cut right to the chase on recommended next steps. The first is work diligently as an industry and with partners with CARU to build on their success in self-regulation but to strengthen it along the lines to what Manly spoke to earlier. I also listened very carefully to what Senator Harkin had to say about his four objectives, and like Mark, I don't know the details of what he has in mind, but I believe directionally, we can get to those objectives and we'll obviously have to work through on how close we are on the details. But I think that it's within grasp. So, I'm encouraged as well.

I would also just make a comment on selfregulation. As somebody who spent 23 years in the
marketing trenches, when a CARU complaint crosses your
desk as a brand manager, you don't respond to it as an
interesting item, you respond to it as you would an FTC
complaint, and a lot of departments, by the way, respond

to them as if they were FTC complaints, and you move quickly. That's why most of the stuff gets addressed and pulled before there's any further action because it's not worth it. We change it and get on with it. And we, of course, have been subject to plenty of CARU complaints.

So, I know whereof I speak. But I would just tell you that it is, from a marketer's point of view, a mechanism that has strength.

But anyway, all of the self-regulation stuff, as I said yesterday, I think is the first 20 percent. I think the other 80 percent is going to be around product choices. Our goal here is to develop healthier product choices and market those and do that in an environment where people, in particular kids, are learning how to make balanced eating and exercise choices.

So, in that spirit, there are three other things I would recommend as next steps that involve both private and public collaboration. The first is, I said earlier, is consistent messaging. I think building on the work of Ad Council, the Coalition for Healthy Children and the extensive work CDC, in particular, has done in learning how to communicate to create a consistent set of messages that can be reinforced in many different ways, including commercial ways, I think would be very helpful, and I think it would really provide

additional support to parents and to people in schools.

The third recommended next step would be to coalesce around a national model action plan for healthy schools, something that goes beyond school vending. It, obviously, has to include school vending. But my concern, as somebody who's very familiar with the school vending debate, is that it is passing, in a lot of locales, as a solution. It's passing as a solution legislatively when in reality there's a lot more here, like how are we going to get nutrition and energy balance education into the schools, how are we going to get physical activity into the schools, how are we going to make sure the meal offerings are what they need to be, and how do we make sure the vending and marketing environment is right?

I think the Institute of Medicine Report and the recommendations in that were terrific in the sense that they got to what needs to be done. What I think we need to do now, though, is take the stakeholders, which include USDA and the states and the schools themselves, and in particular, the people on the ground in the schools, and figure out how is it that we bring all the resources to bear to help solve this problem, including the funding resources. Obviously, industry has a role to play in that. But I see it being kind of a fractured

effort right now and I think bringing the expertise
together to approach that on a national level and to
bring the best thinking to it would be a welcome thing.

That would happen through the work the IOM is doing, that
could happen through the AHA program that was outlined.

I'm not sure of the best vehicle, but I think it needs to

I'm not sure of the best vehicle, but I think it needs to be a national dialogue with the right folks.

And, finally, I think a program to recognize and encourage positive industry action, as Manly outlined, could have the biggest effect of all because I think the industry already sees the opportunity here and I think putting in place some encouragement on what to do, whether it's for employees or whether it's for product development or whether it's community actions, I think all that could have a surprising impact. And so, all of that is consistent with focusing on creating healthier choices in an environment where people learn to make great choices. That's my commentary. Thanks.

MS. ENGLE: Dr. Shifrin.

DR. SHIFRIN: Thank you for your patience. I realize this is the last presentation. You've all been very patient. Hopefully, it will be worth it. I want to also thank the FTC and the HHS for convening this workshop. It's a pleasure to be here today representing the American Academy of Pediatrics, which is an

organization of 60,000 pediatricians and pediatric specialists dedicated to the health and well-being of children. As the Surgeon General stated today earlier, I'm sorry he left because we can compare grandparent stories, prevention is the hallmark of pediatric care.

The present trends indicate that families, traditional families, single-parent families, divorced families, step families, schools, communities, policymakers, physicians, the food industry and the media all drive behavior and influence the most significant ongoing chronic health threat to our children.

Therefore, all play a critical role in reversing the trend of obesity. Much like it's been stated that smoking was a pediatric disease, the same could be said that obesity is now a pediatric disease. Pediatricians are committed to helping kids learn to lead active healthy lives.

The Academy's Board of Directors assigned the highest priority to address the childhood obesity crisis by creating a national task force in 2003. The focus of the task force is on prevention, treatment, reimbursement and advocacy both at a local, state and national level. As a practicing pediatrician daily, I see parents, much like Sam's family that was described yesterday by Dr. Zucker, and care givers every day who are searching for

help with their overweight families. As I speak to you today for these two to three minutes, with a significant sense or urgency, I can assure you that these two minutes are statistically more time than many of my colleagues have with families to discuss nutritional and activity awareness, media time and literacy issues during an annual or every other year health maintenance appointment.

