1	FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION
2	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	WEIGHING IN: MARKETING,
9	REGULATION AND CHILDHOOD OBESITY
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	Wednesday, July 18, 2007
17	
18	Federal Trade Commission
19	601 New Jersey Avenue, N.W.
20	Washington, DC 20001
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	I N D E X	
2		
3		<u>Page</u>
4		
5	Welcome and Introduction (Mary Engle)	. 4
6		
7	Keynote Remarks (Deborah Platt Majoras,	
8	Chairman, Federal Trade Commission	. 4
9		
10	Presentations: Self-Regulatory Initiatives	. 18
11		
12	Questions from Audience	. 40
13		
14	Presentations: Food Company Initiatives	. 49
15		
16	Presentations: Media/Entertainment Company	
17	Initiatives	. 74
18		
19	Questions from Audience	. 102
20		
21	Luncheon Break	. 120
22		
23	Remarks (Jon Leibowitz, Commissioner,	
24	Federal Trade Commission	. 122
25		

1	Presentations: Public Education	134
2		
3	Presentations: New Research on Food Marketing	
4	to Children	173
5		
6	Questions from Audience	198
7		
8	Panel: Scoring the Progress Since Summer 2005	203
9		
10	Remarks (Lydia B. Parnes, Director, Bureau	
11	of Consumer Protection, Federal Trade	
12	Commission)	254
13		
14	Adjournment	260
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	9:06 a.m.
3	WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION
4	MS. ENGLE: Good morning, everybody. My name
5	is Mary Engle, and I'm the Associate Director for
6	Advertising Practices at the FTC. I want to thank you
7	all for coming to today's event. We're expecting a
8	lively discussion, and hopefully we'll hear and learn a
9	lot of good information.
10	We have a very full agenda this morning, so I
11	want to quickly get going. The first thing I'd like to
12	do is to introduce this morning's keynote speaker, who
13	is FTC Chairman Deborah Platt Majoras.
14	Chairman Majoras offered opening remarks when
15	we held the workshop two years ago today actually on
16	these issues, and today she is going to similarly
17	preview the events of today. Chairman Majoras.
18	(Applause.)
19	KEYNOTE REMARKS - CHAIRMAN DEBORAH PLATT MAJORAS
20	CHAIRMAN MAJORAS: Well, good morning,
21	everybody. It's great to see so many of you here, and
22	we're probably helped, I think, by some of the interest
23	generated in the press already by announcements of food
24	company advertising pledges, which we think are a very
25	good and significant step.

As Mary said and you all know, two years ago
the FTC, together with HHS, hosted a joint workshop on
marketing, self-regulation and childhood obesity. As
the workshop wound to a close, one of the final
panelists equated the challenge of tackling childhood
obesity to running a marathon. I think that's a good
analogy

Unfortunately, with the CDC reporting that 10 million school-aged children are overweight, or nearly one in five, it may be more like the iron man triathalon. I've never done any of these things, by the way.

It will be a long and difficult task, requiring a great deal of stamina and a lot of strategy. From the beginning, the focus of the FTC/HHS joint initiative on childhood obesity has been on marketing and self-regulation.

We've always recognized, though, that industry is not the only segment of society that should work to find solutions to this very serious societal problem. We've all been complicit in the decline of our children's health, parents, schools, government, health care, media, food companies. So we all have to take some action, work together to reverse the trend.

Now through this initiative, FTC and HHS have

explored how we might harness the creative forces, the technical know-how and yes, the financial power of the marketplace to promote healthier eating and to promote exercise habits for our children.

We've asked industry to take the lead in providing some solutions to this very complex problem. Today, we're going to look at the progress that's been made over the last two years.

Our 2005 workshop brought together academics, consumer advocates, pediatricians, government officials and some of the largest food and beverage manufacturers, restaurant chains and entertainment companies in the country.

The dialogue we had there, we thought, was quite encouraging. Despite some initial mistrust and skepticism, participants ultimately did find some common ground. Panelists generated many creative ideas for addressing childhood obesity, and the food industry pledged to implement a major self-regulatory initiative.

Our report on the workshop provided a substantial list of recommendations for specific and concrete action. Our report called first and foremost for stronger self-regulation of food marketing to children, working through the Council of Better

Business Bureau's Children's Advertising Review Unit,
which we all call CARU.

We urged CARU to consider minimum nutritional standards for foods marketed to children, and to explore other ways to shift the overall marketing emphasis to healthier food choices. We asked that CARU expand enforcement beyond traditional advertising, to advergaming, peer-to-peer marketing, product placement and other techniques. We called for more enforcement, tougher sanctions and increased funding to make this possible.

Our report also included numerous recommendations directed to food companies, and to media and entertainment. We called for the food industry to expand on product packaging innovations that would provide more nutritious, lower-calorie options and at the same time make those options more appealing to children. Next, we'll ask you to make them more appealing to the rest of us. Just kidding.

We asked them to revise their marketing and sales practices in schools, and to consider adopting a simple, uniform label icon that could help consumers make quick, easy and smart food choices.

We asked the media and entertainment industry to incorporate nutrition and fitness messages into

their programming, and to limit the licensing of children's television and movie characters to more nutritious, lower calorie products.

We called on the food and media industries to combine forces, to develop and support public service campaigns on nutrition and fitness, focusing specific outreach efforts on minority populations, where children's obesity rates are highest.

Now I recognize that all of this was a tall order. Reconciling these recommendations with the economic realities of an extremely competitive marketplace might seem like a feat requiring super hero powers.

But I'm pleased to say in the mold of the Fantastic Four, a new foursome of super heroes is answering the call. Mickey Mouse, SpongeBob, Cookie Monster and yes, the hulking green monster, Shrek. Now you know that all these characters have tremendous popularity with our kids, and they're all harnessing that popularity today, to urge children to eat better and exercise more.

Mickey Mouse and his friends now appear only on foods that meet certain nutritional criteria.

SpongeBob is shifting away from foods high in sugar or fat to carrots, grapes and green beans.

Cookie Monster sings happily that cookies are
a sometimes-food, and Shrek urges kids to get up and
play an hour a day. Perhaps now that Shrek is a new
parent, his perspective on nutrition will further
improve.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN MAJORAS: Now I'm not making light of the commitments that have been made by Disney, Nickelodeon, Sesame Workshop, DreamWorks, the Ad Council or any of the food and beverage companies that have licensed these characters, in an effort to get children to eat more nutritious, lower-calorie foods.

I know there are critics that say that these initiatives don't go far enough, and we want to hear about. That's what this forum is for, to showcase the efforts of industry, to hear from the critics, and to assess where things may be falling short of report recommendations.

So we're going to look behind the pledges, to identify and explore the programs that have been put into place. First, we're going to hear from the Council of Better Business Bureaus, which last November launched the children's food and beverage advertising initiative.

The charter participants, Cadbury-Adams USA,

Campbell's Soup Company, the Coca-Cola Company, General
Mills, the Hershey Company, Kellogg Company, Kraft
Foods, Mars, McDonald's, Pepsico and Unilever, have
pledged to change the content of their messages to kids
about what they should be consuming, as well as how
they communicate those messages.

Advertising by these companies accounts for about two-thirds of the television ads that are directed to children under 12. Eight of the companies we've just heard have commitment to tie 100 percent of their advertising directed to kids to nutritional standards, a significant step in making the healthy choice an easy choice for parents and kids.

Three of the companies have pledge to cease entirely advertising their products to children under the age of 12.

As this BBB program matures and expands, it has the potential to produce real change, I think, in the children's food marketing landscape. I recognize, of course, that the true test will be in the details of the pledges, how they're implemented and whether they're enforced.

We'll also watch carefully to see whether this program expands beyond the eleven charter members. For example, we'd love to see other restaurant chains

joining in this initiative. I'm confident that BBB is committed to tough enforcement, and the FTC stands ready to work with them.

Next today, we're going to hear about some of the food and entertainment industry participants like Kraft and Disney, who got out to an early lead in this race against childhood obesity. These companies were willing to take bold steps to change what products they market to children and how they market them, and they've been joined by others over the past two years.

Most recently the Kellogg Company announced plans to dramatically change the products and techniques used in marketing to kids under 12, even committing to reformulate or stop marketing some of their most popular brands, like Pop Tarts and Fruit Loops.

General Mills will describe its partnership with Nickelodeon, to promote its frozen vegetable line to kids using Dora the Explorer and other favorites.

Sesame Workshop continues to refine their own character licensing guidelines based on their own research, of how pre-school kids select foods, and we'll hear about that today.

So there are many examples, and so many, I'm pleased to report, it's not possible to talk about all

of them and give folks that recognition.

Other efforts we're going to examine today include a program directed at improving the selection of foods marketed in schools, under the direction of the Alliance for a Healthier Generation.

HHS will also discuss public education campaigns targeting both general audiences like the HHS Small Steps PSAs, and then efforts by BET to reach out to specific racial and ethnic communities where childhood obesity rates are highest.

The FTC's own efforts over the past two years will also come under the spotlight, as they should. As part of this agency's commitment to combating childhood obesity, we're conducting research to determine what exactly is happening the marketplace, and how it's evolving over time.

You heard at our 2005 workshop that our Bureau of Economics had described some initial data from a staff study in children's exposure to food advertising on TV, and today, we'll take a closer look at the final results from that study and the findings of other leading researchers.

As many of you are aware, the FTC now is engaged in a far more comprehensive study of food industry marketing expenditures, and activities

targeted towards children and adolescents.

Through this effort, we're exploring not only traditional TV, print and radio advertising, but all of the many other ways that industry reaches children today. In-store promotions, events, packaging, the Internet and product placement in video games, movies and TV programs.

We hope to get a far more complete picture of the marketing techniques for which so far publicly-available data has been lacking. We'll submit the aggregated data about children's food marketing and report to Congress, as directed in the conference report, in our 2006 appropriations legislation.

So today, we're weighing in on the progress we've made since our 2005 workshop. I've already alluded to many positive examples. I imagine we'll hear some frustration today about what has not been accomplished.

So I urge everyone to approach the challenge together, as we would any successful weight loss or fitness program, which anybody who's ever been on one knows that you're much doing it if you have someone enduring the pain right along with you.

Whether we're talking about one individual's weight loss goals, completing that triathalon or

improving the health of a nation's children, success requires a long-term commitment, requires us to recognize that changes may come in small increments that will add up to meaningful progress over time.

We're not going to conquer childhood obesity until we've succeeded in bringing about substantial, lasting and holistic changes in our society by all involved. We must keep our resolve to reach this ultimate goal, even when the process at times is going to seem long and difficult.

We didn't get here overnight. We won't fix it overnight. I continue to have confidence that self-reg and industry initiatives can effectively contribute, and to believe that industry action can bring change more quickly and effectively than government regulation of speech.

I also recognize, however, that this viewpoint has its share of skeptics, and that the skepticism likely is fueled by a lingering resistance by some to make difficult changes in their business models. I realize that what we're calling on companies to do has economic consequences. But no one should underestimate the potential cost of maintaining the status quo.

Our kids are our future. If you want me to

put in economic terms, childhood obesity, which significantly increases health risks, is predicted to contribute significantly to already-increasing health care costs, in large part by today's large employer.

One can imagine that childhood obesity ultimately will cost us dearly in employee productivity over time.

Unfortunately, if this doesn't stir additional firms to act, then ultimately they should be spurred by competition in the marketplace, by those companies who have chosen to act now. The FTC/HHS workshop report in today's forum are providing, we hope, a powerful stimulus, but we know we're not alone in this and we're grateful for that.

The Institute of Medicine, the Federal

Communications Commission, Members of Congress, many in
government have been leading advocates for action.

Again, I'm encouraged by the progress and I'm energized
to continue this right.

You know, who knows? We have this movie that's a hit movie for the summer, "Ratatouille," so maybe it can do for vegetable stew what ET was able to do for Reese's Pieces. You never know.

So I want to thank all of you for being here.

I'm particularly grateful to all of our panelists, for sharing your time, your wisdom, your experience with us

1	today.	Very	app	preciativ	re of	the	hard	work	of	our	staff
2	at the	FTC,	our	partner	HHS.						

Now I will, without further discussion, turn things back over to Mary Engle. Thanks so much.

(Applause.)

MS. ENGLE: Thank you, Chairman Majoras, for framing the issues that we'll hear about today. Before I introduce our speakers for the next set of presentations, I need to go over a few housekeeping details.

Everyone should have received a badge when they came through security. You need to keep that with you at all times, and remember that even when you leave the building at lunch time, when you come back, you'll have to go back through security even with the badge.

In case of emergency, please note the exit signs. We've learned to do that, like flight attendant. If we hear that for some reason there's an emergency and we cannot vacate the building, we'll have security staff come and give us instructions for what to do.

We will be having one or two speaker changes on the agenda, which we'll introduce as the day progresses. We hope that you'll participate in the Q and A sessions that we have scheduled throughout the

	L	day.	You'l	l find	comment	cards	in	your	folders.
--	---	------	-------	--------	---------	-------	----	------	----------

You can write down your questions and give
them to FTC staff members, who you'll be able to
recognize by the ribbons that they have on their
badges.

Also, of course, please turn off all cell phones and PBAs. The microphones will be on all day and this event is being recorded. If you need to make a cell phone call, please go out into the lobby or outside the building.

Of course, the restrooms are across the lobby. There are signs, so you don't have to go through security to get to them. They're out on the other side of the elevator banks.

Finally, when possible, we will be posting the panelists' PowerPoint presentations within the next few days on our website. Now I'd like to welcome two of the distinguished speakers that we have today.

First, Elaine Kolish is the Director of the BBB's Children's Food and Beverage Advertising
Initiative, and she'll tell us about the changes that companies participating in the initiative are making and how food is marketed to children.

Before the joining the BBB's Food and
Beverage Advertising Initiative, Elaine was a partner

1	at the law firm of Sonnenschein, Nash and Rosenthal.
2	Before that, she spent 25 years at the FTC and she was
3	Associate Director of the Division of Enforcement.
4	After Elaine, we'll hear from Kimberly
5	Stitzel, who is a Science and Medicine Advisor for the
6	American Heart Association. Your agenda says Dr. David
7	Faxon will be speaking, but he was unable to make it
8	today. So we're happy to Ms. Stitzel coming in his
9	place.
L 0	Prior to her work with the AHA, Ms. Stitzel
11	served on as a nutrition advisor to the Deputy
L2	Assistant Secretary for Health on Federal Nutrition
L3	Policy at HHS. She will be speaking about
L 4	contributions by members of the Alliance for a
15	Healthier Generation, to changes that have been made in
L 6	food available in schools. So Elaine.
L 7	(Applause.)
L8	PRESENTATIONS: SELF-REGULATORY INITIATIVES
L 9	MS. KOLISH: I have a lot of slides, so I may
20	need this water.
21	(Pause.)
22	MS. KOLISH: Good morning, everyone. Thank
23	you, Mary, for the introduction, and I'd like to thank
24	Chairman Majoras for doing such an outstanding job of
) 5	laving out the challenge that faces all of us today

and for giving you a preview of the exciting news that
I'm so delighted to be able to share with you in more
detail today.

Meeting the challenge of obesity requires the efforts of so many parents, communities, schools, government and advertisers. As you will hear today, food marketers are responding to consumer interest in health and wellness by developing new products and reformulating existing ones to respond to consumer interest.

Participants in the Children's Food and
Beverage Advertising Initiative believe that
advertising can play an important role in helping to
inform consumers about these Better For You products,
and about healthy lifestyles.

These efforts, in combination with the efforts of others, can help consumers be bettereducated about healthy diets and the need for physical activity in our daily lives.

I don't know about you, but after hearing Chairman Majoras, I feel like I should go train for a marathon, but I'm not going to.

