

Minutes preliminary meeting

Date: April 4, 2008

Place: Barcelona

Present: Gabriele Bartsch, Armin Koeppel, Claudia König, Johan Damgaard Jensen, Ina Johansen, Avalon de Bruijn, Wim van Dalen, Esther van den Wildenberg (minutes)

Not present: Karen Hughes, Mark Bellis, Michela Morleo, Shane Donoghue, Peter Anderson

Karen Hughes and Mark Bellis could not be present at the meeting on April 4th 2008. Therefore, a pre-meeting was held on the 31th of March with Wim van Dalen, Avalon de Bruijn, Karen Hughes and Mark Bellis in Utrecht. Similar agenda points were discussed and comments are included in this minute and discussed on the 4th of April.

1. Experience with topic and Expectations of the project:

Work packages are very different in their focus. The associating partners have experience in one of these topics.

Johan says the marketing topic in the project adds to what the Danish Alcohol Policy Network already does in this field (e.g. bad-ads website).

Gabriella says DHS works before on workplaces and health promotion. She knows some good examples, but only in the German context. This project brings the opportunity to examine practices in other countries outside Germany.

Claudia tells something about the HP-Source net. It is a database which the University of Bergen has already started with. All actions/programmes will be collected of the project will be integrated in this database.

Avalon says that the project could link existing practices with their effectiveness (based on literature study).

Wim tells about EUCAM, the new centre on monitoring alcohol marketing, in which the marketing work package will be integrated. Wim tells about the experience of LJMU on safe environments.

Adding LJMU: Concept of Safe Environments: Karen Hughes explains that the concept could be directed at nightlife and violence, but could also be broader defined: connection between alcohol use and child abuse/accidents/etc.

It is agreed that the project should be ambitious in the sense that it will connect practices with existing literature to examine whether practices use evidence based policy measures.

2. Literature study:

How selective should we be on the selection of literature? If there is a lot literature available we could be very selective, if there is little research available we could be less selective.

Comment LJM: Opinion Mark Bellis: Whether to include also non-scientific papers depends on how much evidence you take as a criteria: If you take a narrow definition, then grey literature does not add much information.

Avalon suggests we could take general elements from studies that work, even though many studies have been conducted outside Europe. We should base our selection of good practices on the literature.

Comment LJM: It is a good idea to include not only literature and projects that are described in English. However, if we include studies in other languages we need to ask our collaborating partners to cooperate. We need to talk further whether this is feasible.

Agreed is that we start with a literature study only on English scientific studies (in peer-reviewed journals) and that if we can not find enough articles, we broaden this search strategy by including non-English literature and grey literature.

A similar search strategy as Peter Anderson used in the ELSA project and the PHP project will be used in this project as well (added by searching in Google scholar).

3. Selection practices:

Comment LJM: Mark Bellis and Karen Hughes agree that we should ask partners to collect practices instead of best practices. The associating partners should make the distinction between bad-moderate-and good practices.

Comment LJM: The questionnaire used in the pathways to Health project can serve as a point of departure. Mark Bellis points out that besides these descriptive questions we should also ask questions to test the quality of the practices in more detail (e.g. is there a control group used to test the effectiveness of the practice?).

Agreed is that we ask that we inventoried practices and we selected afterwards what are good practices and what are not good practices (with criteria made after performing literature study). Discussed is that we are looking for good practices instead of best practices, since these practices are not THE best practices as is generally used in the literature, and we are able to select bad practices as well.

Gabrielle identifies a possible problem attached to her work package. Large companies might not reveal data on alcohol on the workplace since this could be sensible information. Wim argues that it could also be the other way around: companies might be 'proud' of their practices.

4. Writing the final reports:

Avalon and Ina will together work on the report on Alcohol Marketing. They need to discuss this thoroughly later at the beginning of the project.

Gabriella asks whether DHS will write the final report or if Peter will do this. It might be possible for Armin to write a draft report which Peter will finalize. Gabriele will discuss this with Peter.

5. Time schedule:

- 1st month (June 1st 2008): Avalon will provide the structure of the report within the first month (to make the literature search easier and more comparable over work

packages). The search method between the work packages should be comparable. All package leaders should propose a list of key words (as in ELSA and PHP project).

- First 3 months: Literature review: including a content list of the draft report. All partners should have written a draft report on the literature search within the first 3 months. Partners should record their search strategy in detail (for the method section of the report). During the literature search there will be communicated between the work package leaders and STAP to see whether it is necessary to broaden the literature search (from peer reviewed journals to grey literature).
- After 3 months a meeting will be held to discuss the results of the literature search and to formulate criteria for good practices (general and work package specific criteria).
- After 1,5 years the database with practices has to be ready.
- The last 0,5 year we can work on finalizing the reports (combining practices with literature study).

6. Contact with collaborating partners:

Results of the literature review and questionnaires (3 different questionnaires) will be send to the collaborating partners. We ask these partners to collect practices. An expert within the organization will be asked to fill in the questionnaires. This could mean that 3 different questionnaires will be filled in by 3 experts within the organization. All contacts within the network will be asked again whether they would like to be a collaborating partner.

Gabrielle mentions the importance of keeping collaborating partners involved in the project by informing them regularly. Avalon will send to the associating partners a draft of an email to inform the collaborating partners on this first meeting. Ina mentions that in this email the objectives of FASE should be clarified.

7. The Face of the project:

All partners agree that it is important to give the project a face. A (simple) project website will be created for collaborating partners and dissemination of the results. There is a lot of money in the budget on the purchase of articles and reports. If we decide to include only scientific reports (and no commercial reports), we can use this money partly for designing a website. The university of Bergen can play an important role in this by thinking about how we can publish the practices on the website.

Thanks to the hospitality of Johan and Ina, the next meeting will take place in Copenhagen at the end of August. During this meeting the results of the literature study will discussed and criteria for selecting good practices will be made (in order to make the questionnaires).

8. List of Actions:

Date	Action
End of April	Sign grant agreement
May 1 st 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Official start project (start literature search) - Up date to collaborating partners (Avalon will send draft email to associating partners)
June 1 st 2008	Avalon distributes structure of report literature review.
25 th of August 2008	First meeting Copenhagen: Presenting

	results literature search and drafting criteria for selecting good practices.
--	---