Contrast that with the amount of time that children spend seeing -- let's bandy about the number -- 40,000 or so commercial messages each year, the 20 percent of two to seven-year-olds that have televisions in their bedrooms, the 68 percent of eight to 18-year-olds that have television in their bedrooms, it hardly seems like a level playing field for parents and pediatricians.

The Academy has always been one of the strongest advocates for children on Capitol Hill. We have a long-standing media education policy recommending amounts of media time that are healthful for the families, but we recognize that educating families about moderation, healthful choices, balance rather than restrictions, portion size and physical activity many times are lost in the tsunami of their children's media exposure to less healthful foods. Marketing has

empowered kids to demand, parents constantly need to negotiate.

There are many risk factors that contribute to childhood obesity and we're not denying that and there are many lines of defense beginning with parental responsibility, but that is not the only line of defense. All children need a good support system behind their success in achieving this long-term change. While many obstacles to recognition, prevention and treatment seem insurmountable, the Academy recommends early guidance in office space encounters, as well as increased physical activity, decreasing sedentary activities, including our recommendations for screen time for all families, and providing tools in continuing education for its members, as well as education and motivation for children and parents on this critical issue.

The following are highlights of the Academy's positions on advertising and marketing issues specifically as they relate to this problem. One, the American Academy of Pediatrics considers advertising directly to young children to be inherently deceptive and exploits children under the age of eight years.

Two, the Academy supports and advocates for social marketing intended to provide healthful food choices and increased physical activity. Industry should

develop and advertise healthful food and eating choices.

2 Healthful foods that are nutrient-rich and palatable, yet

low in excess energy from added sugars and fat need to be

4 readily available to parents, school and child care food

5 services and others responsible for feeding children and

independent of socioeconomic status or community.

7 Examples of healthful foods are whole grains, vegetables

8 and fruits, lowfat dairy products and others as

9 recommended by the new USDA guidelines.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Advertising and promotion of energy dense, nutrient-poor food products to children may need to be regulated or curtailed. For example, the increase in sugar-sweetened drinks has been linked to obesity.

The government certainly should fund more research to assess the effects of television and other media marketing on the behaviors of children. The Academy, as a member of the Children's Media Policy Coalition, wants children's advertising protections to be updated for digital television. As Ms. Miller dictated earlier, we are going to a digital universe. This includes a prohibition on interactive advertising to children in the digital world. I also would remind you it's not going to be digital television, it's going to be cell-a-vision. Okay, for those people who can't see this, this is a Forbes Magazine cover for May talking

about cell-a-vision. Forty percent of 12 to 14-year-olds have cell phones, unrestricted, unregulated content. \$10 billion are being put in venture capital to put content into phones. Our friends at Disney are now marketing phones to eight to ten-year-olds. It's been said that nature abhors a vacuum. Obviously, technology abhors a vacuum.

The use of exclusive foreign contracts as a means of generating revenue for schools needs to be addressed such that revenue is not generated at the expense of our children's health. The AAP recognizes corporate sponsorship of school events, activities and programs as advertising and promoting product branding. Schools should develop curricula to teach children and adolescents media literacy, something we called for in our media education statement that was published in August of 1999. The Academy launched its own Media Matters Campaign in 1997 to help teach media literacy and we look forward to talk more to the Ad Council about their new media education campaign.

In closing, I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this meeting. The AAP supports the Institute of Medicine recommendations on marketing, media and advertising as stated in their Prevention of Obesity Report. As experts in the primary and specialty care of

children, we would welcome the opportunity to participate in an ongoing dialogue with the Federal Trade Commission and the food industry about possible implementation of those recommendations. And because everybody was quoting sources, I thought that I would give you a quote from one of only three honorary members of the American Academy of Pediatrics. His name is Mr. Rogers, I'm sure you all remember him and I'm going to direct this quote to all of

Mr. Rogers said, "We live in a world in which we need to share responsibility. It's easy to say it's not my child, not my community, not my world and not my problem. There are those who see the need and respond. I consider those people my heroes." So, the Academy obviously is looking for heroes here today. Thank you.

the industry representatives and government officials

here today.