The eleven companies, as you've heard, although the number may sound modest, have a huge impact in the marketplace. They represent an estimated

two-thirds of the 2004 children's food and beverage
television advertising expenditures.

These companies are proud to have responded to the FTC and HHS challenge to contribute their voices to meeting the childhood obesity challenge.

Before I launch into the details of the program, I'd like to tell you a little bit about the BBB first.

Founded in 1912, the BBB has been a leader in advancing trust in the marketplace for nearly 100 years. We take pride in the fact that we serve millions of consumers each year, by for example, giving them information about companies they're thinking about doing business with, and by helping to resolve disputes between consumers and businesses.

The BBB also administers two well-known self-regulation programs, the National Advertising Division and the Children's Advertising Review Unit. Those two programs are led by the National Advertising Review Council, which sets their procedures and policies.

Oh, I forgot to go down on the slide. So sorry. I'm going to give you just a tiny overview of what I'm going to say. I want to give you some background about the initiative, an overview of the progress that we've made, and then I want to tell you

1 more about the company pledges.

2 Then I'm going to turn to a report on the 3 changes and updates to the CARU program, and I'll end 4 with next steps.

First about the initiative's origin. As the Chairman said, two years ago, the FTC and HHS held a workshop on self-regulation in children's marketing.

In April 2006, the agency issued a report with many recommendations.

After that report, the BBB and the NARC and industry members worked together to address the agency's recommendations, to enhance an existing program, the children's advertising review unit quidelines.

They did this by commencing a review of the program, a comprehensive review, and this review was led by one of the nation's preeminent leaders and experts in consumer protection, former director Jody Bernstein.

In November 2006, the BBB and the National Advertising Review Council were delighted to announce that this comprehensive review of the CARU program had resulted in updates to the CARU guidelines and other CARU program enhancements, as well as to the creation of the new Children's Food and Beverage Advertising

1 Initiative.

At the outset, let me explain that this new initiative, like CARU, addresses advertising directed primarily to children under 12. The difference between the two programs can be stated simply.

The initiative focuses on what products are advertised to children, while the CARU guidelines address how food and toys and other products are advertised to children, and is looking to make certain that those advertisements are truthful and fair and appropriate.

The new initiative responds directly to the agency's specific call for additional self-regulation, as well as to the Institute of Medicine's recommendation issued in its December 2005 report, "Health Food Marketing to Children Through Other Opportunity," that food and beverage manufacturers should use their creativity and resources to promote and support more healthful diets for children and youth.

Under this initiative, the participating companies agree to shift their mix of food and beverage advertising.

Specifically, the participants agreed that at least 50 percent of their ads primarily directed to

children under 12 in measured media, that is, TV, radio, print and Internet, will be for products that represent healthier dietary choices or advertising that encourages physical activity or good dietary habits.

The participants also agreed to five other goals. They would reduce the use of third party licensed characters in advertising primarily directed to children under 12, they committed not to seek for or pay for product placement of any of their foods or beverages in any program or editorial content directed to children under 12, and they committed not to advertise their foods and beverages in elementary schools.

Additionally, on company-owned websites, they agreed to meet the 50 percent commitment, and they agreed that on interactive games directed to children under 12, if their food or beverage products were part of those games, that they would now incorporate Better For You products and/or healthy lifestyle messages.

Let me tell you some highlights on the initiative's progress. We are very pleased that all eleven companies have pledges that have been approved for our program. As I said before, these eleven companies are going to have a significant impact on the marketplace, because of their share of the marketplace

in terms of advertising.

These pledges are going to affect both the type of products that children see in advertising directed to them, as well as the number of ads that are directed to children under 12.

Now the implementation of these pledges is an ongoing process. Some have already been completely and fully implemented. Others are in the process of being implemented now. For others, their completion will be by the end of December 2008.

The changes in child-directed advertising is going to be substantial and dramatic. Virtually all child-directed advertising will be tied to nutrition standards, meaning that you will be seeing -- children will be seeing Better For You products.

Eight of the companies have committed that 100 percent of their advertising will be for Better For You foods, and three companies have agreed that they will not advertise their candy or their traditional candy or snack products or beverages, and one company is either going to not advertise or it will devote 50 percent of its media impressions to a Better For You product.

Now of course the basis for what a Better For You product is is very important. These companies have

all used nutritionists in-house to develop nutrition criteria, and these criteria are all grounded on the same sound nutritional principles that emerge from government recommendations.

In large part, the standards are based on how FDA defines healthy: low, reduced, fat-free products. They're also based largely on the United States 2005 dietary guidelines for Americans, which contains recommendations on foods we should eat more of, vegetables, whole grains, low-fat dairy.

They also have recommendations on things we should try to consume less of, such as salt and sodium. Now under these companies' nutritional criteria, products may qualify as a Better For You product in one or more ways. Some of the criteria focuses on providing these needed foods and nutrients, such as whole grains.

Other have requirements that limit the amount of nutrients, such as sodium, fat and sugar. Other requirements turn to whether the product is a reduced or lower fat or sale or calorie version, or the product provides a functional benefit.

I'd like to say that although they're all company-specific nutritional criteria, the differences are small compared to the similarities. But truly the

grounding in this same scientific basis means there's more commonality.

Other pledge highlights. All the companies that are going to be advertising to children under 12 going forward have agreed that they will limit their use of licensed characters, third party licensed characters to their Better For You products.

Secondly, they've all agreed they will not be doing product placement for their foods. Whether they're Better For You foods or not, they will not be doing placement in media that is primarily directed to children.

And all of the companies will not be advertising to children in schools. Most have already stopped. A few still have some materials out there, but that will all stop by early fall.

Similarly, the companies that have sites that are directed to children or content on other sites who are primarily directed to children, have agreed to limit the products shown on those sites to Better For You products, or in some instances they've taken down sites, and in other instances they're going to be included healthy lifestyle messages.

That applies to the interactive games as well. To the extent that there are products, there are

games directed to children that feature company food products, they will now feature Better For You food products, as well as healthy lifestyle messages.

Virtually all the companies are taking advantage of the web to additional promote healthy lifestyle messages to children.

Now here's a breakdown of the companies whose advertising is going to be tied to nutrition standards in the future, and it's also noteworthy, as you'll see on subsequent slides, that although this is not a part of their pledges per se, most of these companies already had existing policies to not advertise to younger children, to children under eight or under six.

So I'm going to start and tell you a little bit more about each company's pledge right now.

Campbell Soup's nutrition policy is organized around its food product categories, as are a number of other companies. Under its pledge, it's going to limit its advertising of soups to those that contain less sodium and/or contain a full serving of vegetables.

It's also going to limit its advertising to crackers that contain less than 35 percent of their calories from fat and sat-fat and have only a little bit of sugar. For them, that will be their baked cheddar goldfish crackers.

For canned pasta products, they will be limiting their advertising to those products that have less sodium, that is 25 percent less, and they have reduced amounts -- not reduced amounts -- they have less than 35 percent calories from fat, and they will include a serving of vegetables and other positive nutrients.

Under General Mills' pledge, it has committed that all of the products it advertises in the future will have to meet its dietary guidelines. It has recently revised these dietary guidelines to make them even more rigorous, and notably it has added a new limitations, a 12 gram per serving sugar guideline.

Between these two criteria, many of their products are affected, and they will be engaged in reformulation efforts that will either lead to products that meet these standards or they will stop advertising them by December of 2008. A representative from General Mills is here and will give you more details about their excellent program.

Kellogg just recently announced nutrition criteria that it has incorporated into its pledge. Significantly, this criteria applies across the board to all of its product line, and affects approximately 50 percent of its food portfolio globally, including a

number of popular cereals such as Apple Jacks, Fruit Loops, Rice Krispies and products such as Pop Tarts and some fruit snacks such as Yogos. Some of the products that will meet their new criteria are Frosted Flakes and Eggo Frozen Waffles.

Kraft began using nutrition criteria in 2006, to determine which products it would advertise to children. Its nutritional criterial program is known as the Sensible Solution Program, and its products that meet this criteria actually carry a flag that describes for consumers what, how that product is qualifying.

Lance Friedmann from Kraft is going to be addressing the forum later this morning, so I'm going to defer to him to provide more information about Kraft's health and wellness initiative.

But I think it's notable that as a result of Kraft's criteria, that it meant they will no longer advertise a number of well-known products to children, including the original versions of Kool-Aid and Capri Sun, Oreo and Chips Ahoy, as well as many varieties of Lunchables.

McDonald's, the only quick serve food restaurant in our program, which we hope will change, has adopted nutrition criteria based on the 2005 Dietary Guidelines for Americans, as well as other

government standards. Its future advertising is going
to be based on this criteria.

This criteria, as you can see from the slide, contains reasonable limitations on calories and on fat and on sugar. The advertising is going to feature the following Happy Meal of 375 calorie four-piece Chicken McNugget Happy Meal with apple dippers, low-fat caramel dip and one percent low fat white milk.

Pepsico is now committing that 100 percent of its advertising will be for products that meet its Smart Spot nutrition criteria. This criteria, which already existed, is divided by product category and contains various requirements for beverages, foods and snacks.

For example, one way that a product can qualify if it meets specific limitations for fat, cholesterol, sodium or sugar. Another way it could qualify is if it is a reduced-calorie fat, sugar or sodium product.

What's new about Pepsico's product pledge is that it is now committing that all of its advertising to children will be tied to that criteria.

Unilever has recently adopted new nutritional criteria for an Eat Smart, Drink Smart logo program.

Its program, which also takes international guidelines

1	into	accou	nt,	contair	ns fi	Lve	benchmarks	that	а	product
2	must	meet	to	qualify	for	the	logo.			

Under its program, only products that meet its reasonable limitations for fat, sodium, sugar and cholesterol, will be allowed to be advertised to children. Currently, this advertising is for certain popsicle varieties and for Skippy peanut butter.

Now I'd like to turn to the no advertising group, which consists of Cadbury-Adams, Coca-Cola, Hershey and Mars. I'll start with Cadbury.

Cadbury only advertises one product to children under 12 right now, and that's Bubblicious gum. Under its pledge, by March 2008, it will no longer advertise this product, or it will devote at least 50 percent of its media impressions targeting children under two to a version that meets the Initiative's healthier food criteria. They will do this by March 2008.

Coca-Cola is now publicly affirming and committing to its long-standing practice of not targeting advertising to children under 12. As an Initiative participant, it is now subjecting itself to the BBB's transparency, its monitoring and its oversight.

The Hershey Company stopped advertising its

candy products in January of this year. This means
that this year, there will be zero media impression for
Hershey candy targeting children under 12. In
comparison, last year there were 400 million
impressions primarily directed at children under 12.
So I think you can see just one company's decision to
stop advertising will have a significant impact.

Mars has its feet in two camps. It has stopped its advertising of traditional candy and snack products to children under 12, and they've accomplished that this spring. It also manufactures several lines of Better For You snacks that are tied to specified nutritional criteria that limit calories and fat and sugar.

These products, if they are advertised at all, would be advertised to children over nine. So they're in the no advertising camp and they're in the camp that their advertising will be tied to nutrition criteria in the future. So that sort of completes the food part of the program.

I'd like to take a minute to talk to you about the CARU program and the FTC's recommendations for CARU. CARU is a self-regulation program with a long and distinguished history. It looks at all child-directed advertising, as well as the actual products

themselves as well as the packaging. As I mentioned at the outset, this program looks at how the ads are communicated to children.

For example, you know, ads should not encourage children to ask their mom to buy them something so they can be popular.

During the FTC-HHS workshop, a number of specific recommendations were made to improve upon CARU's excellent self-regulation foundation. We are pleased to report that the BBB and the National Advertising Review Council have taken many steps to address the agency's recommendations.

First, as suggested by the agencies, the CARU Advisory Board has been expanded. As the name suggests, this is a board that provides guidance to the CARU staff about developments in children's marketing, about how children perceive and understand marketing, and that we now have experts with a background in health and nutritional issues.

We also have added an on-line complaint form to the site, to make it easier for parents and other members of the public to file complaints. This has led to an increase in the number of complaints that we're receiving from the public, and in turn, an increase in the number of cases that are being initiated based on

1 complaints filed by the public.

In addition, as suggested, the CARU resources

have been increased, and the Initiative resources, my

position for example, are on top of those.

Finally, because of some additional funding or support from the Grocery Manufacturers Association, CARU's ability to do pre-screening of food ads and other ads has increased.

This means, though, that in this program, advertisers can submit a story board or another draft of an ad, and get CARU's analysis of that ad before it runs. This way, problems can be nipped in the bud before they are happening.

Now the guidelines themselves in November 2006 were also updated, to provide additional guidance to advertisers about the actual scope of the guidelines, and to provide some additional further guidance on food and beverage advertising.

The guides have always applied to all advertising. But to make this crystal clear, the guidelines now include an expansive definition of national advertising. To hammer home the point even further, a provision of advergaming was added, so that everyone would know that this is advertising as well.

In addition, the guidance on food advertising

was revised to say that food quantities that are shown being consumed in ads should be tied to the label serving size. In the past, the guidance had said you should show appropriate quantities.

Now we've tightened that up and we're tying it back to the label serving size. In addition, a provision was added to say advertisers shouldn't disparage healthy foods, such as fruits and vegetables, or healthy lifestyles.

Additionally, meal time depictions of foods should be shown in the context of a nutritionally balanced meal. This is to keep promoting the idea of healthy diets. Finally, what was already in the guides and remains and is an important point is that snacks should be depicted as snacks, not as substitutes for meals.

Now our next steps is to take these fine pledges and begin working with the companies to monitor them, to review compliance reports they'll be submitting in the future.

We also welcome public comments and feedback on how you think the companies are doing, and to let us know what you think. We'll be publicly reporting on the results in the near future.

Additionally, we plan to conduct a

1	comprehensive program review after we've been
2	operational for a couple of years.
3	Finally, we hope to expand the program, as
4	Chairman Majoras hopes as well. We hope that other
5	companies will see the value and benefits of
6	participating in self-regulation. We know that other
7	companies, like some of our own participants, already
8	have existing programs.
9	But we hope that they will see that joining a
10	self-regulation program that provides transparency and
11	accountability, is the best way to have the most
12	powerful impact on the marketplace. So we look forward
13	to talking with more companies in the near future.
14	So let me close by saying thank you for your
15	time and attention. I know it was a lot of slides. We
16	hope that you'll visit us at our website and view the

time and attention. I know it was a lot of slides. We hope that you'll visit us at our website and view the pledges for yourself. If you have comments and inquiries, we hope that you'll send them to our new email box. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MS. ENGLE: Thank you, Elaine. Next, we'll hear from Kimberly Stitzel.

MS. STITZEL: Just click on my name. That would be great. Thanks. Or Kim Stitzel. You may be wondering why someone from the American Heart

1	Association is coming to talk to you about the Alliance
2	for a Healthier Generation, and that's because the
3	Alliance is a partnership between the American Heart
4	Association and the Clinton Foundation.

The Alliance was created almost two years ago to combat childhood obesity. The goal is to stop the increasing rate of prevalence of childhood obesity by 2010, and to reverse that trend by 2015.

In looking at our shared capacity, the Alliance chose four directions for our work: industry, kids, schools and health care. The health care pillar work is our newest initiative, and I won't be going into too much detail about that today, other than the few comments I'll make right now.

The health care pillar will be our obesity work, working with leading health care insurance companies to help physicians and health care professionals prevent, assess and treat and diagnose childhood obesity.

Thanks to generous funding from RWJ

Foundation, the schools program launched about a year

ago in Little Rock. This is a criteria-based

recognition program that offers schools either hands-on

assistance or virtual support in reaching the criteria.

The areas that the criteria address include

school meals, competitive foods and beverage, nutrition education, physical education, health education, employee wellness as well as before and after school programs.

