

Peters, John C

From: Alex Malaspina
Sent: Mon 2/23/2015 4:45 PM (GMT-07:00)
To: scohen@unmc.edu; beauchamp@monell.org; Hill, James; Peters, John C;
fergc@foodsci.umass
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Fwd: UPDATE: IFIC Foundation's 2015 Dietary Guidelines Media Call

Mike makes some good points. Any ideas how we can counteract recommendations not based on science but mainly on anecdotal

evidence. This matter is now becoming very critical with the latest dietary recommendations. Many thanks. Best regards. Alex

-----Original Message-----

From: Michael Ernest Knowles <mek59100@gmail.com>
To: Alex Malaspina <malaspina@aol.com>
Sent: Mon, Feb 23, 2015 7:52 am
Subject: Re: UPDATE: IFIC Foundation's 2015 Dietary Guidelines Media Call

Alex ,

This IFIC media call is a great example of how the industry should respond to biased , non-scientific-based recommendations . It's after the event of course but will no doubt be successful in ensuring that they do not get adopted as written . It hopefully will also demonstrate to governments that they must have credible scientists in their advisory committees , or else they risk being made to look foolish .

I think that IFIC should follow with further media calls on the key issues raised with again former panel members but reinforced with recognised experts in the subject of the call - for us it would be a call on aspartame to rebut the aspartame allegations .

As to the generation of credible , consensus science on the issues hitting the industry - obesity and causative factors , sugar , low/no calories sweetener safety - in particular we have to use external organisations in addition to any work we directly commission (and that needs to be very carefully reviewed in light of the BMY article !) ; examples are :

> ILSI : as I said in my comments to the RF Director and Board , the RF must establish both safety outside GM foods and nutrition programmes or centres ; this has been strongly supported by another RF Board member who also added that they should add ' risk - benefit ' communications to the public .ILSI was formed by you for the very reason that such contentious issues need to be addressed by all stakeholders i.e.. under the tripartite procedure . The ' One ILSI' strategy currently being developed should do this but it's too slow these issues need to be addressed now in the traditional manner of ILSI - in a transparent manner with the best international experts and the full proceedings published and further publicised by IFIC . The ILSI Branches can build on this for their own countries .

> Scientific Societies : we all belong to one or more of these and we should have leadership roles in the key ones and push for individual issues to be addressed by public conferences / workshops in the manner of ILSI above .

> Medical Associations : we do have good contacts in some and we should encourage them to address public health matters and ' suggest ' appropriate topics - I belong to the Apothecaries Society (it's a very old , traditional medical - 90% medics - organisation in the City of London) and they may be interested - they give courses in ' catastrophe medicine ' so perhaps our issues qualify ! I will talk to my friend Sir Colin Berry who's a Past President of the Society and has advised us on several issues in the past , worked with ILSI and Tox Forum - a vg toxicologist and medic .

> National Academies of Science : in EU we do have an association of these bodies and the UK's , The Royal Society , has recently opened a ' food science ' theme and we can talk to them through the IFST , of which I'm a Fellow , to suggest some form of debate on the issues , ensuring of course that the debaters are balanced !

> EU / Govt. research : this is longer term of course but we should look ahead and proposed work in those which could become ' issues ' and we have vehicles through FDE and ETP Food For Life Board in Europe . The EU Commission is pressing for greater international collaboration with the US at the top of the preferred collaborator list , so we should encourage this through ILSI and our academic contacts .

That's just a selection of ways we can address the issues we currently have and ameliorate future ones and they require an SRA / PAC collaborative approach to be successful .

Hope that helps ; always happy to discuss .

Kind regards

Mike

On 22 Feb 2015, at 16:37, Alex Malaspina <malaspina@aol.com> wrote:

-----Original Message-----

From: Alex Malaspina <malaspina@aol.com>

To: ehays <ehays@coca-cola.com>; ctuggle <ctuggle@coca-cola.com>; hlaman <hlaman@coca-cola.com>

Sent: Sun, Feb 22, 2015 8:41 am

Subject: Fwd: UPDATE: IFIC Foundation's 2015 Dietary Guidelines Media Call

Dear Ed and Clyde: IFIC is coming through for industry. I am looking forward to our visiting them on March 4th. Warmest regards.Alex

-----Original Message-----

From: Dave Schmidt <schmidt@ific.org>

To: Alex Malaspina <malaspina@aol.com>

Sent: Fri, Feb 20, 2015 9:11 pm

Subject: Fwd: UPDATE: IFIC Foundation's 2015 Dietary Guidelines Media Call

Fyi

Sent from Dave's iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Marianne Smith-Edge <smithedge@ific.org>
Date: February 20, 2015 at 5:53:26 PM EST
Cc: Dave Schmidt <schmidt@ific.org>, Kimberly Reed <reed@ific.org>, !All International Food Information Council Employees <allstaff@ific.org>
Subject: **UPDATE: IFIC Foundation's 2015 Dietary Guidelines Media Call**