DR. O'GRADY: Thank you very much. There's a number of things that I think we'd like to get going with the dialogue, but I did want to take a second to thank all the panelists for their very interesting presentations and the tweaks of different things, different ideas that they've put on the table. And I wanted to kick things off a little bit with just a couple of questions and answering a couple of questions that came up here.

an idea of HHS putting together something that would be along the lines of awards for healthy lifestyles and I just want to let you know that we already have, and have for at least two years now, had a Secretary's Prevention National Awards and we're very interested in that sort of stuff and we'd love to talk to you more about what you had in mind with that. But we have found that in our prevention awards, it has been very successful in terms of the idea of your ability to go out, identify people who really are doing ground-breaking work in this area and sometimes in very unexpected areas, whether it's churches or small businesses and different -- you know, across the board in terms of very innovative work.

And you also brought up the idea of communication campaigns, and I'd like to support that and I think we are if you look at kind of what we spend our money on and how we move in. Certainly, at the CDC and NIH, there's a number of different things to realize, and certainly if you've ever heard our -- either our current Secretary or our past Secretary, Tommy Thompson, talk about prevention, there's this notion, definitely, that we have to reach people before they show up at a doctor's office, before they show up at an emergency room. And that really means changing the way we do business and it

does mean moving out into social marketing, these sort of communication campaigns that we've talked about on a number of different areas.

Although we have vast expertise at HHS, NIH, CDC, if you need an epidemiologist or an endocrinologist, you know, we've got them, we've got the best. But I think as experts in our own fields, we recognize that this area of marketing and how you target audiences and whatnot, that it's something that we're freshmen, maybe at best sophomores, and I don't think I have to tell anyone who's ever seen a public service announcement compared to a really well put together marketing campaign that -- you know, we don't want to be still there with -- and I apologize if anybody was involved with McGruff the Crime Dog or any of those sorts of things -- but we really need to up our sophistication.

I guess I'd like to make that promise to you that that's an area that we definitely identify as a priority and we're moving forcefully to do. At the same time, the ability of industry, if you're willing to share that kind of data and expertise, we recognize that we are not up the learning curve in this area and we would love to start that kind of dialogue of how do you identify particular populations at risk, how do you identify these sorts of most effective ways, and we'd be very, very

- interested in working together in that area.
- 2 There was sort of a question in there, did
- 3 you --
- 4 MR. MOLPUS: Well, let me respond briefly.
- 5 First of all, we would be happy to provide any sort of
- 6 expertise, and we have a tremendous amount with HHS and
- 7 areas that you may have a little shortfall, at least give
- 8 you some ideas of how our companies go about assessing
- 9 these things and looking at our research and our
- 10 marketing. I think, also, of course, HHS has a
- 11 tremendous role to play via FDA and the various issues we
- can tackle there on labeling. I think we've discussed
- doing something different about caloric labeling, which
- we would agree needs, in some ways, more prominence for
- 15 consumers. So, there's just a lot we can do together and
- 16 we would have some ideas. We're aware of the initiative
- 17 that started under Secretary Thompson and I think there
- 18 are some ways to enhance that and make it a little bit
- 19 different and a little bit more all industry oriented in
- a complete best practice sense, and we'd be happy to work
- 21 with you on that.
- DR. O'GRADY: Great. I had one brief question
- and then I'll kind of open things up to my colleague from
- the FTC here. In terms of the -- Dr. Kris-Etherton, in
- 25 terms of the American Heart Association, the For Kids By

Kids Campaign and what you have in mind there, I guess there were a couple of things that in terms of the different discussions we've heard over the last day-and-a-half that sort of tweaked my interest and also my curiosity. The emphasis definitely seems to be for kids by kids. At the same time, I wonder if you could talk for a second about the interaction with parents because the world of parents has clearly been brought up in a number of different ways over the last day or so, and how you're drawing some of those distinctions that we've also heard about how you deal with the younger kids versus teens and what sort of tools, data, sort of what are the resources that you guys are thinking about that you can bring to bear to this problem?

DR. KRIS-ETHERTON: Well, things are still in the developmental stages, but initially, kids that are 9 to 13 are going to be targeted and the very first town hall meetings are actually starting in September. It's hoped that kids will be the initiators and the spark that help drive parents' decisions about what foods to choose. Of course, you know, you have to also work with parents as well and that's something that's going to be down the road as well. But I think that one thing that's really important is the Alliance is looking to see how we can get kids to drive the market toward health. So, parents

are a really important part of that, as are teachers,

schools, health care providers and the media, as well.

3 So, it's going to be a great big effort as well and

4 things are just getting put in place, but, of course,

5 parents are going to be a part of it, too.

DR. O'GRADY: Thank you.

MS. ENGLE: I have a question for Manly Molpus with respect to the GMA's proposals for perhaps some recommendations they're making to CARU. One of them was to increase the scope of CARU's oversight to include online activities, advergaming and that type of thing and I was wondering about that. At the FTC, when we look at advertising, we include everything that's promotional in nature no matter where or how it appears. Did you give some consideration to expanding CARU's jurisdiction to speak generally in terms of advertising and not limit your additions to the online area?