We have been working with the industry to support schools in making a healthier environment. We will award the first schools to reach recognition status at the healthy schools forum this summer, and there are about 35 of those schools.

The ultimate goal is to help schools make healthy environments and policies the norm. We also want to help make healthier policies easier for schools, and that has led us to our industry initiatives to date. In addition, 20 percent of the funds are dedicated to research and evaluation, so that we can better inform our evidence base.

Given the increased challenges in areas with low resources, we are over-sampling in low SES areas, with 70 percent of our hands-on assistance in low SES schools. Currently, we have over 230 schools in our hands-on program, and over 1,000 schools in our virtual program.

In May of 2006, we announced a landmark agreement with the beverage industry, and in October we announced a similar agreement with the food

1 manufacturers. These are the signatories for both of 2 those agreements.

The beverage companies and the American

Beverage Association agreed to fundamentally change

what they sold to schools, while the Alliance agreed to

promote a standard set of guidelines to help unify

healthy standards across schools and districts.

Specifically, the industry is committed to change contracts, product mix and machines, while the Alliance has agreed to work with schools to improve their policies, provide technical guidance and to promote the guidelines.

The competitive food guidelines or guidelines for all of those foods sold outside the school lunch and breakfast program, are a little more complicated, given the increased complexity of foods versus beverages. But you can find all of the details for those guidelines on-line.

The parties in the competitive foods agreement have made similar commitments as those that were made in the beverage agreement.

Beyond schools and industry, we are working to inspire kids themselves. In 2006, we launched a partnership with Nickelodeon, leaving to the Let's Just Play Go Healthy Challenge, an on-air, on-line, on the

1	ground youth activation campaign that aims to motivate
2	young people to make healthier changes where they live,
3	learn and play.
4	In 2007, our goal is to have two million
5	young people pledge to go healthy and to actively
6	engage them in doing so in their communities. This
7	year's on-air portion tracks the lives of two young
8	people, April and Kendrick, as they work to go healthy.
9	On-line, youth can find cues, tips and tools
10	to help them go healthy, either on Our Kids' website, I
11	Gohugo.org or on Nickelodeon's website,
12	<pre>nick.com\letsgoplay, or let'sjustplay.</pre>
13	In the real world, AHA staff in Partner in
14	Youth serving organizations are motivating kids to make
15	healthy choices every day. Pictured here is a kickoff
16	to a walk to school campaign in Boston. We're also
17	engaging in public awareness, working to remind youth
18	to go healthy all over town.
19	Here is a billboard or a bus depot with our
20	mascot Hugo, encouraging youth to take the pledge to go
21	healthy. For more information, I encourage you to go
22	to either of our websites. Thank you.
23	(Applause.)

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

QUESTIONS FROM AUDIENCE

MS. ENGLE: Now we'll be able to take

24

25

questions	from	the	audience.	I	don't	see	
-----------	------	-----	-----------	---	-------	-----	--

MALE PARTICIPANT: My question, as farfetched as this may seem to you, if it is established
that a strong, positive correlation exists between
children's ability to innovate and start learning and
participating in scientific advancement, and a high
junk food diet, would you agree that healthy eating
initiative should halt? In other words, is the focus
on a healthy lifestyle too parochial?

MS. ENGLE: Can you clarify that question?

MALE PARTICIPANT: Sure. Let me go back. In the Stone Age, children no doubt had healthy eating habits and a lot of physical exercise. Now I don't suggest there's a positive correlation between living in the Stone Age and a healthy diet.

But what happens if, as far-fetched as it may seem, and I don't have any basis; it's more a question of potential initiative, between a junk food diet on the part of kids, and a high ability on the part of kids to innovate and advance science, so that future generations, in my far-fetched example, might have a better, more advanced lifestyle if their kids ate junk food today?

If that were the case, would you agree that healthy eating initiatives should cease or are you

1	making a broad, moral judgment
2	MS. KOLISH: No, I would not agree that
3	advertising for healthy or Better For You foods should
4	cease. I'm quite confident that our nation's children
5	will continue to be innovators and leaders of the
6	future if they eat a healthy diet.
7	(Applause.)
8	MS. ENGLE: Could the questioners please
9	identify themselves before they speak?
10	DR. MONTGOMERY: I'm Kathryn Montgomery from
11	American University. I will get a chance to respond to
12	am I on?
13	VOICES: Yes.
14	DR. MONTGOMERY: All right. Can you hear me?
15	Kathryn Montgomery from American University. I'll have
16	a chance to respond in my formal remarks this
17	afternoon.
18	But I would like to ask Elaine if, with the
19	company initiatives, where individual companies each
20	have sort of a different profile of initiative, was
21	there an effort within the industry, through your
22	organization, to try to create some uniformity there
23	and some standards that would be more easily understood

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

by consumers, for one thing, where companies could

agree across the board? If so, what were the

24

25

MS. KOLISH: Thank you, Kathryn, for that question. When the program was established last November after extensive consultation with industry leaders and the BBB and the National Advertising Review Council, it was specifically designed then to encourage as many companies as possible to participate, with their various and varying food portfolios.

At that time, the idea of having one nutrition standard would have been counterproductive to that goal, or would have taken months or years longer to reach agreement on that. We think this is a wonderful great step forward, to have companies participating, and for the first time, for many of them tying their advertising in the future to nutritional standards.

The fact that the standards may look a little different to all of you doesn't really -- isn't really troublesome in my mind, because they're all rooted in sound, nutritional policies, and they happen to reflect the realities of their own food portfolios.

For example, a two gram sat-fat limitation may work wonderfully for one company. It is an excellent goal. But it may not be as appropriate for a company that's selling cheese and meat products and

1	pasta products.
2	MS. ENGLE: There's a question over here.
3	MR. PACKER: Thank you. My name's Dick
4	Packer. I'm the founder of Athletic International
5	Marketing. This one's for you, Kimberly. I noticed or
6	the photograph that you had up there that showed all
7	the kids towards the end of your presentation, it
8	appeared to me that it was kind of a broad spectrum of
9	elementary-aged kids.
10	Is the AMA and Heart Association, is that the
11	focus of this program with the two million children, or
12	the elementary age bracket?
13	Then the follow-up to that would be if that's
14	the case, elementary age kids, having been a former
15	executive director of a school foundation, they're
16	pretty much dependent on their parents having this
17	knowledge, because actually, you know, they're not
18	walking into Publix or Wynn-Dixie buying the products;
19	the parents are.
20	So how do you juxtaposition reaching out to
21	an elementary aged kid, and getting that message to
22	really who the user needs to be, and that's the parent?
23	MS. STITZEL: So the physical activity
24	nortion that you saw the Let's Just Play or Let's Go

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

Play, that was done in one of the elementary schools

25

themselves through our Jump Rope for Hoops Program as
well at the American Heart Association.

The food and beverage portion is actually across all three schools, elementary, middle and high school, as well. So we are trying to reach the broad spectrum of ages, where we can get to them the best.

MS. KOLISH: I would just like to add that I think your question illustrates the need for there to be a multi-faceted solution to the problem of obesity, that it can't just be schools. It has to be parents and communities and government.

MS. STITZEL: And I just want to add, I didn't go into our health care pillar, but one of the portions of that will be the discussion with parents when they're in the physician's office as well.

MR. CHESTER: Jeff Chester, Center for
Digital Democracy. I haven't had time to read indepth
all the pledges made, but this is a question for
Elaine.

To what extent in the announcements today regarding the use of websites, do the companies have committed to not use social networks, mobile and other kinds of marketing, peer-to-peer networks targeting, for example, older sibs, knowing that those peer-to-peer networks or social networks will reach young

1	people, virtual reality?
2	To what extent do these pledges include the
3	full range of digital technologies, which are at the
4	heart of the media experience for America's children?
5	Thanks.
6	MS. KOLISH: Thank you for your question.
7	MR. CHESTER: Behavioral targeting and data
8	collection as well. The full range.
9	(Laughter.)
10	MS. KOLISH: I'm not certain I can address
11	the full range of those issues, but I'm sure the FTC
12	will be able to address the full range of those
13	activities, after it completes its food marketing study
14	that we will read with interest. I'm sure it will
15	provide us food for thought as we conduct our program
16	evaluation.
17	Right now, the pledges are focused on
18	company-owned websites and the depictions of company
19	products. What we've asked the companies to do is to
20	make certain that at least 50 percent of the products
21	that they're advertising and showing or using

The companies that are committing to advertise in the future are going to be using Better

advergaming on those sites, are for Better For You

products or healthy lifestyle messages.

22

23

24

25

For You products in those websites. Some of them are going to be limiting access to those websites by using parental controls; others are going to do neat things like have timeouts on their games.

So after the end of 15 minutes or 30 minutes, children are going to be encouraged to go to another physical activity. I wouldn't rule out that there's more that could be done, but I think they've gone a really long way with these pledges today.

MS. RIDEOUT: Hi. I'm Vickie Rideout with the Kaiser Family Foundation. You mentioned that the companies that are a part of your coalition account for approximately two-thirds of all marketing, food marketing to children.

MS. KOLISH: On television.

MS. RIDEOUT: Okay. Could you tell us who the biggest companies are that are in the third that won't be covered here? Who are the biggest companies that haven't joined, and what prospects do you have for or plans do you have for reaching out to them and getting them to be part of your coalition?

MS. KOLISH: Well, that's a great question that I hope somebody else will answer. But I have lead list for my August activities, which is to follow up on the other companies that currently aren't members.

1	We hope that they will come and join us,
2	because I think, you know, collectively, we will make a
3	bigger impact with having more members.
4	MS. ENGLE: Any other questions?
5	(No response.)
6	MS. ENGLE: Well, if not, I think, you know,
7	we're a little bit ahead of schedule, which is nice.
8	All right, yes. So we can take a break now. It's
9	about ten o'clock now. So if we can come back around
10	10:15.
11	(Applause.)
12	(Whereupon, a short break was taken.)
13	MS. ENGLE: Could everybody take their seats
14	please? We'd like to get the next panel started. As
15	Chairman Majoras mentioned in her remarks this morning,
16	the report from our 2005 workshop encouraged food
17	companies to reformulate their existing products or
18	innovate products, to make them lower calorie, more
19	nutritious and more appealing to children.
20	It also recommended changes in advertising,
21	marketing, labeling and packaging. Some major food
22	companies last year instituted initiatives in this
23	area, and we'd like to showcase those this morning.
24	First we'll hear from Lance Friedmann, the
25	Senior Vice President of Health and Wellness and

After Lance, we'll hear from Christina Shea,
the Senior Vice President of External Relations at
General Mills, and President of General Mills Community
Action and the General Mills Foundation.

## PRESENTATIONS: FOOD COMPANY INITIATIVES

MR. FRIEDMANN: Here we go. There it is.

Okay. Good morning. I'd like to thank the Federal

Trade Commission and the Department of Health and Human

Services for inviting Kraft to this forum. We

appreciate the opportunity to share our experiences

with self-regulation of marketing to children.

As we look at the past several years, I would characterize them as a period of commitments that we've made and kept, commitments that have led to real change at Kraft.

We do see growing momentum among food companies to adopt strong self-regulatory practices, and certainly the remarks you heard from Elaine this morning are the latest evidence of that, but that we all still have more work ahead, because it will take time to make progress against childhood obesity. As Chairman Majoras said, this is a marathon.

So in the next 15 minutes, I'll describe our commitments, the changes that have happened at Kraft,

some of the lessons that we've learned, and where we see things going next.

The health and wellness initiative that we announced in 2003 committed us to change what we make and how we market it, and it focused on four key areas. Product nutrition, which is about improving the nutrition profile of our total portfolio; consumer information, providing more information to help consumers make better-informed choices; marketing practices, obviously mostly related to children, and that's the focus of today's discussion; and advocacy and dialogue like what we're doing here today.

We announced our Sensible Solution nutrition standards in January 2005, which are the basis for the pledge that Elaine described earlier. They place limits on calories and ingredients of concern like fat, sat and trans fat, sugar and sodium.

They emphasize inclusion of beneficial nutrients, and they also consider functional benefits like heart health or bone development. The nutrition standards are guided by recommendations from FDA, USDA and other public health authorities.

We now have over 500 Sensible Solution products on shelf in the U.S., and in the past several years, these products have nearly doubled as a portion

of our portfolio and now represent about a third of our
U.S. sales, and they're growing two to three times
faster than the rest of our portfolio. So good
nutrition is also proving to be good business.

In the area of today's focus, marketing to children, we've taken a series of voluntary actions that have progressively broadened and deepened our commitment to helping kids lead healthier lifestyles. I think you'll see that collectively they touch on virtually all of the FTC report recommendations from a couple of years ago.

For many years, we have not advertised in media aimed at kids under six. In 2003, we adopted a total ban on marketing in schools, and applied nutrition standards to foods sold in school vending machines.

In 2005, we were the first company to announce that we would advertise only healthier products to kids six to 11, whether it's on TV, radio, print or websites. That's how we've been operating since the end of 2005.

Also in 2005, we restricted advertising of products with licensed characters to only permanent, non-promotional items that meet Sensible Solutions standards. We do still permit use of licensed

characters on temporary promotions on a broader range of items, but only the Sensible Solution, the Better For You version, can be advertised to children.

In 2006, when we joined the Alliance for a Healthier Generation, we added new criteria for sodium and calories to our school nutrition standards, and we extended our policies to cover all foods that are made available in schools, not just vending items.

So those are the commitments that we've made, and here are some of the changes that those policies have led to at Kraft.

In 2003, none of the products in our Lunchables line met the Sensible Solutions standards. After reformulation and introduction of new items, 35 percent of Lunchable sales are now Sensible Solution products.

In fact, in the last few years, we've reformulated every single item -- that's about 50 or 60 different versions of Lunchables, and significantly reduced the calories, fat, sat-fat and sodium in these products.

Reducing sodium has been particularly challenging, because it helps with food safety as well as good taste, and there are very few substitutes. So to help us get to this reduction in sodium, we've spent

well over \$20 million in research and development to achieve that.

But we're going to keep pushing on sodium levels in our products, and to encourage our businesses to do that, we're going to reduce the Sensible Solution limit for sodium in these products by an additional ten percent in the next two years.

In our line of Capri Sun beverages, we've added Roaring Waters, a flavored water product with only 35 calories per pouch, and 100 juice product to deliver more servings of fruit in kids daily diets.

On Kool-Aid, we've added a ten calorie version of Kool-Aid Jammers, the ready-to-drink version of Kool-Aid, as well as the popular single serve form for kids to pour into their water bottles, with only 30 calories per serving.

We've reformulated our two leading kids cereals to reduce sugar and deliver whole grain or fiber. Both Pebbles and Honeycomb have reduced their sugar to between nine and eleven grams per serving, which is at the low end of most kids sweetened cereals.

While neither of these products included whole grain or fiber a few years ago, Pebbles is now a good source of fiber, and Honeycomb offers at least 16 grams of whole grain in each serving.

One of our biggest successes launched in 2004 has been our 100 calorie packs. Now consumers love these products because they're portion-controlled, they taste great and they're satisfying, because you get a pretty good number of thin crisps in each bag.

Moms definitely like them as a snacking solution for kids. We've learned that about 40 percent of 100 calorie packs are eaten by children 12 and under. Those are a few examples of the reformulations of new products coming out of our focus on product nutrition.

Now even with all those new products, our spending on children's advertising has actually gone down over the last few years. These spending levels are indexed to 2003 before we adopted our self-regulatory standards.

Spending went down to 65 percent of its previous level in 2005, and it's risen a bit since then as we've added the products that you saw on previous pages.