To: IFIC Board of Directors
IFIC Foundation Trustees
All IFIC Committees
IFIC Media Relations Program

From: Marianne Smith Edge

Cc: Dave Schmidt
Kimberly Reed
All IFIC Staff

Date: February 20, 2015

Subject: UPDATE: IFIC Foundation's 2015 Dietary Guidelines Media Call


This morning we had **40+** journalists participate in our DGAC report conference call (see resulting media coverage and bulleted overview below). Participants included the Associated Press, Politico, WBEZ-Chicago, Capitol Press, and trade press as well as nutrition columnists and bloggers. The former DGAC panelists included Dr. Cheryl Achterberg, Dr. Joanne Lupton, Dr. Linda Van Horn, Dr. Theresa Nicklas, Dr. Connie Weaver and Dr. Roger Clemens. This hour-long webcast was recorded and has been **posted to our website**. We also live tweeted and heavily promoted our **new Dietary Guidelines Infographic** during the call. Today's combined Dietary Guidelines communication activities have resulted in more than **393,500 total impressions**.

In addition to the media call, we have compiled a list of **20+** experts with content-specific expertise in DGAC "hot-button" issues (Added Sugars, Aspartame, Caffeine, Sustainability, Cholesterol, Red vs. Lean meat, etc.) who have agreed to be available for media inquiries.

My special thanks to Matt Raymond and Kris Sollid for coordinating the media participation and DGAC panelists, respectively.

RESULTING MEDIA COVERAGE

Politico filed a story this afternoon based on today's call. The author, Chase Purdy, was the most inquisitive reporter in attendance. If you'd like the full text of his story emailed to you, let us know as it is only available to Politico Pro subscribers at this time. We also anticipate an article to be posted by the Associated Press.



Members of the 2015 Dietary Guidelines Advisory Committee aren't just catching grief from the meat and soda industries for their report. On Friday, members of two former dietary advisory panels piled on, as well.

“I think it’s good that the new guidelines contained recommendations for action, but it’s not clear that all of them are science or evidence based,” said Cheryl Achterberg, a nutritional development scholar at Ohio State University who served on the 2010 committee. “I’m not sure a demonization of any food group is going to be productive.”

Achterberg was one of five former panel members, from both the 2005 and 2010 committees, to participate in the hour-long event organized by the International Food Information Council. There’s little doubt the Ohio State professor was talking about the way the 2015 panel suggested reducing the consumption of red meat, a recommendation that received swift rebuke from the meat industry.

To view the full story online:

<https://www.politicopro.com/go/?id=43972>

MEDIA CALL OVERVIEW

SCIENCE REVIEW VS. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

- Did the 2015 DGAC overstep their bounds? The 2015 evidence review process was discussed with emphasis on how it differed from previous DGA's.
 - 2010 DGAC members noted that they were clearly restricted to providing only and evidence-based review. 2015 seemed to go outside of this guidance in crafting their recommendations.
 - 2015 DGAC has too much emphasis on public policy—specifically with sugars, taxes and labeling—and not enough on evidence-based scientific review.
- Question from reporter asked for reasons for “trendy foodie” recommendations.

- o Responses cited: DGAC selection process; no DGAC agriculture expertise, food regulation or food science members; unbalanced view of presentations made to subcommittees.

MEAT

- The science behind the “lean” and limiting red meat recommendations is conflicting.
- Recommendations should be based on totality of evidence as cultural bias exists when making recommendations about red meat and processed foods. There is no evidence for this recommendation in foreign cultures.

SUSTAINABILITY

- Recommendations on sustainability do not take into account the entire beef food system.
- They give a “soft” definition of sustainability.

ADDED SUGARS AND LCS

- Added Sugars recommendation was based on insufficient evidence to change from a limit of 25% to 10% of calorie intake.
- Evidence about restricting SSB and Added Sugars should be held to the same rigor of evidence as other recommendations.
- Conflicting recommendations about sugar and non-nutritive sweeteners based on different use of epidemiological evidence.
 - o The LCS recommendations will likely confuse consumers.

FOOD REFORMULATION

- Will the 2015 DGAs drive reformulation and what are the implications? Will it spur meaningful palate and behavior change?
- Questionable effectiveness of changing the food supply to lower sodium. Instead, there needs to be an increase in appeal of healthful foods like fruits, vegetables and dairy.

DEMONIZATION OF FOODS

- All panelists concurred that the demonization of certain food groups is not productive. Potatoes cited as a prime example.


DGAC VS. DGA

- This point was made very clear—the DGAC recommendations are not the Dietary Guidelines.


CHOLESTEROL

- There will be concern and confusion with the public regarding dietary cholesterol. This should be carefully communicated.

Regards,



Marianne Smith Edge, MS, RD, LD, FADA
Senior Vice President, Nutrition & Food Safety



International Food Information Council
1100 Connecticut Ave, NW Suite 430

Washington, DC 20036
202-296-6540 (office)
202-293-1860 (office direct dial)
270-316-2118 (cell)

<image001.jpg><image004.jpg><image005.jpg>