MR. MOLPUS: Well, when we put this proposal together, we were thinking more in terms of responding to CARU and CARU's current scope, even though this is an expansion of scope, and I suspect we better walk before we run. But we'll leave this up to NARC and their board to determine how far they should go. This is a significant expansion of scope for our industry to come forward with, and if there are additional scope issues

1	that	we	ought	to	look	at,	we	would	encourage	NARC	to	do
2.	t.hat.											

MS. ENGLE: And you think there would be support for industry funding of an expansion of scope if it looked like the initial steps, the walking was successful?

MR. MOLPUS: If we agree on expansions of scope, our companies have said we are in agreement to help provide resources. But at this point, we looked at what CARU has currently been doing, what was the next step and what we had heard most about was advergames, and we thought in terms of priorities, that should be tackled first.

MS. ENGLE: One of the issues that we've heard a lot about over the last day-and-a-half is sort of -- and I think maybe it was a question that was of the last panel -- was the idea of parental responsibility and that parents should just say no when their children are asking for products that their parents don't want them to have. At the same time, we heard about the tsunami of marketing for products that are less healthful that parents have to say no to. So, I was wondering, in terms of industry's willingness on a self-regulatory basis to decrease the tsunami so that parents are not -- you know, right now, there is a situation where if you look at the array of

products, of foods that are marketed to children, you could see that there is an imbalance in terms of those that have more positive nutritional profiles.

Since we're here to talk about self-regulation and what industries can do on their own initiative and certainly, you know, that doesn't involve the First Amendment concerns that government regulation would, what would industry be willing to do? I mean, Kraft is certainly taking some steps with respect to nutritional profile of foods they advertise to younger children.

Would there be more support perhaps from other industry members or GMA as an advocate to its members to do that kind of thing?

MR. MOLPUS: Brock and Mark may want to respond to this, but I can tell you that what you're seeing today is the benefits of fundamental free enterprise and competition and innovation at work, and I think for a while you are going to see a diverse array of company strategies and programs to address this issue that fit with company strategies. You've got some that we've heard about today. There are many others out there that have different approaches and I think this is the very best approach we could possibly get right now because you've got this huge engine running of consumer focus, consumer responsiveness and competitiveness that's going

to drive a tremendous amount of change, already has, and will continue to drive a tremendous amount of change throughout the industry.

4 MR. JAFFE: Mary, could I respond to that for a second?

MS. ENGLE: Um-hum.

MR. JAFFE: I think that the idea that you just have to say no, that parents are in a situation where they have to say no to all of these products is wrong.

Many of these products are fine, it's just that they shouldn't be your diet. And what we're hearing is that in the marketplace, there is a major incentive for companies to come up with new products. You've heard from the companies that have spoken at this conference and you just heard from Manly that there's been 4,000 new products that have been reformulated. You're going to see much more of this in the marketplace because companies are making money with this.

You can see right on the table all the various companies that are selling, you know, waters that were not branded in the past. All the quick service restaurants, virtually every one of them is selling their salads, their apples. One of the quick service restaurants is the largest seller of apples in this country.

We're going to have a much different mix in the marketplace because the marketplace is demanding it, because the public is demanding it, because parents are demanding it and they want to be doing what's right for their kids. So, the idea that we have to come up with descriptive rules to say, only these types of things can be advertised, I don't believe is the right way to go.

DR. SHIFRIN: Can I inject something here? I deal every day with families who are fractured. Fathers have children one day and they pick them up Wednesday night at 6:30 for dinner. These fathers are not known for their nutritional creativeness, okay? They have three things on their mind, pizza, what was it, quick service restaurants -- I want to be politically correct -- or delivery, okay? That's the three options they have. Now, what I'm saying is that the marketplace isn't going to move that.

What we need to do is move into some social marketing to give them more options. It's not enough to say just say no to those people because they don't have the time or inclination. They want to spend time with their children. They don't want to spend much time in the kitchen. This goes on with weekends, it goes on with visitations, it goes on in the minority communities all the time. So, the marketplace putting out new foods is

exciting, but in the marathon that we're going to be looking at, it's only one part of the equation, and we have to think of very creative solutions for families that really need those creative solutions, not the choir that may be talking to the Kraft Food Company about their products, because I guarantee you you're not getting a lot of calls from single fathers. If you are, I'd like to know that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DR. LINN: I'd like to respond to that as well. I also work with very, very poor -- I work with very, very poor children. Poor children watch more television, they are advertised to more than other children. They are bombarded with advertisements for junk food, and I don't see that giving positive nutritional messages in the barrage of junk food is going to make much of a difference to these kids. They're just bombarded with So, I don't understand how one public service campaign or a couple of public service campaigns or 10 public service campaigns about eating healthy food is going to do anything unless you guys stop marketing unhealthy food to kids. I mean, it's just not going to make much difference.