I can also tell you that these changes had a pretty big impact on the business results of several of our brands, but we knew that that would happen going into this. Our hope is that as we add more products that meet our nutrition standards, the spending will

get back to or even above its historic levels, and business results will do the same.

Now also when it comes to other kinds of marketing to children -- there was a question about that earlier -- like websites, videos, digital marketing events and so on, we look forward to providing data on that in response to the FTC request for information, which we expect to receive shortly.

As a result of our self-regulatory policies, several brands are no longer advertised to children at all. You can see the 14 brands here that were advertised in 2003. It is now down to eight brands in 2007, all of them meeting our Sensible Solution standard.

Similarly, with licensed characters, we had ten that were carried on permanent non-promotional packages in 2003. That's down to six characters in 2007. We specifically eliminated characters that appealed to kids under six, like Dora the Explorer.

Now I mentioned earlier that we also continue to use licensed characters on temporary promotional packages, on a broader range of items, but again, only the Sensible Solution version is the one that we advertise. Those promotional packages account for about 15 percent of the total packages of those brands,

just to give you an idea of the size of that activity.

As part of our commitment to children's well-being, since 2003, we've contributed over \$30 million to healthy lifestyle and nutrition programs that primarily reach kids who are most at-risk for childhood obesity. The Salsa, Sabor y Salud and Triple Play programs teach kids the basics of good nutrition and staying active.

We develop salsa in partnership with the National Latino Children's Institute and Triple Play with the Boys' and Girls' Clubs and Coca-Cola. These two programs now reach over 100,000 kids a year across America.

Second Harvest distributes fresh produce to those in need, and has increased its distribution from seven million pounds ten years ago to nearly 100 million pounds today.

Now I'd like to describe some of the lessons that we've learned in the last few years about what works, what doesn't work, and when it comes to marketing, healthier foods to children.

First, the eternal lesson when it comes to food: taste still rules. It's not enough for a product to deliver great nutrition and great convenience at a great price. If it doesn't taste

good, people won't buy it a second time.

We reformulated Alpha Bits and developed Kids Sense from scratch, both of them to deliver a very high level of nutrition, which they did. But they didn't meet expectations for taste and we pulled them from the market.

Alpha Bits has since been reformulated, tastes better and will be back on the shelf, and Kids Sense has evolved into the kid-friendly 100 calorie packs that I mentioned earlier.

When we adopted our self-regulatory policies, we hoped that by creating an incentive to develop more nutritious products, it would stimulate product innovation. As you saw earlier and as dramatized on this slide, it really has.

All of these products have been reformulated or developed from scratch over the past few years, in response to that incentive, and we expect more to come in the future.

When it comes to communicating with kids, you have to speak their language and focus on the things they care about, like being with their friends, having the energy they need to keep -- whoops, sorry. Can I back up? Okay, sorry.

As I was saying, you have to talk to kids in

language that they understand, talk about things that
they care about, having energy to keep playing and
having fun. Once you've done that, sort of gotten
their attention in a language they understand, then you
can maybe squeeze in a message about nutrition.

I think our partners at Nickelodeon do this better than anyone else. We've been working with them for the past three years to support a healthy lifestyles ad campaign that airs on Nickelodeon. The ads are simple profiles of real kids talking about their favorite sports and favorite foods, and here's the most recent spot.

(Video plays.)

MR. FRIEDMANN: I hope you could hear that. We've also learned that self-regulatory momentum builds over time. You can see on this time line many of the important steps taken by leading companies on marketing to children, all of them participants in the pledge announcements today.

Year over year, there's been more and more self-regulatory activity with today's pledges an important milestone. I'm sure there's going to be more milestones in the future.

I would like to spend the last couple of minutes describing some of the things that we expect in

the future. First, we're obviously committed to continued innovation in healthier products.

There will be more foods from Kraft that offer fruits and vegetables, like our Fresh Creations ready to eat salad, Garden Harvest chips, and Jell-O Fruit Passions. Others are going to offer specific wellness benefits like digestive health from our new "Live Active" brand, or Energy and Crystal Lite.

We also hope to make more progress in delivering simple, consistent messages to kids about leading healthy lifestyles, since that's the best way to make sure those messages have an impact.

GMA/FPA has supported the Ad Council's development of messages like "Be a Player." The Ad Council places them as public service announcements, and food companies will carry these messages onto packages and websites to build more impact, and I know we're going to hear more about this later this morning.

We think a very important area for common messaging is nutrition symbols, and there was a question earlier about common standards. Now with more and more of these systems appearing on packet in-store, instead of making it easier for consumers to make healthier choices, they may be making it a bit more confusing, and we recognize that.

We've already learned a lot about how consumers respond to these systems. They like the front of pack symbols. But we've also seen in quantitative research that we don't think they're enough by themselves to necessarily change consumers' choices. They prefer a common Better For You symbol, with common, underlying nutrition standards and authoritative endorsement.

We also think that the people to aim for with a system like this are not the nutritionally savvy shoppers, who are already using the nutrition facts panel, but the ones who will probably benefit the most, and for whom the system should be designed, are those who want to make healthier choices but aren't sure how. I'm sorry.

It will be essential to conduct an education campaign, so consumers know what the symbol means and how they can use it to make healthier choices. We're participating in a broad-based initiative to deliver a common set of nutrition standards and an accompanying Better For You symbol.

That effort is facilitated by the Keystone

Center, recognized for its skills in bringing together

diverse viewpoints on public policy issues, and then

helping to develop solutions. The initiative, which

	6.
1	began earlier this year, includes food companies,
2	retailers, NGOs, scientific experts and government
3	regulators.
4	Now it will not be easy for all these groups
5	to agree on a common solution, but we hope to make that
6	happen in the near future. Today is an important
7	milestone in marketing to children.
8	We all understand, as Chairman Majoras said,
9	that making progress against childhood obesity will
L 0	take time and the collective effort of food companies,
11	media companies, schools, communities, regulators and
L2	parents.
L3	We're glad to see momentum building in this
L 4	area, and look forward to continuing to play our role.
L 5	Thank you.
L 6	(Applause.)
L7	MS. SHEA: Hopefully, this is going to come
L8	up. Good morning. I'm Chris Shea and Im pleased to be
L 9	here today to tell you a little bit about what General
20	Mills is doing to help address the serious problem of
21	childhood obesity. Shall I just wait? Oh, okay.

meg file that's bringing it to its knees. 24 25 (Pause.)

That's what she did.

22

23

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

MALE PARTICIPANT: It's coming. It's your 40

MS. SHEA: All right. There we go. General Mills' mission is to nourish lives by making products that help people. By nourishing communities that help people live better lives in their community, we contribute five percent of our pre-tax profits to help communities, and by nourishing the future, with a focus on health and sustainability.

We have a long tradition of nourishing lives. We started canning peas back in 1930, so people could eat vegetables year-round. We came out with the first ready to eat oat cereal in 1941, and in 1950, we helped people learn how to cook with the first picture cookbook from Betty Crocker.

Now our goal is to help make people's lives healthier, easier and richer, with a wide variety of food products. We have a lot of products that help people live healthier lives, and help them do it in a convenient way. We have vegetables, fruits, low fat dairy and whole grains, all foods that we know the USDA says we should all be eating more of.

We also have the unique capability in that we have our in-house author, Betty Crocker, who has actually teamed up with some medical experts, for people that are dealing with severe health challenges, like living with cancer, heart disease and also

1	diabetes.

Most recently, we've come out with a cookbook
that is very focused on helping people win at weight
loss, the topic we're here to talk about today.

I want you to know that we heard loud and clear the call from the Institute of Medicine in September 2004, when they asked for industry to help develop healthier foods, expand nutrition information, and also give clear media messages.

We also heard when the FTC asked us to really step up and make nutritious, low calorie food products appealing to children, to adopt nutrition standards and to shift the mix of products that we market to children, and to improve public education.

So my focus today is really to help share the progress that we've made since January 2005. We've improved the health profile of 30 percent of our product volume. We've introduced new healthful products, and increased nutrition information.

We have shifted the mix of marketing to children with nutrition guidelines. These are guidelines we've been operating under for a year and a half. We've also increased community support to help improve nutrition and fitness behaviors.

Now over the last three years, we've improved

30 percent of our product portfolio, the health profile of those products, and we have goals to continue to do that. This game is not done yet.

This is challenging when you're dealing with some inherently healthy products to start with like cereal and soup and vegetables. In our effort to really ten focus both on decreasing limiters like fat, sodium and sugar, and increasing positives like whole grains, vitamins A and D, calcium and fiber.

But we're really focused on trying to help people make good food choices. So we're the biggest vegetable provider in the United States, with packaged vegetables. We know and we talked to people that don't eat enough vegetables. They say they don't taste good and I don't know how to cook them. So these are some of the things we're doing.

Simply Steam is a new steam technology that cooks vegetables perfectly; Green Giant Select Blends like Tuscan Herb, which provides a low fat flavorful sauce that makes vegetables taste good to people that don't inherently like the taste.

Healthy Way is a natural blend of vegetables that are naturally high in fiber, so they increase satiety and help with weight loss while tasting good.

Just for One is a package of four individual containers

with low fat sauce on vegetables, that kids can eat as a snack after school for 60 calories.

Yes, we've got SpongeBob and Dora vegetables now, with a little sticker that mom or dad can reward their child with once they've eaten their vegetables.

Now we're also helping consumers eat more fruit. We sell Cascadian Farms frozen fruit, and we also tried a product called Nature Valley Fruit Crisps. I say "tried" because it's a product that we spent a lot of money to develop. We took it out to the market, but it failed because not enough consumers would buy enough of it.

That is just a fact of life. We can spend millions of dollars developing products, putting them out on the shelves. But if they're not tasty enough or they don't meet certain needs, they're not going to sell.

Now we haven't given up. We're trying again. We have a new product. It's still a full serving of fruit. It's just lightly sweetened with a little cinnamon. This one has ridges on it, so it's a little crispier and more attuned to kids tastes, and has a little smiley package on it. So we're hoping we'll do better with this one.

We're helping consumers eat whole grains. We

know that only one in ten Americans gets enough whole grain in their diet. General Mills made an enormous commitment to reformulate all of our Big G cereals to include at least eight grams of whole grain. Some are virtually all whole grain.

The result of this was prefect in our society, because consumers didn't have to change a single behavior, and yet they consumed 1.5 billion 16-gram servings of whole grain a year more each and every year, now that we've done this.

We're helping kids eat low fat dairy.

Products like Trix and Yoplait kids yogurt just have

110 or less calories per cup, and Yoplait kids yogurt

has 25 percent less sugar than most kids yogurts. All

of these contain Vitamin A and D, which is present in

milk as well.

Now we're helping consumers reduce the amount of sodium, fat and sugar in their diets. We've made silent sodium reductions on some products, and yet we've also introduced other things like 50 percent reduced sodium Progresso soups. We've made significant fat reductions in a number of products, and we've reduced sugar in many of our products.

Now once again, you can see the X's here. Some of these products have not made it in the

1 marketplace. But we have had some good successes and 2 again we'll continue.

We're also very focused on helping children learn calorie and portion control. Each of the products that's pictured here per unit has 100 calories or less, and many are delivering very important food groups like vegetables, low fat dairy and whole grains.

These products can really help teach kids both portion control, in terms of the calories that they have, and help them learn what an appropriate serving size is.

Now we're also trying to help children and parents with information about healthy living. A Healthy BET is a partnership with Black Entertainment Television, who you'll hear from later today, to help African-American women learn how to have better nutrition and fitness habits with their families.

We're a supporting partner of More Matters, the CDC fruit and vegetable initiative. We carried the new food guide pyramid on 100 million packages when that was first launched. Also most recently, we partnered with Bob Green, who is Oprah's personal trainer -- she has a lot of power -- to promote life long changes in exercise and healthy eating.

We're reaching out to children as well,

trying to help them improve their nutrition and fitness behaviors, using cereal packages to help again children learn the food guide pyramid, providing nutrition information on whole grains, and using the Green Giant and his little sidekick Sprout, to promote healthy nutrition and fitness on a new website called Mightygiants.com.

And we've also partnered with Nickelodeon, with some TV spots that I'd like to show you briefly here.

(Video plays.)

MS. SHEA: We're also helping children through a special grants program called Champions for Healthy Kids. Over the last five years, we've invested \$eleven million in grants to non-profit organizations across this country, that already work with kids to help improve nutrition and fitness behaviors.

These grants are really focused at at-need kids, with the majority of the money going to support kids of color. A recent analysis of the five-year mark showed that these grants are having a major impact.

Now we also want to help consumers by increasing transparency about what is in our food products that they buy, and we've done this on package with a program called the Goodness Corner. There are

many different approaches and thought philosophies around nutrition labeling, as you just heard about one approach from my colleague Lance.

While there's no one answer to what the right labeling is, and what is the best way to help consumers, I would ask that you all remember that the major thing we're focused on here today is obesity. The key with obesity, as we all know, is focusing on calories and energy balance.

If we don't learn how many calories we eat and how many calories we burn out, none of us are going to be successful at this. Our philosophy is it's very important that we focus on facts, especially calorie content, and give people those facts and not just our judgments about whether something is Better For You or not.

So you can tell we have some concerns about Better For You labels. You know, we've seen and believe that what can happen is sometimes they'll send a message of eat everything that you want.

We kind of saw this with Better For You messages about low fat in the 90's, when people thought they could eat all the low fat products they wanted and it would get them too much calories. Or when it was low carb was the Better For You label.

So we'd just ask as we go forward in this as an industry together with everyone else, that we make sure that we're really doing the education on calorie consumption and calorie burning. Because until people get that message, they are not going to be successful at controlling their weight.

Now we know our system is not perfect as well, with Goodness Corner, and we've heard the criticisms of that, particularly that we haven't labeled the amount of sugar on the front or the amount of sodium.

So today we're pleased to announce that on our Big G cereals, we're going to go to a fact-based nutrition program, and this will highlight calories, saturated fat, sodium and sugar.

This approach is very similar to the GDA approach that our joint venture on cereals worldwide, which is Cereal Partners Worldwide has been using in the European Union for over a year, and it's also very similar to what Kellogg's announced last month.

We believe that this fact-based approach is going to help somebody look at this fruity Cheerios while they're walking the aisle and say "Oops, 100 calories per serving. Let's see. There's nine grams of sugar in that product," and decide if they want to

1	pick	i +	1110	$\circ$ r	not
_	$b_T c_V$	エし	uР	$O_{\perp}$	1100.

And in conjunction with Kellogg's doing this,

I think we're going to have a wonderful experiment with
the majority of the cereal in that aisle, to see if
this does work in helping consumers.

Now we've also shifted the mix of products marketed to children, and to encourage the consumption of lower calorie-higher nutrient items. As I mentioned, a year and a half ago we started implementing these nutrition guidelines, and they are based on FDA and USDA criteria.

General Mills has only marketed products to children that are 175 calories or less per serving, and meets an important nutrition guideline. All products have to either have a half serving of a USDA-recommended food; so that's vegetables, fruits, whole grains or low fat dairy, or they need to meet the criteria for FDA Healthy.

FDA Healthy is a very strict criteria. You have to have three grams or less of fat; one gram or less of sat fat; 480 milligrams or less of sodium, and also contain a positive nutrient, at least ten percent of Vitamins A, C, calcium, iron, protein or fiber.

So under our criteria, any product that we market does have to have a product nutritional benefit

for children. Now we've eliminated any marketing for children in elementary schools, in middle schools and in high schools, and we also do not target any advertising to children under six.

So we believe these are strong criteria that we've been living with for the last year and a half, and yet we clearly heard the call for more, which we want to acknowledge and want to respond to. And so General Mills will be adding, as you heard earlier, a sugar limit.