I mean, it's very nice that SpongeBob

SquarePants is selling spinach, but, you know, the

Nickelodeon movie came out with all of this extra

SpongeBob SquarePants movie food, and the kids I work with, that's what they all wanted. I mean, they all saw the movie, they all want the food. We hear about how Elmo can sell broccoli. Well, Elmo's also selling fruitflavored snacks to kids, some fruit-flavored snack boxes. I think that's confusing for children. Elmo says to eat spinach, he's also telling me to eat, you know, junk food.

That really needs to change, and if you're really serious about combating childhood obesity, I would really like to see you say, we're not going to do this anymore, you know. I'd like to see Coca-Cola get rid of their toys for young children or to see companies stop partnering -- there's not a children's movie that comes out that isn't partnering with some, you know, junk food. McDonald's is selling salads exactly the same time that they were advertising their salads and how wonderful it was they were selling salads, they were getting rap singers to insert Big Mac into their songs. I mean, how is that really helping childhood obesity?

And if you're going to have awards for public service campaigns, I hope that you take into consideration all of a companies policies, not just this one campaign.

DR. SHIFRIN: I just want to -- I don't want to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

pile on here, but in deference to the marketplace, I always thought that there was nothing so bad that it couldn't be used as a good example, but some of the foods that have been built lately for adults that trickle down to teenagers are blatantly not healthy at all, whether they're part of a diet or not. I suppose that if you have one hour to go to nuclear obliteration, they would be fine.

But, you know, I think that you guys have the most sophisticated marketing research in the world and what I'd like you to do is put some of that to work and say, we can help families who are looking for creative solutions. I've got the number one single dad meal here ready for you, just order number one. I do it on the They got three meals to choose from, one, two airplane. That's all I got. And you guys can do that by or three. creating, you know, marketing to certain -- you know, you quys are experts at demographic niches. Let's put it this way, kids don't grow up in neighborhoods anymore, they grow up in demographic niches anyway.

So, the answer is that you're going to have to put families in those niches because all families are not -- one size does not fit all and we're looking at you to be the heroes here, not just in product, but in social marketing.

1	MR. BERLIND: Market and product research I
2	think is exactly the point. I mean, we and other
3	companies have tremendous incentives to find ways to come
4	up with nutritious products that appeal to kids, and we
5	think that the more successful that we can be at doing
6	that and developing them and creating incentives within
7	our own company to drive in that direction, that we will
8	win in the marketplace and other companies will want to
9	follow that or do it on their own or lead that, and
10	that's the real answer here. So, there's a lot of common
11	interest in pursuing that goal.

I would say, Mary, in answer to your question, you know, we certainly think parents have responsibility, but we think we, as a food company, have responsibilities, too, and the government has responsibilities and there's a lot of shared responsibility going around. So, what we prefer to talk about and emphasize is things that relate to what we do as a food manufacturer and as a food marketer. So, there's plenty of responsibility to go around, but no, it's not just all the parents and we're focused on our own.

By definition, self-regulation and improving it requires, if not consensus, broad industry support, which as I said is what's so encouraging about the proposals

that Manly put forward today because they have a lot of support and that's a great way to step forward. I think our belief is that as it becomes clearer and clearer over time that what the great market potential is for nutrition, fun, good-tasting products that appeal to kids, then you're going to just see more and more movement in that direction by -- across the industry.

MS. ENGLE: I think that's right and I think we've all been thinking that what we need here is more tasty, fun and still nutritious foods, because as someone was saying yesterday, if it's in the cupboard, it's not doing anything for anybody's health. And so, we're looking for ways to promote competition among companies to advance these more nutritious, yet still delicious and fun foods that kids will eat and kids will ask their parents for.

We've also heard some discussion over this workshop about the need for a positive nutritional message to get out there and we've heard about the work that the Ad Council is doing and that has a large budget compared to -- over \$100 million compared to what most, say, government-funded educational budgets would have, and we've also heard discussion about the need for consistency across platforms reach out to the population at large and how powerful television is because of its

1 reach. That's really unparalleled.

Is the Ad Council type of advertising campaign something that the individual companies would consider getting behind and supporting financially, for example, to really extend the reach?

MR. LEACH: Well, I think they do in the sense of contributing production dollars and so forth to the campaigns. I would say that the messaging, though, and getting it consistent is more important even in reinforcing it in other commercial messages as well, so that you have it not only coming about in the public service campaigns, but you have it reflected in the same kind of consistent messaging through the other stuff that goes on.