We will not market any products that have more than 12 grams of sugar per serving. Then we've also said that any of those products that meet that criteria for a half serving USDA of the food group that's recommended, as well as the 175 calories, we'll make sure that they have zero labeled transfat, two grams or less of saturated fat, 230 milligrams or less of sodium for cereals and snacks, and 480 milligrams of sodium or less for main meals and side dishes.

These will begin implementation -- frankly the majority of it, probably about 90 percent of all of our advertising will be meeting these requirements by the end of 2007. It will be fully implemented by 2008.

So I hope you can see that we're committed to

L	healthy products for children. We're going to develop
2	new products. As Lance said, it's a business
3	opportunity, and it's a business opportunity we want to
1	be part of.

We know that not all of our efforts that we undertake are going to be successful. But we really believe that many will. Most importantly, we are committed to not being done.

We're going to continue at this. We're going to continue to reduce calories, sodium, fat and sugar. We're going to help consumers understand the dietary choices that they're making.

We want to be part of the solution in helping people understand energy balance, and understanding the calorie content of the foods that we're providing them. We want to help families.

We want to help them achieve healthy weights for themselves, the parents as well as the kids, through increased activities and balanced eating. We really do care about the children in this country, and we really do think that this is a journey, a marathon, and that the only way we're going to do it is by everyone in the room together.

We need industry, we need government and we need the public interest groups to work together to

1	make this happen. Thank you.
2	(Applause.)
3	MS. ENGLE: Thank you, Lance and Chris. The
4	FTC/HHS workshop last year report encouraged media
5	companies to explore ways to improve the distribution
6	of clear and effective educational messages to children
7	and parents about nutrition and fitness, and to revise
8	practices regarding character licensing.
9	Here to talk about changes in this area are
10	representatives from the Walt Disney Company and from
11	Sesame Workshop. Our first presenter, Jennifer
12	Anopolsky, is Vice President of Corporate Brand
13	Management at the Walt Disney Company.
14	After we hear from Ms. Anopolsky, we'll hear
15	from Dr. Jennifer Kotler, who's Assistant Vice
16	President of Domestic Research in the Department of
17	Education and Research and Outreach at Sesame Workshop.
18	PRESENTATIONS: MEDIA/ENTERTAINMENT COMPANY INITIATIVES
19	MS. ANOPOLSKY: Good morning. Let's see if I
20	can clear this out. Great. As you've all heard, less
21	than a year ago, the Walt Disney Company introduced new
22	food guidelines aimed at giving parents and children
23	healthier eating options.
24	The new policies called for Disney to use our
25	names and characters only on products for kids that

meet specific nutritional guidelines. Disney also announced nutritionally beneficial changes in meals served at our theme parks to children, across all of our parks and resorts, and we unveiled a company-wide plan to eliminate transfats from foods served at our parks and resorts, our licensed products and all of our promotional programs. These efforts were all part of a first step in a long-term commitment to this issue by our company.

In making this announcement and putting these policies into practice, we are using the power of our brands and characters to promote foods that kids will want and that parents can feel really good about giving to them.

We know that this is the right thing to do for the Walt Disney Company, it's the right thing to do for our business, and we're so pleased to bring children and families these healthier eating options, and that we can contribute to a solution on this issue.

Our commitment to this topic and the changes that we're making pertain to all of our business areas, including parks and resorts, studios, licensed products and media networks.

Even though it's only been eight months since our announcement, I'm delighted to be here to tell you

about the progress that we're already making. I'll begin today by recapping for you the highlights of our nutritional guidelines.

Then, I want to show you some examples of how we're starting to implement changes across all of our businesses. Finally, I'll share with you some of our early efforts in the area of consumer education.

So let's start with the nutritional guidelines. Our nutritional guidelines were developed with Drs. Keith Ayub (ph) and Dr. Jim Hill. Dr. Ayub is Associate Clinical Professor of Pediatrics at the Albert Einstein College of Medicine in New York. Dr. Hill is Director of the Center for Human Nutrition at the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center.

Our guidelines are based on the dietary guidelines for Americans from the Department of Health and Human Services and USDA. Our guidelines feature separate standards for key meal occasions.

So for example, main meals have different requirements than snacks or dairy products. They include specific limits by meal occasion for total calories, total fat, saturated fats, sodium and sugar proportion.

So for example, our cereal guideline calls for less than ten grams of sugar per ounce, and we

commit to zero grams of added transfat across the board.

As part of our guidelines for licensing, we will still be licensing special occasion sweets, like birthday cakes and seasonal candies, but we will be limiting them to a minority portion of our overall food portfolio.

Our guidelines were developed to anchor our business decisions going forward, and of course implementing them will take time. But we've made so much progress in the last eight months.

With that overview as context, I'd like to go business by business and show you how we're string to improve the food options to kids, starting with what's going on in our parks.

In the Disney parks, we've already taken significant and systematic steps to make healthy eating options more available and appealing to kids and families. In October 2006, we changed the standard offering in our kids meals to feature the healthy side dishes and beverages.

So for example, if you visited our park before the change and ordered the kids meals, you would have had a choice of sides and beverages. But if you didn't specify one, it automatically would have come to

1 you with fries and soda.

Today, when order a kid's meal, it automatically comes with either fruit or veggies on the side, and a choice of lowfat milk, water or 100 percent juice to drink. Parents can still order fries and soda for their kids, if they make a special request. But the built-in bias is to offer the healthy options first.

I wanted to show you a video now. Take a look at this. So the tape that you're looking at is not highly produced. It's video that we shot in the park last week.

Those are real kids eating with their fingers, chewing with their mouths open. But they're clearly enjoying the grapes and carrots that came with their meals. I wanted you to see what this looks like in practice. This is the real deal here.

By all measures, the guests seem to love this new approach that we introduced. Since we introduced this change in both Disneyland and Disney World, we're finding the overwhelming majority of our guests are selecting the healthy options, and we're very pleased with the way that they're embracing this change.

Another big focus in the parks is snack foods. We want to make sure that in addition to

indulgences that people have come to expect in a park environment, that we also have healthy snack food options that are widely available and very appealing to our guests.

To that end, we started introducing fruit carts like this a few years ago. Again, pardon the real life footage. This was also from last week. But consumes love the fruit stands.

So for the last two years, we've been steadily increasing the number of fruit carts like this, and the variety of other nutritious snacks in the park like nuts and trail mixes and all sorts of things that are nutrition. They're fun and easy to eat during a park visit, and it's turning to be pretty good business for us as well, which is great.

finally, we're phasing out added tarns-fats from all food items served in our parks. Moving away from trans-fats is a very important priority for us, and right now we are on track to achieve this by the end of 2007. Already we are most of the way there.

So the kids meals and healthy snack offerings are important, because they make eating healthfully both easy and appealing for guests when they're at our parks. But we're also focused on daily behavior.

So now I'd like to turn to what Disney is

doing outside of our parks in the general market, where people live, shop and eat every day. Licensed products account for the bulk of Disney food in the market, and this is an area where we're really changing things.

As we announced last October, going forward we are using strict nutritional guidelines to determine which foods we'll license with the Disney brand and characters.

Our vision in this area is to make nutritious, everyday foods that are apportioned appropriately and appealing to kids. So now you'll find Disney characters on fresh fruits and veggies like these, and I want to tell you what's here. Some of these are not on the market yet.

On the top of the slide, I'm giving you a preview of some new items that are launching this fall. On the upper left, you see a product called "Foodles." It's a personal sized veggie and dip item, with Mickeyshaped packaging, and it will be lots of fun for any kid to pull out of their lunch box.

On the upper right is a fresh broccoli product that will also come with other vegetables, but I'm showing the broccoli here. The broccoli steams really easily in just a few minutes, and it comes with light sauces that can be added after cooking.

The sauce recipes were developed especially to appeal to kid's pallets. So they're in flavors that you and I might not choose, but they tested really well with kids in research, and of course they're formulated to meet our nutritional guidelines per serving.

On the bottom, you see some of our fresh fruit products that are already out on the market.

Those have been on the market since last summer, and are doing quite nicely for us.

Also, we think it's important to work with consumer behaviors, not against them. As an example, we know that families rely pretty heavily on convenience foods at times.

One thing that we can do is bring to market convenience foods with sound nutritional profiles for children. So that's why we're bringing to market Disney versions of kids staple foods, things that are family favorites.

They're in most pantries, and now we're formulating them to meet our nutritional guidelines, and we're putting our characters on them so that they'll be the kinds of foods that kids will feel really good about eating, and parents can feel good that they meet nutritional guidelines. So these are some examples here.

You can see the Mickey ravioli product is one that meets all of our nutritional guidelines, and is lower in fat content and sodium content than other comparable products on the marketplace.

So next I'd like to turn to another area that's being transformed by our guidelines, and that is the area of kid-targeted promotions. These are marketing events, where you might see us partner with another company periodically, to market a Disney product like a movie.

Here's one recent example of a promotion that we did behind Ratatouille, which is our new movie.

Everyone should go see it. It's about food. Here's our promotion that we did with Intel, obviously in a non-food brand.

In this promotional area, again we're applying our guidelines very strictly on kid-targeted promotions as they're planned on a go-forward basis. This means at times that we're looking outside of food categories for new kinds of promotional relationships like Intel.

I want to show you some other examples. Our promotional line-up behind Ratatouille featured things that meet our guidelines like bottled water, and those are some fruit stickers that appeared on -- they're

probably still in supermarkets right now on watermelon.

We also did promotions with airlines and the Department of Energy, among many other partners that we had. So we're really changing how we do our marketing, with an eye towards marketing healthier foods to kids like water and fruit, and also just looking to other means of marketing our movies that have nothing to do with food.

So now I'd like to turn to our kids media networks. As you probably know, Disney Channel is a commercial-free platform, but it does accept some brand sponsorship messaging. This is another area where we are applying our nutritional guidelines to determine which foods and brands can qualify for sponsorship on our network.

Going forward, if a brand doesn't meet our nutritional guidelines, then it cannot be a Disney Channel sponsor. We're being very strict about that. On our other kids media outlets, we accept regular food advertising from a variety of food and non-food products, that comply with routine standards and practices.

However, only foods that meet those very same guidelines can qualify for child-targeted content sponsorship and promotion on or off air. Now as a

broader industry-wide issue, we expect that the guidelines for children's advertising, as led by CARU will evolve over time, and we'll be monitoring those developments.

But for now, these are our guidelines and we feel really good about them. Okay. So we've talked about how we're starting to change food in the Disney parks and licensing and promotions, and sponsorship on our media networks.

Now I want to turn to another important area for us, and talk about how we're starting to use our influence to shape kids preferences. Disney Channel has been and continues to incorporate healthy lifestyle messaging into programming.

One example is how we're using our characters as role models, where it fits seamlessly into the story-telling. This means that kids will see episodes of their favorite shows, things like "Hannah Montana," "The Sweet Life of Zach and Cody," and "Not So Raven," among others, where the central theme of the episode is about healthy lifestyles, including both nutrition and exercise.

I'll show you a clip now from "Not So Raven."

In this episode, the cafeteria at Raven's school is

turned into a food court. Once Raven gets past the

1	initial novelty of it, she realizes that eating there
2	has some drawbacks. She and a friend leads their peers
3	to take ownership over their own nutritional choices.
4	Let's take a look.
5	(Video plays.)
6	MS. ANOPOLSKY: One of our early efforts in
7	bringing this issue to television and talking to kids
8	through the characters that they really look up to, and
9	we'll be doing more of that.
10	But our focus on role modeling is not just
11	for television. One off-air program that will be seen
12	for the next several months involves "High School
13	Musical," a pre-teen phenomenon right now. The cast of
14	the popular movie is appearing in print ads like this
15	one, to promote milk consumption to kids.
16	Disney Channel also runs a series of short

Disney Channel also runs a series of short form programming called "Get Your Head in the Game," in which kids tell each other peer to peer about their passion for their own chosen sport, to sponsor both inspirational and aspirational. Let's take a look.

(Video plays.)

MS. ANOPOLSKY: Beyond offering role models for kids to emulate, we're also starting to empower them with real information and education about healthy lifestyles.

1	Two such examples are Disney Channel's
2	"Adventures in Nutrition" and "Ooh, Ahh and You."
3	Let's watch them now, so you can see how we're using
4	our broad reach to talk to young kids quite directly
5	about healthy lifestyles and what it means for them.
6	(Video plays.)
7	MS. ANOPOLSKY: That's Kevin Carlos. So now
8	"Ooh and Ahh." This is a new one.
9	(Video plays.)
10	MS. ANOPOLSKY: I hope you enjoyed that. I
11	realize now we should have prepared the local
12	restaurants for the rush on blueberries and bananas at
13	lunch time. Oh well.
14	So engaging educational programming such as
15	what I've shown you today airs at least every two hours
16	every day on Disney Channel. As you can see from both
17	the short form and the long form thematic programming
18	like Raven, we're really serious about empowering kids
19	in this area. On Disney Channel alone, messages like
20	these are seen by 25 million kids a month.
21	Beyond TV, we're also finding that as our
22	licensed food business grows, we have lots of
23	opportunity to talk to kids on the back and side panels
24	of food packages. As our first foray into this area,
25	we've been teaching kids the "My Pyramid" curriculum,

along with information about important nutrients.

Right now, messaging like this can be seen on millions of food packages, and this is a program that we'll look to continue to develop over the coming years.

Finally, we also launched an educational website, Disney.com\healthykids, that's also being promoted on millions of packaging. The website teaches kids the principles of My Pyramid, and helps them learn about nutrition and activity through interactive games and their favorite Disney characters.

We're so excited about these early efforts on TV, the Internet and packaging, to help educate and empower kids about their health. We look forward to doing much more in this area in the future.

So to wrap up today, I've had a chance to tell you about some of the changes we've already made, including our nutritional guidelines, new licensed products that are coming, phasing out of trans-fats across our businesses, kids meals with healthy options as the standard choice at our parks, and our efforts in kids education.

These represent only some of our efforts and the initial steps in a long-term commitment by the Walt Disney Company in this area. As you can see, the

1	efforts are comprehensive across all of our business
2	areas. It takes time to implement changes like these,
3	but we're really committed to this for the long term.

I look forward to sharing more progress with you as our efforts evolve in this area. So stay tuned. Thank you.

(Applause.)

DR. KOTLER: Thanks to the FTC and HHS for having Sesame Workshop, especially to Mary Dunson and Jennifer Bishop, who made this happen kind of at the last minute. So I thank you very much.

Today I'm going to talk to you about some updates to our healthy habits for life initiative at Sesame Workshop, started in 2004. We are a non-profit educational organization dedicated to making a meaningful difference in children's lives, and we create educational content that maximizes children's potential.

We're committed to the fact that children deserve the chance to grow and learn and be better prepared for school, and part of that is developing healthy habits, both physically, mentally, emotionally.

So what we did was in 2004, we started our Healthy Habits for Life Initiative. I'm not going to talk too much in depth about each part of our

initiative, because I did talk about that at the 2005 forum as well. But I just want to talk to you about some of the updates since then.

Initially, I presented research showing that when you pair characters with healthy and unhealthy foods, there's an increase in children's appeal to those healthy and unhealthy foods. I'm going to talk to you about the update to that study today, and also about our licensing program and how that has changed.

But we also have a lot of content that we've created our Healthy Habits for Life initiative. So on Sesame Street, we have street stories that are dedicated to teaching children about healthy eating, just showing the appeal of all these different fruits and vegetables and how great that can be.

We have a Dinner Theater segment to our show, a health module. So for example you'll see a parody of the song "Hair" from the 60's. It's now "Pear," and you see a dancing pear.

We have "Man of La Muncha" instead of "Man of La Mancha." There's an Ode to a Zucchini instead of "Maria" from West Side Story. So we have all sorts of content in the show that's really dedicated to eating healthy and being physically active.