I just wanted to make one other comment back to your previous question, if I could. Marketing follows product and so, I think, for example, nutrition standards for purposes of helping companies get focused on products, as what we're doing internally, is very useful because it helps us motivate our own organization, et cetera. That's a much more productive application of nutrition standards, I think, than trying to use it to restrict advertising, because advertising is a peripheral marketing tactic on the edges of what we're really trying to get done

1	here	is	we'	re	trying	to	find	healthier	products	that	are
2	reall	.V 6	attra	act	ive.						

So, I think the debate needs to start at the other end of the pipe, which is how do we make sure that's happening, first and foremost, because the marketing will follow, and that marketing can reinforce not only the benefits of the product, but it can reinforce the healthy lifestyles in the process, and that's what we're certainly aiming to demonstrate.

MS. ENGLE: Dr. Kris-Etherton, did you want to respond to that?

DR. KRIS-ETHERTON: Well, just to say that, you know, I think parents also need to understand that obesity is a problem and there are a lot of parents and a lot of ethnic groups that don't really know that it's --

DR. O'GRADY: You need to speak into the mic.

DR. KRIS-ETHERTON: Okay. Parents, I think, are key. They need to understand that obesity is a real problem, and then along those lines, in Mike's first question, American Heart is going to be developing materials for parents letting them know about the health hazards of obesity so that maybe that can help drive more healthy food products and advertising as well.

DR. SHIFRIN: Just looking at behavior changes in pre-contemplative and then contemplative stages, when

I see parents who are there for a totally different reason, a sprained ankle, knees hurt because the youngster is overweight and he's doing P.E. and we talk about the fact that this youngster's gained 30 pounds in one year, the parents are actually shocked because they don't notice it a lot of the time. The awareness factor is fairly small. So, when you talk to them in a primary care way, even that awareness sometimes even in a 10-minute visit is enough to start them contemplating a change. But it's -- again, it's a marathon. It's like a cruise ship, you're not going to turn it around in two minutes. It's going to take 30, 40 miles to get the cruise ship to turn around.

So, don't think that you're going to turn around on a dime on it, and that's why when we start this in the office, we like to see other things going on outside the office that's going to reinforce that message that they've got to start at least doing inventory about what that youngster is eating and what kinds of activities the youngster is or isn't doing.

And lastly, in terms of the digital problem, very soon -- and we realize -- the Academy realizes we're not going to get the TV out of every bedroom -- the TVs out of every child's bedroom in America. However, those televisions will be connected to digital boxes which will

recognize that television as being watched by a youngster that is either eight to ten years of age. And so, if we are going to create PSAs for that age group, we're going to want them channeled into those boxes because that's what's going to happen in the digital world. Everybody's going to know who's watching the television and what age they are. So, we look forward to working to craft messages that can be delivered consistently, that are going to influence youngsters to really start making this sea change.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DR. LINN: I also think that parents need not just education about obesity, but they need education actually from before their children are born, when They need education about the link they're pregnant. between media characters and junk food. They need to understand that the products that they buy their babies that are branded with Sesame Street characters or Nickelodeon characters or Disney characters, that their babies are going to love those characters, and when they love those characters, they're going to want all the stuff that those characters advertise. That buying all that stuff for babies is the beginning. You're heading for tantrums in the grocery store. That's the link. mean, how is a two-year-old who's developed all these warm, wonderful feelings about Elmo, how is that two-

year-old going to understand that he or she can't have Elmo fruit snacks?

I mean, so the media literacy stuff that everybody sort of talks about, and I know you guys really love media literacy, but that it needs to be from even before children are born, that parents really need to understand that link, because they don't get it. And when they're in the middle of the tantrum, they don't understand why it's happening, they don't make the link between the fact that they have Disney wallpaper and their two-year-old is having a meltdown about not being able to get a Disney candy or something like that. They need to understand that.

DR. O'GRADY: One thing in terms of thinking about some of the comments that different people -- and I do want to thank the panelists that did make positive proposals, for the thought that they put into them and the way that they went forward here.

One of the issues that came up had to do with this idea of a dialogue and a continued dialogue and how you continue to move this process forward, and I guess I was just -- especially, I think, two different commenters made that suggestion and I was just hoping that they might take a second to expand on what they had in mind.

MR. BERLIND: I think I was one of them and,

you know, it could take many forms. I mean, hopefully, there's ways of having dialogues that do not require the convening of a major event like this which -- with all the planning and all the space that occur between that. But, to me, it's everything from the informal conversations that take place, whether it's within industry level or between members of the public health community and industry, it's working with folks here in Washington, both in a group basis and an individual basis, and perhaps all leading to some next event. look to you all for your thoughts about what a sort of follow-up event to this one could be.

But if we get it -- if it's established at some point in the not terribly distant future, it's something we could all work towards to move the ball forward. I mean, I can't tell you -- I think Manly and Brock will certainly agree with this, it's the fact of having this workshop that sort of galvanized the folks within GMA and our companies to say, all right, well, there's going to be a workshop, let's see what we can do to put some proposals together, and I don't know that that would have necessarily happened without the fact of this event. So, I don't know what the appropriate spacing is, but this is the kind of process that needs to continue.

DR. SHIFRIN: I think I was the other one that

talked about a dialogue, at least someone who would admit I think that as pediatricians there's a number of frustrations we have about any topic, bicycle helmets, car seat restraints, just name one, it will just fall out of the sky. This one is a big one, autism, attention deficit disorders. But we need advocacy partners here because we can't do it ourselves. Many physicians have thrown up their hands. My partners constantly tell me all day, it's not going to work. I talk to them until I'm blue in the face, they come back, they've gained another 15 or 20 pounds and this time the family's separated and they're living in two different spots and the kids have different foods in different houses, what can I do? I'm stuck. I don't have any ammunition at all, my qun's empty.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So, what we need to do is continue the dialogue from the partnership, from a health standpoint, a public health standpoint as the Surgeon General said, and the private sector, the industry, and also government. It's also a three-legged stool that we need to keep together and I'm -- I certainly speak, I think, for our Board of Directors in saying we'll probably go anywhere and meet anyone at any time to help out.

MR. MOLPUS: I'll just add a word. I think

Mark is exactly right. Usually you get a question when

you announce some new initiative. Well, why now, why not a year ago or why not six months from now? I think the catalyst for our agreement, our open-mindedness about extending self-regulation to our industry truly came from preparing for this meeting and not wanting to come here and just talk about the status quo or defend what was there, but to think about what steps we could take to make something better.

I think, Dick, the success of all of this work on obesity goes so much and it's so fundamental to a sustained effort, and it's what the lady from IOM said earlier, it's going to be a long haul and it needs a sustained effort, and sharing groups and forums, whether it's as formal as this or something less formal, is helpful because it makes us all stand back and have to think very carefully and very sensitively about where we are on this issue and we all learn from the different views that are here.

DR. O'GRADY: Thank you. And I have to just reinforce certainly, you know, we'll sit down with the FTC and we'll talk about kind of logical next steps and we'll have that dialogue and figure out what makes sense as the next step. But I would say that one of these themes that I heard across the last day-and-a-half, as well as on this panel as well, that I'd like to

emphasize, is it's quite clear there is no one particular dimension here that is going to solve this problem for us. So, it really is -- and certainly we see this across lots of different policy areas. You really have to hit

5 it across four or five major things.

so, with the government doing social marketing and moving into that area more strongly and trying to be smarter and more effective, will that solve everything? Of course not. But that's got to be one of the tools that you bring to bear. Are there different ways to be able to do these things, different ways to be able to help and empower parents? Sure. Will that do it alone? Of course not. It's got to all be in conjunction, three, four different fronts being opened at the same time. You know, to try and explain what goes on with childhood obesity, it's clear there is not one explanatory variable, there are tens if not hundreds, and we have to figure out how to address those and move forward and make some progress.

MS. ENGLE: Well, that sounds like a summing up.

DR. O'GRADY: I didn't mean it to be.

MS. ENGLE: And I know we've passed the hour that the panel was supposed to end. So, I just want to thank the participants on this panel for the very

thoughtful remarks and for their willingness to come here and discuss what they have today, and also for all recognizing -- I think everybody has agreed that this conference is not just about reporting on the status quo, but to move forward and to really driving further changes in the future to help tackle this problem. So, thank you.

(Applause.)

DR. O'GRADY: Given the lateness of the hour, I think we're going to go right to closing remarks, if that's all right with everyone.

I think I was introduced before. I'm Michael O'Grady, I'm the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation at HHS. And I want to take just a couple of minutes, I know everybody is hungry and everybody is ready to move on. I want to take a sec to thank the FTC and I really want to thank you very much for coming and sharing your thoughts and concerns on this topic.

Based on the information shared during the workshop, we can all agree that childhood obesity is an alarming trend and a serious public health problem that will have far-reaching consequences for individuals, families, communities and the country. As we've also heard over the last two days, and quite forcefully by our Surgeon General, the problem is complex, multi-

dimensional, having social, cultural and environmental
factors, and while we all understand the goal of
achieving the right balance between calories and
exercise, we know that influencing behavior is difficult,
change especially in developing healthier lifestyles.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Correcting this problem will require a longterm commitment, as we've heard from a number of The problem of childhood obesity didn't happen overnight and there is no quick fix. HHS has made a long-term commitment and is diligently working to address this problem. Hopefully, you are all familiar with our Steps to a Healthier U.S. Campaign, the Dietary Guidelines and efforts to help inform consumers by improving the food label. There are also a number of new launched activities, including HHS as a funder of the IOM Report that you heard about earlier, HHS through the Centers for Disease Control is studying the effects of food marketing on children's diet and health, identifying characteristics of food marketing to promote healthier choices, and as we have been here, HHS, through our colleagues at the National Institutes of Health, have been holding a workshop on what communication science can tell us about promoting optimal dietary behavior.