I want to say what's really important that I

think we do is we're really reaching young children and their parents. So as much as we can, we try to really get children to have these healthy habits earlier on in their lives, so that it's not harder as they get older to really change them out of habits.

Because we know that it takes sometimes 12 or 13 tries for a young child to acclimate to a taste of a particular new food. So if we can do this really early with children by getting them excited about eating well and exercising, then we feel that we can set them on a good trajectory for later on.

So on the show we have that going on.

Publishing of video, we have Happy Healthy Monsters,

which Grover is exercise instructor. On Sesame Street

Live, we have "Super Grover Ready for Action," and he's

a super hero, but the only way he really can have all

super powers is if he eats right, exercises, gets rests

and cools down as well.

We have public service announcement with celebrities, and we have PSAs with Senators and Governors about different foods from their locales that they talk about that they love so much. We also have really beefed up our outreach in this effort.

We have Healthy Habits Caregiver Guides that are accessible on our website. We've distributed to

1	all PBS stations around the country, and we've also
2	just almost completed a tool kit for child care
3	providers, that were funded in part by Nemours. We are
4	distributing this.

It's a tool kit of all sorts of activities that can go on in child care centers, and there's also materials for children to take home to the parents.

We also have a traveling museum called "Sesame Presents the Body," which teaches children how to enjoy healthy foods and how their body works and exercise. So it's really we're coming at children from all different directions.

But specifically, we've reevaluated.

Starting in 2005, we really started changing our
licensing agreements, based on what was going on in the
landscape of childhood obesity. So we worked with
advisors from NIH, AAP and IPN, and we looked at the
U.S. dietary guidelines.

We've really decided that we're going to change how we license the characters. Again, we're a non-profit organization, so we don't advertise per se to children. But we do license our characters out to various partners who use them in responsible ways.

So we're really trying to encourage partnerships with food corporations, making a sincere

1 commitment to improving public health, and I think
2 today we've seen a lot of companies that actually are
3 doing that, and we're very happy about that.

The licensed foods should contribute to children's overall healthy diet, and portion sizes should be age-appropriate as well.

We also care about things like the price of foods. We want to make sure that our characters are associated with foods that are reasonably priced as well, and also every opportunity for food labels to have information to parents and children about those foods we're looking to as well.

So we have four different kinds of foods, that we think about foods in four different categories. One is our primary food category, which is really healthy foods based on USDA guidelines. Then there are secondary foods, which is the healthier options of lower, lower in salt, lower in sugar.

Then there's special occasions. So you might still see Elmo on a birthday cake, because that's a sometimes food. That's not something that children have all the time. But for example, and then there are restricted foods which we don't -- we will not license our characters on anymore.

So for example, fruit snacks or something

that doesn't have real nutritional value. We're not going to do that anymore, or anything that's a choking hazard for children as well. So for example, we've created these displays for various produce partners, to highlight how fun it can be to eat healthy.

Again, this is targeted to children and their parents. There's usually information for the parents about how children should — how you can enjoy these foods and how you can do fun things with foods. So for example, we'll have tips like on July 4<sup>th</sup>, how to make an American flag with blueberries and strawberries and lowfat yogurt or something like that.

So there's little tips and little guidelines to go along with that, to really make it fun for the children. We also have other partners, you can see. We've been getting lots of letters from parents saying "I never could get my child to eat green beans before, but I saw that Elmo was on green beans and my child just loves them now."

So again, if you start early with children, getting them, encouraging them to eat healthier foods, they're more likely to continue in that vein as they get older, because earlier research shows that the young children don't really have an understanding of the fact that the foods that they like to eat aren't

1 necessarily healthy for them.

If you try to explain it's going to help you get big and strong -- for example, my niece, who's two and a half, would say to me "Well only daddy is big and strong, because he's six feet" instead of anyone else who's in the fives apparently is not big and strong, even if they are.

So the young children have a really hard time distinguishing, understanding really what that means, and they often think that what they like to eat is healthy. So we really have to instill in them a love of healthy foods earlier on.

So now I'm just going to turn to the update on the research. Earlier, I had -- in 2005, I had talked about a small pilot study that we did. We had talked about that study, and the Robert Atkins Foundation said that they wanted to fund us doing a larger study, using similar kind of methodology, as well as including a taste test to see if children actually would practice what they preach in terms of how they would choose foods.

So we had 343 children ages two to 5 for Study 1, and a subset of those children in Study 2, which was a taste test, and we just had it from 3 to 5 for that. So in this study, children were asked who do

you like better? Do you like this one this one?

So we asked for Elmo, Grover, Oscar and then three unknown characters. These were characters that were about to be used for a developing television show that actually has not been aired yet, but since they had colors that were similar.

What we wanted to do is we didn't really want to -- our argument wasn't pit our characters versus anybody else's characters per se. But rather assuming that children are going to like the known characters and not like the unknown characters, or at least have no feeling towards the unknown. So we wanted to get a sense of how characters really influence children's food choice.

So the children who choose all three Sesame characters that they liked better, I'm calling them high fam. Those who didn't choose the unknown, who maybe chose two Sesame but one unknown or anybody who didn't have three, I called them low/medium fans, and I did the analysis differently. I'm only going to present these for the fans. Most of the children were fans.

So we had 191 of the children who were all three fans. Not to say that those who didn't choose them aren't fans; I just wanted the data to be as clean

1	as	possible	to	show	how	characters	influence	how
2	ch:	ildren mi	ght	choos	se.			

So the study design, for example, we broke the children into three different groups. So we'd ask them what would you like to eat, this food or this food?

So we're calling the first food that was shown to them -- they were both shown at the same time, but the one on the left we'll call A, and the one on the right we call the B food.

So in the control group there's no pictures on either. So in the first condition we have Sesame Street character on the A and an unknown character on the B, and then the reverse is true for the next condition. Really all we did is we took little stickers.

This was not high tech big packaging; it was just showing them a picture of mushrooms and sticking a little Grover there and seeing where their eyes go; where are they looking.

So that we're assuming it sort of models what might be going on in grocery stores if children are walking down the aisles and they see a picture of a character. So we had nine different pairs of foods.

We tried to have foods that were relatively

equal in terms of appeal, and then we had some where we thought children would like some of the foods more than the other. But we tried to do a variety of different foods, and we pre-tested this as well.

so we have these nine pairs of foods. So we have the A foods and the B foods. They're just presented in this particular way, and the methodology is just like I showed you with the mushrooms and the peas. It's just that we did this for each food individually.

So then if you take all the foods that were sort of relatively both healthy -- I know from a nutritionist's standpoint there's difference. So for example between a grape and a banana, but we're trying to say they're both two fruits or both two vegetables, or we have crackers versus wheat bread.

What we find here is that if there are no pictures on anything between relatively healthy foods, there's about an even split. 52 children chose the B foods and 48 percent of the children chose the A foods.

But a different group of children were shown with the Sesame Street character on the A foods and unknown on the B foods, and then the reverse for the third.

What you see in this slide is that the Sesame Street character, and again this is for the high fans, they are more likely to choose a food that has a Sesame Street character on them. Now I'm just not showing you the low fans, because it gets very confusing with the graphs. But the pattern isn't nearly as strong with the non-high fans.

So I'm not saying everybody on the planet, it was a total high fam, and it doesn't work. But it's showing that for -- if you love a character, and we know Elmo is really loved by most children, then in fact that can make a huge difference.

So since most of these children were high Sesame fans. You see this strong effect, and again it's not as strong for the low fans, but it's in a similar direction. That's between two relatively healthy options.

If you pick a healthy food versus a less nutritious snack; so if you have broccoli, apples and Cheerios versus chocolate, potato chips and donuts, what you see is that again, same pattern. The less nutritious snack is in the orange, and that goes up tremendously when you have a Sesame Street character on it and you are a high Sesame fan.

What's slightly discouraging is that you

1 can't really increase the healthy food when they're both pitted against each other. It is the direction as before when I presented the original Elmo broccoli study.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You do see that it does increase the healthy food by a little bit, but not significantly. So in fact it's really particularly pernicious to have a beloved character on unhealthy foods, because it really increases from 56 to 74 percent, for example. Doing the reverse isn't nearly as powerful.

Now we also -- what we did was we took three out of the nine pairs, and we actually gave children the option to taste each of the foods. We did this only for the Elmo characters, because we knew that he was the character that almost all children chose as being their favorite.

So what we did was we gave children each the potential to eat five pieces of each food. We had the A foods and the B foods. So the A foods you have zucchini, grapes and chocolate, and the B foods you had celery, banana and broccoli.

So in the control group, you see that children are more likely to eat the greater percentage of the A foods. That was likely due to the chocolate that was in the A foods, and B foods about 48 percent.

1 So they're eating about half of the B foods.

But if you put Sesame on the A foods, you see that it does -- the amount that they're eating of those A foods slightly goes up, and the amount that they're eating on the B foods goes down. So this wasn't an either/or, whereas the picture test was which one would you like to eat, this one or this one.

You could all of both. You could have some of each. You could have none, whatever you prefer. We just did this with little displays. We'd have a big sort of Elmo cutout with a plate in front of him, and then the other characters with a plate.

Then when you reverse it though, here's what's very interesting, is that you got 53 percent of the children to be trying the B foods. So from 48 to 53, that was significant, and notice the 40 dip was also significant.

So in fact, when you do put a character on a healthier food, it does increase children's (a) preference towards that food, and (b) potential to taste that food. Even though it's not strikingly high, if this happens over and over again, the likelihood that children will acclimate to the taste that healthier food is improved.

This is something that we did without real

big high tech displays, but it's something that even parents can do at home, where they can take a stuffed animal that the child loves and put it in front of plate with the foods that the child wants to eat.

So there's creative ways to promote healthier foods. It doesn't have to be Sesame Street per se. It could be whatever beloved character that is. But we do know that children really love the Sesame Street friends that are consistent in their messaging as well.

So the research summary is basically that what I just said, that they're more likely to eat those foods with beloved characters. Again, it's particularly dangerous to put beloved characters on already tasty, non-nutritious foods, because that increases even moreso than putting them just on healthy foods.

Putting them on healthy foods is absolutely a step in the right direction, but it's also -- it's really important that we're all doing this together, where we're trying to really put an end to putting the characters on foods that aren't particularly good for kids.

So that's that. Thank you very much. If you have any questions, I'll be around for the rest of the afternoon.

1	(Applause.)
2	MS. ENGLE: Now again, if you have a
3	question, raise your hand and someone will bring the
4	mike to you. Please identify yourself first.
5	QUESTIONS FROM THE AUDIENCE
6	MR. RUHERFINGER (ph): Hi. My name is Sam
7	Ruherfinger. I'm a student at Duke University. I also
8	work for a program that helps bring physical and health
9	education to school districts that don't have proper
10	funding for them.
11	So this is actually a question for General
12	Mills. I was wondering if you've done anything to look
13	at your imitative to cut advertising in schools,
14	because I know that a lot of underfunded school
15	districts really rely on those revenues.
16	MS. SHEA: Well, we don't advertise in
17	schools. So we're not cutting any funding. I don't
18	know if I'm getting your question. We don't currently
19	fund schools through any type of advertising in
20	schools.
21	We have a program called "Boxtops for
22	Education," that's towards parents and PTAs, that
23	provides funding for schools. But there's no marketing
24	of our products in schools to kids.
25	We do have the program I was speaking

1	about earlier is called "Champions for Healthy Kids."
2	It's a grants program. It's open to any non-profit,
3	any schools, activities. They're \$10,000 grants. They
4	go a long way. It's on-line and it's an ongoing
5	program. We've made a ten-year commitment to it. So
6	feel free to apply for that.
7	MS. ENGLE: Margo, you could probably be
8	heard without a mike.
9	FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Actually Jennifer, I had
10	a technical question for you.
11	DR. KOTLER: Yes.
12	FEMALE PARTICIPANT: I was just wondering in
13	that last slide, the numbers for having Sesame Street
14	characters on A and B didn't add up to 100. So I was
15	wondering the kids that taste both foods, is that it?
16	DR. KOTLER: Or neither. So it was the
17	percentage of foods that they, on average they ate. So
18	there were five pieces of chocolate, for example, and
19	five pieces of broccoli. So any one child could have
20	three pieces of chocolate and two pieces of broccoli.
21	So it wouldn't add up to 100.
22	FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Okay.
23	DR. KOTLER: So if you ate all your broccoli
24	and ate all your chocolate, you would get 100 percent

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

for your broccoli and 100 percent for your chocolate.

25

1	FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Was that the same with
2	choosing a product, because some of what you showed at
3	the workshop two years ago, there was a more dramatic
4	effect.

DR. KOTLER: Right, right. We didn't find that this time. It was in the same direction; it just wasn't as dramatic. There were more children. It was also two years later.

There was some also evidence that children who were high Sesame fans in another part of the study, that in fact they ate, they choose better foods anyway. So that could lead one to think that children who are watching a lot of Sesame were changing their eating habits.

I don't feel totally confident with that statement. So the eating habits look like they did slightly change over the two years, in terms of that. So it could be due to that. I'm not exactly sure why it's not as dramatic, but it is in the same direction.

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Did you look at Sesame characters versus no characters? That's really more what we see out in the marketplace.

DR. KOTLER: Right. Well, we weren't sure if -- we could do that. That would be another study. But we were trying to see the effect of beloved character

1	versus a non-beloved character, because we don't know
2	if it's a character that's influencing or could it be
3	any particular character?
4	Yes, presence of a character. So we didn't
5	want to compete character versus nothing, because then
6	we wouldn't be able to say that it's a beloved
7	character. But we could certainly go back and try to
8	do it without any
9	FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Yes. It might be
LO	interesting to look at no character versus beloved
L1	character, because that's what's going to happen in the
L2	marketplace. A lot of products don't have any
L3	characters, and then some will have a beloved character
L 4	on it.
15	DR. KOTLER: Right, and that's right,
16	absolutely we could do that. It's just a slightly
L 7	different question that we were trying to answer, but
L 8	certainly yes. Good point.
L 9	MS. ENGLE: Who has the mike? There's a
20	question in the back.
21	MR. LATTIMER: Hi. I'm Hugh Lattimer from
22	Wiley, Rein. I noticed we've been getting a very
23	significant increase in inquiries from overseas food
24	companies about how to comply with children's

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

MALE PARTICIPANT: Can't hear you.

25

1	MR. LATTIMER: About how to comply with
2	children's advertising by European companies and other
3	companies around the world. I was just curious. If
4	you turn that around, are you undertaking similar
5	initiatives overseas with your products?
6	MR. FRIEDMANN: I can answer on behalf of
7	Kraft that the advertising policies that we adopted
8	since the end of 2005 are global policies for us. So
9	we apply the same nutrition standards and the same
10	practices to our advertising everywhere in the world.
11	MS. SHEA: We're similar. We have fewer
12	products marketed to children worldwide. But we are,
13	you know, you have to do something that's country-
14	specific and lines up with the government in those
15	countries. But we are.
16	MS. ANOPOLSKY: And for Disney, we're using
17	the same strategies around the world. We're just in
18	different stages of implementation.
19	MS. PATTON: Hi. My name is Diana Patton.
20	I'm from Toledo, Ohio, and I'm a mother, which is my
21	most important job. But my second most important job
22	is I'm a nutritionalist and a life coach.
23	What I find, because in the trenches my
24	children are only allowed to watch Disney Channel and
25	the public station. The reason for that is because of

1	the	advertising.

I am really interested to hear about General Mills and of course Kraft, because what I'm seeing on the Cartoon Network and the other stations, which have the hip stuff, you know. They have so many advertisements for the chips and stuff. I am not seeing the advertisements for the fruits and the Cascadian Farms and that kind of stuff.

So I guess I'm watching it. So what do you have to say about that? I'm just of curious where that's going.

MR. FRIEDMANN: Well, I think on one of the impacts, as you saw in my remarks, of adopting the standards that we adopted, was to encourage development of healthier choices, and that has in fact happened. That's all that we're advertising on the commercial channels that you're referring to.

I think you're also seeing things progress over time. I mean we've been operating on that basis since the end of 2005. You've heard the whole range of pledges, many of which are going to be implemented either later this year or into 2008.

So I think the picture that you will see a year or a year and a half or so from now, I think, will reflect much more the pledges that you're seeing today.

1	MS. RIDEOUT: Hi. I'm Vickie Rideout from
2	the Kaiser Family Foundation. On the issue of the
3	impact of licensed characters on sales, I was going to
4	ask Ms. Shea.
5	You said that you started licensing
6	characters like Dora on vegetables, and you showed some
7	images of that. Do you guys have any data on impact on
8	sales or anything you can share with us?
9	MS. SHEA: Actually, we don't at this point.
10	Those products just shipped over the last month or so.
11	So we're just getting in there, and likewise the spots
12	that I showed you just started airing in May.
13	So but we're very committed to it. The
14	single unit vegetables that I showed you have been very
15	successful and we know that there's a lot of kid
16	consumption of those as well.
17	MS. ENGLE: Angela?
18	MS. CAMPBELL: Angela Campbell, Georgetown
19	Law Center. This is a question for Disney. I was
20	wondering if you had any tell us how much food
21	advertising kids are watching on the ABC Network, which
22	you also own, and whether you have any plans to extend
23	your guidelines to that network and those third party
24	ads?
25	MS. ANOPOLSKY: Our ABC Network has very,

1	very little kids programming on it at all. It airs on
2	Saturday mornings only, and even that, not necessarily
3	every week.

It sometimes gets preempted by the local stations. As part of that, we are still taking the regular advertising. So straight advertising we're still accepting.

But we are applying our nutritional guidelines, as I discussed, to anything that would be a tie-in sponsorship or promotion of the programming that airs there. We're definitely using our guidelines for that.

In addition to that, the programming that airs on ABC on Saturday mornings is programming that is being developed by the Disney Channel. So that episode of Raven that you saw, that's the same programming that goes to ABC. So any positive lifestyle messages that we embed in the Disney Channel programming would also travel to ABC and reach that audience when it airs there.

MS. CAMPBELL: Well, what about kids watching other programming or only watching TV on Saturday mornings? Excuse me. I'll repeat the question for the camera, okay?

MS. ENGLE: Oh, okay.

1	MS. CAMPBELL: What about programming that
2	airs throughout the week on ABC and not just Saturday
3	morning?
4	MS. ANOPOLSKY: Throughout the week on ABC,
5	it's really adult targeted. We don't have kid's
6	programming.
7	MS. CAMPBELL: (Not on mike)
8	MS. ANOPOLSKY: A name. If you look at the
9	ABC schedule, it's pretty adult-targeted. We just
10	don't have a lot for them. Our premier place for kids
11	to watch is Disney Channel. It's where we have the
12	biggest audience and then we use the same guidelines on
13	all of our kid-targeted programming.
14	MS. ENGLE: Cathy, did you have a question?
15	But we need the mike. We need the mike definitely for
16	the
17	DR. MONTGOMERY: I'll stand as Margo did, and
18	maybe people can hear me.
19	MS. ENGLE: The camera said they couldn't
20	hear you.
21	DR. MONTGOMERY: I'm sorry. Okay. Catherine
22	Montgomery, American University. I was actually going
23	to ask you the same question that Angela asked, but it
24	really is a bigger question that I want to pose.
25	So you, as the only representative, I guess

1	today, from the broadcast television industry. Just to
2	tell us why we haven't really seen initiatives coming
3	out of broadcast television.

If there have been, what they are and what role those companies are making, are playing rather in this very important area, besides the really important initiatives that you've just told us about Disney? So I know I'm kind of putting you on the spot, but I don't know who else to ask this question of.

MS. ANOPOLSKY: Well --

DR. MONTGOMERY: These are the good guys

here.

MS. ANOPOLSKY: You ought to ask Viacom and Time Warner. I really can't speak on their behalf. I mean we've stepped up and taken the measures that we feel are important and fit well with our business, and really meet what consumers are looking for in the marketplace.

You know, we hope that we can provide leadership in the industry. But it's really for those other companies to step up and help find solutions in the private sector. So we hope that they come with us.

One of the reasons we've been very public about what we're doing, we've been out there. We put our guidelines out there. We've shared them with many

of you in the room before today, and we will continue to share them and hope to provide leadership in this area.

MS. ROSS: Hi. I'm Mimi Ross from National Action Against Obesity. I have another question for you. What I find so striking is that it seems like Disney did things that you didn't have to do. I don't think that you are under as much pressure as a lot of other organizations, yet you still made changes.

They probably are more expensive. It's more expensive to provide healthier food than junk food. We know that junk food is very popular, and you made changes that probably may have cost you money. I'm curious how you were able to successfully do that.

MS. ANOPOLSKY: I'm sorry, in the microphone.

MS. ROSS: I'm curious how you were able to successfully roll this program out, roll this business model out, and have it well-received among your shareholders, because I think it's admirable that you did what you had to do before you really had to do it. Thank you.

MS. ANOPOLSKY: Thank you. You know, for us, we really believe -- you know, there are some short-term changes that we need to make in our business, but we really feel that this is something that is good for

1	our business in the long term. This is really honing
2	in on parents want. When Disney delivers what parents
3	want, it is successful for our company.
4	It really is that long-term vision that we've
5	been focused on that we're pursuing. So I mean it's
6	really the only answer there is to that question. We
7	know that it's good for our business when we're
8	delivering what parents and kids can agree on.
9	It's the same approach that we take in all or
10	our Disney-branded businesses.
11	DR. MONTGOMERY: (Not on microphone) So the
12	reason I asked this because so often in some of the
13	environments, finding what is right, finding what is
14	more healthy is countered by what's possible. Every
15	quarter, the companies have to talk to Wall Street and
16	say "We sold more of this product."
17	I'm always curious how a company does the
18	right thing without losing money. So that's why I'm
19	asking the questions I am.
20	MS. ANOPOLSKY: Never wrong by watching your
21	market and staying where your consumers are.
22	MR. GOODWIN: My turn? Which is my point.
23	Where your consumers are.
24	MS. ENGLE: Could you please identify

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

25

yourself?

L	MR. GOODWIN: My name is Bill Goodwin. I
2	have a youth consultancy in the Philadelphia area. I'm
3	a father of four kids, and I've watched all of this
1	unfold over the last few years, and I want to express
5	some concerns.

Three years ago, I spoke in Sweden about childhood marketing at a kid's marketing program. I also speak at Kids Power and IRR's Youth Marketing mega event, and I'm really concerned that no one's looking at the fact that this just doesn't work.

It's a parental problem. I would cite a Kato Institute article "Don't Blame SpongeBob for Childhood Obesity," by Radley Balko. Ad bans have failed everywhere they've been tried. The list so far includes Sweden, Quebec and Norway.

There's no correlation between ad exposure and childhood obesity. I will amend that point by saying there was a UK study that was recently released, in which they looked at 152 kids and quickly pointed out that it does have an effect on 152 kids in the closed study.

You need to ban ads in adult programming. We are a commercial society founded on capitalism, and we keep going. I'm sorry. The ban would cripple children's television. I disagree. I do think that

L	our	cli	ent	:'s,	which	include	many	of	the	people	who	has
2	spol	ken	so	far,	have	tried.						

General Mills with the white X's were a perfect example, that the consumers are simply not ready for what we're trying to force on them. How do we, as marketers, as government and as parents ourselves, address this issue, and how can we meet this as quickly as is being required of us?

I know it's a very complex question. It's just the only reason I showed up here today, was to kind of say that. I frankly am at a loss when I'm asked, and I'm really looking at this room. When we as a group of marketers, get together, we struggle too. So how can you help us?

MR. FRIEDMANN: Chairman Majoras started today's discussion by saying that it really does — that no one thing is going to turn the tide on this, and I think we all recognize that, that it takes a collective effort. It's companies, it's educators, it's people who lead youth programs like yourselves. It's certainly parents. It's regulators, and it's not going to happen that quickly.

But I think as each of us tries to do our part, hopefully that collective effort can start to make change happen. In terms of the commercial side of

1	it, as I mentioned we're finding that the healthier
2	products is, are what are selling faster.
3	As far as IOM report in 2004 said, if you can
4	sort of harness that engine to go in this direction,
5	it's a good thing and becomes self-reinforcing.
6	MS. SHEA: I would just add to that. I mean
7	I think it's about energy balance, and it's about
8	catching parents, you know. It's parents when they're
9	having a kid. It's, you know, getting the message
10	across. It's about catching kids at early ages, as we
11	heard from some of the companies, the media companies
12	doing that.
13	It's about us trying to make sure we're being
14	responsible in how we market. It's going to take all
15	of us together.
16	MS. POMERANTZ: Hi. I'm Jennifer Pomerantz
17	from the Rudd Center of Food Policy and Obesity at Yale
18	University. My question is for General Mills.
19	Regarding your sugar sorry.
20	Regarding your cereals, the advertising sugar
21	limit of 12 grams for advertising, I was wondering if
22	that made you have to reformulate your cereals, or if

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

limit for advertising?

you plan to reformulate them in the future to meet that

MS. SHEA: Well, the answer is yes. I mean a

23

24

25

number of our products do meet that guideline already;
some don't. That's why we've set a time table, that
this will be fully implemented by the end of 2008. As
I said, 90 percent of our advertising to children will
be compliance with that by the end of 2007.

So we certainly intend to reformulate products so that we can advertise them, we can have them on-line. We can use licensed characters on the packaging. We hope we can, but if we can't, then we don't advertise or market them to children.

MS. EMMA: Hi. My name's Mary Emma. I'm from the Wade Group. My question is directed to the representatives from Kraft and General Mills. As you speak about future product development and reformulation, are you focusing mainly on food marketing specifically for children or adults as well? What's the split between children, food for children and food for adults for future development?

MS. SHEA: Boy, I'll start that. I mean I would say we're doing a lot in the area of adults, and we were asked to focus on kids in the presentation today.

But whether it's Yoplait yogurt that's 100 calories per container; whether it's Progresso Soups, we have 25 varieties that are 100 calories or less per

1	serving.
2	We know that, I mean this is not just a
3	childhood problem; this is an adult problem. So
4	anything that we can do to help adults understand; you
5	know, eat more Green Giant vegetables, eat more
6	Cascadian Farms fruit, you know, delay the treats or
7	minimize the treats, that's the key messaging.
8	So we're doing everything we can, because as
9	Lance said, it's a great business opportunity as well.
10	MR. FRIEDMANN: Again, similar answer for
11	Kraft. I mean again, I focused today on products that
12	we're reformulated and developed for kids.
13	But some of the ones I mentioned at the end,
14	like the ready to eat meal salads, are clearly targeted
15	at adults and a broad range of products that are
16	targeted to all family occasions too.
17	MS. ENGLE: Any additional questions? Okay.
18	One more question here.
19	MR. SILVERGLADE: Bruce Silverglade, Center
20	for Science in the Public Interest. I'd just like to
21	disagree with the comment that was made from the
22	individual who spoke in Sweden.
23	The literature actually looking at the Quebec
24	advertising ban, I refer to the study by Cathy Baylis

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

that came out this year, shows that the Quebec

25

advertising ban has had effects on children's food eating patterns in Quebec.

In Sweden, where there has been a ban on food advertising on their national government station, ads still come into Sweden via cable and satellite and European-wide.

So it's just unclear what the obesity levels in Sweden would have been if there was a complete ban on advertising, including cable and satellite, versus no ban at all. It's really wrong to try to draw conclusions from that. But the study from Quebec is quite promising and supportive. Thank you.

MS. ENGLE: Okay. I think we can now break for lunch. Thank you to all this morning, presenters. But before we go -- hold on. I have a couple of announcements to make. Remember when you come back from lunch, you will have to go through security again. So please allow time for that.

We'll be restarting at one. In your packets are information on local establishments where you can get lunch. In addition, the panel of today will be a Scoring the Progress panel, and you will be able to raise questions for the panelists.

If you write them down on the index cards in your folders and give them to FTC staff identified by

1	rib	bons	s on	th	neir	nam	ne	tag	gs,	we	can	get	. tł	nose	que	estions
2	in.	I	thir	nk	that	t's	it		Oka	ay.	Нач	re a	. go	ood	lunc	ch.
3				(Wh	nere	upor	1,	at	11	:57	a.m.	, a	. lı	ınch	eon	recess
4	was	tak	ken.)	)												
5																
6																
7																
8																
9																
10																
11																
12																
13																
14																
15																
16																
17																
18																
19																
20																
21																
22																
23																
24																
25																

## 1 AFTERNOON SESSION 2 1:03 p.m. 3 MS. ENGLE: All right. I think we'll get 4 started again for the afternoon session. I think some 5 people are still coming through security, but so that we don't get too far behind, we'll get going. 6 7 So I'd like to welcome you all back for the public education and research session, as well as the 8 9 wrap-up panel that will be scoring the progress in 10 summer 2005. 11 A few reminders to turn off your cell phones 12 and PDAs if you turned them back on during lunch, and also again, we do have index cards in your folders for 13 14 questioners who are the last panel, and at that --15 during that panel, if questions come up as you go 16 along, there will be an FTC staffer with a microphone 17 who will be collecting the index cards. Moderating the next panel is Lee Wilson, 18 who's the Director of the Division of Public Health 19 20 Services in the Assistant Secretary for Planning and 21 Evaluation's Office of Health Policy at HHS. He'll 22 moderate the panel and introduce the speakers. 23 But before that happens, we are pleased to 24 have FTC Commissioner Jon Leibowitz here to offer a few

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

25

remarks.

## 1 REMARKS - JON LEIBOWITZ

MR. LEIBOWITZ: Thank you, Mary. As Mary pointed out, I am Jon Leibowitz, one of the FTC Commissioners, and I am happy to weigh in at today's forum on childhood obesity and food marketing.

Last month, I happened to be listening to C-SPAN radio, and I heard Bill Clinton speak to the National Partnership for Women and Families. Former President Clinton highlighted in dramatic terms just how alarming the health care problem, childhood obesity is becoming.

For the first time in history, significant numbers of young people have developed Type 2 diabetes, what used to be called adult onset diabetes but can't be called that accurately anymore. A recent study predicted that one in three children born in this decade will develop diabetes at some point in their lifetime.

Most overweight children have at least one major risk factor for cardiovascular disease, such as high cholesterol, high blood pressure or high insulin. This obesity crisis threatens not only to overwhelm our health care system, but to give us the first generation of American children with a shorter life span than their parents.

Just think about that for a minute. A shorter life span than their parents. Simply put, children are eating more calories, gaining more weight and developing more chronic diseases earlier than ever before. It would be nice, of course, to have an easy target to blame, but childhood obesity is a complex problem with a variety of causes.

A large part of the problem may have to do with changing lifestyles. Children today just aren't getting enough exercise. Sure, some kids play organized sports, but they don't seem to slip out the back door and play outside as much as they used to, perhaps because parents are afraid to leave them unattended.

Young people are spending more time inside, engaging in sedentary activities like watching TV, playing video games or going on the computer.

Meanwhile, more and more parents are working, and they don't have time to make nutritious home-cooked meals, often relying on restaurants, take-out and quick fix process foods.

Half of the American food dollar is spent on eating out, and about 40 percent of that amount is spent on fast food restaurants. It's no wonder whole families are getting supersized. There's no surprise

either that there's been a big spotlight on food
marketing to children, both as a possible cause and as
a potential cure.