For our efforts to be successful, solutions will have to be multi-sectorial, reaching across many

domains, including children, their parents, schools and the medical community, media and the food industry. To address this problem, everyone has a role to play.

During the past two days, we have heard about efforts begun across all these domains and about work that is also needed, including that we have heard from the consumer and public health community about more needing to be done both by government and the private sector. We have heard about initiatives from restaurants and food companies about their introduction of marketing of healthier foods. We have heard about proposed efforts to coordinate messages across public and private campaigns to increase the resonance of health messaging.

We have heard from companies interested in tightening current self-regulatory guidelines in marketing to children and from those who think current self-regulation lacks the teeth it needed to make a real change. We've talked about research on this issue, but we need more. We need to learn what works, what doesn't and how these different variables can work together.

Getting together at this meeting has allowed us to identify the new partners in addressing this issue. This effort should not end here. It should be ongoing and reflect the changes and practices, the health needs of Americans and the knowledge that we gain from

evaluation of our collective activities. This meeting has given us a great deal to think about as far as the next steps, and I can speak for the Department in saying that we view the dialogue over the last two days as the beginning, just the beginning, as we look forward to working with all of you to move forward on addressing this very serious public health problem.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

DR. O'GRADY: And now my colleague, Lydia Parnes from FTC.

MS. PARNES: Thank you. I guess I get the last word this morning and I will tell you all, I usually eat lunch at 12:00, so I'm hungry and I'll be really quick.

Let me start by thanking Michael O'Grady and his staff at HHS who were our partners in putting together this workshop. Frankly, we couldn't have gotten or asked for better partners in this effort.

One of my favorite movies, Field of Dreams, in that movie an Iowa farmer is told that if he builds a baseball diamond in his cornfield, they will come. Well, the FTC and HHS built a workshop to discuss childhood obesity and you came. You came because you knew this was an important issue. Why? Because childhood obesity affects the very health of our children and we need to

act quickly and effectively to address this very important issue.

The panelists who came shared their expertise and experience. The audience posed questions and made comments that called on our panelists to apply their expertise and experience, and with all of that, we all learned.

And based on what we've learned, I think there are several things that are worth pursuing. First, we should share our research on how to reach children with nutritional messages. Second, we should all work together to develop consistent educational messages and get those messages out to parents. Parents care about their children and we need to help them do the right thing.

Third, food companies should continue and expand on their efforts to make and market healthier food options for children. Fourth, we should consider and debate changes to self-regulatory standards, including an assessment of the ideas that we just heard from GMA on self-regulation. And fifth, we should support industry's good work thus far and encourage them to do more.

One of our panelists from yesterday asked if we had a goal, a goal, he said, to reduce if not eliminate the problem of obesity. What a great and difficult

1	challenge for all of us. To meet this challenge, HHS and
2	the FTC will do all that they can to facilitate creative,
3	innovative and effective industry efforts.
4	As Chairman Majoras emphasized yesterday, our
5	task now is to seize the momentum that the workshop has
6	given us to confront the great challenge of childhood
7	obesity. I know that we're all up to this challenge, I
8	look forward to working with all of you as we continue
9	this dialogue, and I want to thank you and I hope you all
10	have a good lunch.
11	(Applause.)
12	(Whereupon, at 12:56 p.m., the workshop was
13	concluded.)
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	CERTIFICATION OF REPORTER
2	
3	WORKSHOP TITLE: PERSPECTIVES ON MARKETING, SELF-
4	REGULATION & CHILDHOOD OBESITY
5	DATE: <u>JULY 15, 2005</u>
6	
7	I HEREBY CERTIFY that the transcript contained
8	herein is a full and accurate transcript of the notes
9	taken by me at the hearing on the above cause before the
10	FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION and DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN
11	SERVICES to the best of my knowledge and belief.
12	
13	DATED: JULY 21, 2005
14	
15	
16	KAREN GUY
17	
18	CERTIFICATION OF PROOFREADER
19	
20	I HEREBY CERTIFY that I proofread the transcript for
21	accuracy in spelling, hyphenation, punctuation and
22	format.
23	
24	
25	WANDA J. RAVER