This morning, we heard about some of the food media companies' commendable efforts to address children's obesity, and I see Jody Bernstein in the audience and she played a critical role in making this happen. This afternoon, the agenda includes a discussion of public outreach and research about the connection between advertising and overweight kids.

The FTC staff recently released a report on children's exposure to TV advertising, comparing data from 2004 to data already in our files from 1977.

That's before the childhood obesity crisis, but at a time when the agency proposed a rule to ban all children's advertising or almost all children's advertising on TV.

The authors of our new study will present the details in a few minutes. But to my mind, the results are of a good news, bad news and more bad news variety. The good news is that compared to 1977, today's children are seeing somewhat fewer paid ads, somewhat fewer food ads, about nine percent fewer, and somewhat fewer total minutes of advertising on TV.

The bad news is that today's kids still see a

whole lot of commercials. In 2004, children ages two to eleven saw on average more than 25,000 TV ads, including about 5,500 food ads, mostly for junk food.

Think of it this way. If right now you started watching just the food ads, one after another, you'd still be sitting here in this lovely auditorium early Friday morning.

If you watched all the commercials children see on average in a year, you'd be sitting here for more than a week. Of course, no one's going to make you do that. Even more troubling, compared to the 1970's, twice as many of these food commercials are now targeted on children's shows.

The FTC study didn't reach whether these child-specific food ads are more effective than ads for a general audience. But food marketers didn't just fall off a turnip truck or a good humor truck. You've got to figure that advertising especially designed for children is more likely to influence their product preferences, purchase requests and eating habits.

In these days, of course, TV is only part of the marketing picture. In addition to TV screens, there are also movie screens, video game screens, cell phone screens and computer screens, each a virtual venue and a potential bonanza for advertising to kids.

It's estimated that food and beverage
companies spend 10 to 12 billion dollars a year. I've
seen estimates even up to 15 billion dollars a year,
for a broad range of marketing activities directed to
children. Of that, more than one billion is spent on
media advertising, primarily TV.

The remaining billions are spent on youth-targeted promotions, public relations and specially designed packaging. Advertisers are marketing on-line, in stores, in schools, through character licensing and celebrity endorsements, with premiums, prizes, promotions and product placements, and via viral marketing, buzz marketing and even cell phone messaging.

Some of these efforts surely are experiments in advertising. But others presumably work, and work effectively. As many of you know, at the request of Senator Harkin and really at the direction of Congress, the FTC is beginning a more comprehensive study of all types of food and beverage marketing activities targeted to children.

We're about to send subpoenas to more than 40 major food and beverage marketers and fast food chains. This is a tough issue to be sure, but we will try our best to enlighten policymakers, by gathering real facts

and figures, as they say, from soup to nuts, and in this case from broadcast to broadband, about the kinds of marketing decisions food companies are making and how they affect the youngest generation of Americans.

While it may be debatable whether advertising and marketing are part of the obesity problem, there is no question that they have to be part of the solution. This morning we heard about some promising industry initiatives. Eleven major food and beverage marketers, including Kraft and General Mills, have pledged to shift their product mix advertising to promote healthier food choices to kids.

Spurred by the Alliance for a Healthier

Generation and other advocacy groups, leading soft

drink companies now offer low calorie and more

nutritious drinks at schools. To its credit, Disney

has taken steps to ensure that its parks and its

popular cartoon characters won't be pushing high

calorie, low nutrition foods.

These are laudable initiatives, but make no mistake: More companies need to be involved, pledging to make meaningful changes in products, in marketing and in media messages.

These eleven companies represent, as I understand it, two-thirds of the TV advertising to

kids. Where's the other one-third? And for example, there's only one fast food chain participating in the BBB initiative. That's unacceptable. Other companies need to get involved, either by joining some group or by doing it on their own.

The companies who are participating have made useful commitments about advertising to children, or not advertising, as the case may be, and to developing more Better For You foods that will appeal to kids.

But some of these companies can and should go further.

Many spend only a fraction of their food marketing budgets on measured media advertising. So can't they extend at least some of these commitments or their commitments to the rest of their marketing product packaging, point of sale materials and other youth-targeted promotions?

And how will companies define advertising primarily directed to children under 12? If a company allows junk food ads to audiences comprised of up to 50 percent children ages two to 11, that's not much of a standard at all.

You know at the FTC, we've done a series of reports on the marketing of violent entertainment for children. We look at movies, we look at music, we look at computer games.

We've always said that a 35 percent underage
standard for ads for viewing children may actually be
too high. Here, we may have some companies talking
about a 50 percent standard, which is even more
tolerant.

To be sure, I do recognize that many of the details of the company commitments are still in the formative stages, still works in progress. But the Commission will be watching how you industry leaders actually implement your plans, your promises and your pledges in the coming months.

Hopefully, we'll continue to see improvements and we'll begin to see more uniformity. As the saying goes, the proof is in the pudding, or in this case in the Pop Tarts. That was a joke. Thank you for laughing.

Of course, there are things we can all do, not just industry but also communities and families, to stem the rise in childhood obesity. Parents and schools need to do a better job at selecting healthy foods and encouraging more physical activity for children.

Restaurants and food companies need to offer better options, so we can make better food choices.

How about posting a little more nutritional information

1		£ ~ ~ +	£1	1		
1	OII	ldSt	LOOG	ana	restaurant	menus:

Two of our law clerks this summer, Frederick

Law and Cole Smith -- Cole is back over there -- went

looking for nutritional information postings at a

handful of local fast food restaurants in the FTC area.

They tell me that this kind of information was really,

really hard to find, kind of a challenge.

Now some of you may be thinking that this is just the Washington bureaucracy talking, and that the political heat of July will inevitably cool down in the Congressional recess of winter.

Interest in children's health is bipartisan and it is non-partisan. I saw that Congressman Markey had his staffer here today, and just last week the Surgeon General nominee said childhood obesity is his top priority and he could support a ban -- a ban on advertising junk foods to kids. That would include, of course or I assume, the Internet.

Look at the slate of candidates for the White House. Which one doesn't care about offering our children healthier food choices and a healthier future? Sam Brownback? He's threatening a regulatory solution if companies don't take substantial steps to curtail junk food marketing to children.

Hilary Clinton, if you've seen her latest U-2

video, you know she's been feeding her husband carrot
sticks instead of the onion rings he truly craves.
Thank you for laughing over there. At this point,
almost all of us prefer industry self-regulation, and
the initiatives discussed today are a healthy start.

But as these voluntary programs discussed today are rolled out, they need to measure up and they need to scale down to their promise, because if obesity rates continue to rise, you can be sure that the pressure for government to intervene will be hard to resist.

You could call that carrot and stick approach, or you could call it the carrot-stick approach. But whatever you call it, let's hope that with responsible marketing, responsible policymaking, and responsible parenting — and responsible parenting is a big part of this — we can start reversing the childhood obesity crisis and put American children on a healthier path to a longer life. Thank you so much.

(Applause.)

MR. WILSON: Good afternoon. My name is Lee Wilson, and I represent the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Thank you for that excellent talk and a little bit of humor there, Commissioner Leibowitz. It's a serious topic, but we need to be --

1 yes. Okay, thank you.

One thing I would like to say is I'm pleased to have been invited to participate in this activity, and to represent the Department here. We do want to apologize that there was aq little bit of a human error at getting someone here this morning for the opening session. It was not for want of commitment on this issue.

As you know, HHS's primary responsibility is to ensuring and promoting the good health of the nation. We take the issue and the growing issue -- not to have a pun there -- of obesity very seriously, and we have invested a tremendous amount of money, time, resources and thought on issues around the research and development for strategies to prevent and treat problems with obesity, clearing drugs, working on health communications and promotional strategies.

Many of you have seen the recent Shrek advertisements that have been put on Nickelodeon and some of the children's TV shows. But there's a lot more behind just that, just those small public education activities. So we are committed, and we look forward to continuing our partnership with the FTC on these activities and with all of you.

My charge here today is to try to show you

that since the charge was given to advertisers, to businesses and other organizations to work on public education activity, to talk a little bit about the change that has taken place in the last two years since this first meeting was held.

So what we've done is tried to identify a number of different public education activities, campaigns that are all targeted at childhood obesity at the national, local and organizational level, so that you can see some of the things that have gone on.

There has been change. Granted the change is not, in my opinion, significant enough, and granted we haven't reversed the course that we're going on. One of the key points that the Commissioner just stated that many of you already know, probably know far better than I do since I'm relatively new to this arena, is that if we do see this continue, we will see our children have shorter life expectancies than we will. No parent wants to have that happen.

So what I'm going to do is just introduce our very notable panel here, and let them talk to you as the experts on this subject.

First we've got Heidi Arthur, who is with the Ad Council, and she has partnered and her organization has partnered with the Department, and many other

1	private and non-profit organizations, to be about good
2	advertising.
3	We've got John McGrath, who Dr. McGrath is
4	with the National Institute of Child Health and Human
5	Development at the National Institutes of Health, and
6	he is Chief of the Public Information and
7	Communications Branch there.
8	Our third speaker is Linda Dorman from Black
9	Entertainment Television Foundation, and they have done
10	a number of special initiatives around healthy
11	lifestyles for African-American youth.
12	Finally, we've got Natasha Lance Rogoff, who
13	represents KidsCOOK, with a very popular show called
14	Finky's Kitchen that some of you may be aware of. So
15	let me turn it over to Heidi.
16	PRESENTATIONS: PUBLIC EDUCATION
17	MS. ARTHUR: Thank you. I clicked on my
18	name. Okay. There we go. That was scary. Well thank
19	you for having the Ad Council here today.
20	We actually participated in the workshop two
21	years ago, and it's really good to be up here to share
22	with you the progress that we've been making on several
23	fronts.
24	For those of you who aren't familiar with us,

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

we're a non-profit organization, and we're largely

25

supported by the media, marketing and advertising
community. Our mission is essentially grounded in the
belief that communications programs really can go a
long way to creating social change.

We do believe that advertising can have a big impact on the issue of childhood obesity, and in fact we're starting to see some positive signs with the work that we're doing that I'll share with you today.

I'm going to focus on two key initiatives.

One is our wonderful partnership with the Department of Health and Human Services, which is a multi-media public education campaign, as well as a new collaboration that's really taking off, where we have marketers, media companies, other non-profits working to extend these research-based messages in their own communications programs.

So in terms of our PSA campaign, we launched it in 2004. It was created pro bono by McCann-Ericson, and it was based on significant research that showed that parents were essentially overwhelmed.

It was a daunting task to think about leading a healthy lifestyle, and the whole notion of small steps, things that you can do everyday that really add up to a big difference, was very motivating to families and parents in particular, who we all know are setting

1	the	tone	for	health	and	wellness	in	the	home.
⊥	CIIC	COIIC	$\perp \bigcirc \perp$	IICULUII	ana	WCTTICOO		$c_{11}c$	iioiiic •

It consists of television PSAs, significant PR efforts, a very rich and deep website, out of home, Internet and so on. We also have a campaign that targets children ages 6 to 9, and it really is designed to provide them with a more meaningful reason why to make healthy choices.

We all know that just touting the health benefits to a child, more often than not, just falls on deaf ears to them. You know, if you throw up after eating that's because it wasn't healthy. It has nothing to do with long-term cardiovascular issues or diabetes.

So we have a campaign that's quite extensive, that includes interactive components, an in-school program as well as television PSAs. What I'll do now is just share a sampling of one execution from each of those initiatives.

(Videos play.)

MS. ARTHUR: That's good, because kids laugh at that one too. The good news here is that we're really seeing the donated media model work hard for this initiative. The media community has clearly embraced this issue.

To date, we've had about 325 million dollars

in donated media and that's real quality donated media, real commitments from the outdoor industry, from television stations on both the national and local level, as well as the interactive community.

So we're really seeing this message getting out there in a significant way. We're also seeing it have an impact on kids and families. We're measuring this through the visits that they make to our website. We've had about 190,000 visits per month, which is very significant for a public education campaign.

We've had about 190,000 people sign up for an eNewsletter. They're hungry for more information. They want tips. They want to be able to maintain a healthy lifestyle, and they're also staying on this site, you know, just long enough to get enough information; not too long to be completely sedentary. But six and a half minutes, again, for a public education campaign, is very strong.

We're also very disciplined about measuring the impact of our campaign. We do a pre- and post-wave tracking study and this is just a highlight of some of the measures that we've seen over time.

Adults who have seen the PSA, more adults who have seen the PSA say they've made changes and have maintained them for at least three months. That's 32

percent versus the 25 percent who have not seen the advertising.

For kids, more kids who saw or heard the PSA say that it's very important that for them to eat healthy foods every day. So again, we're really seeing some, you know, self-reporting that's indicating that we're moving in the right direction.

What's really been interesting is that while this campaign in national in scope, we're actually seeing it being embraced by local communities. We've had requests from governors, from mayors, from Senators, to use it as a framing for local events, to really galvanize the community behind obesity, to shine a spotlight on it, on the local level.

So they're able to localize the PSAs, and then they've been having events, "Shaping America's Youth," use the PSAs to get people to attend a town hall event recently in Chicago. Then at these events, we're seeing the local media community again step up to the plate, giving very strong commitments to run the campaign consistently, as well as developing their own materials or adapting them for local use.

I'll just share an example of some radio that was developed by Clear Channel in Texas recently.

(Audio clip plays.)

MS. ARTHUR: So then given the multiple
groups that really have a vested interest in this
message, we saw a huge opportunity to really get more
volume behind the right research-based messages.

So with support from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, we started the Coalition for Healthy Children, which has really enabled multiple groups to take the messages that we've developed and extend them through their own communications programs.

To date, we've had tremendous support and interest from many marketers, media companies and other non-profits. I know you started to hear about some of that earlier this morning.

So the premise is very simple. It's providing a unique forum for everybody to collaborate around the same research-based messages, and then more importantly, be able to measure progress and track the impact of a collective effort over time on key attitudes and behaviors related to health and wellness.

We developed these messages based on significant input from the members of the coalition, as well as volunteer advertising agencies who have donated significant time up front to really put the best minds behind the right messages.

We did exploratory research with parents,

children and teachers, as well as quantitative research to make sure that the concepts that we had were actually believable, informative, and we're really going to cut through and make a difference for kids.

The key areas that we're focusing on right now are physical activity would be a player, which you heard a little bit about this morning; portion control, which we heard over and over again from the academic, the medical community, that this is something that we really had to address if we were going to start to make a dent in the issue, as well as energy balance, which is largely confusing to many parents and children.

So here are some baseline research that we use to make sure that we really saw an opportunity to close the gap between what we know is important and what parents and children are actually doing.

So you can see from this research that levels of physical activity two years ago really weren't where we needed it to be. We needed to really ramp it up, and get people up and active on a regular basis.

Portion control. You know, many parents don't even think about it. They don't even know what the right portion is. Again, this is from 2005. With kids, we saw more than a third of kids really admitting that sometimes they just sit down and eat the whole bag

1 and drink the whole bottle all by themselves. again, a big opportunity to push the right messages around portion control.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Then energy balance is something that both parents and children say is important. But then when you look at whether or not they're actually doing it, you know, the levels aren't where they need to be.

So again, a big opportunity to close the gap between what parents and children think is important and that they want to do, but what they're actually doing on a regular basis.

So the way that this works is that the members of the coalition are encouraged to use these messages in their own communications programs. We've had significant commitments to date that I'll talk a little more specifically about up front, to get out there.

Whether it's in advertising, on packaging, on location and events, grass roots marketing, websites, newsletters. You know, we have a lot of associations who are members of this. We can giving talking points, so that you're starting to frame these concepts in a very consistent way.

I want to just walk you through an example of how exactly this program works, through the "Be a

Player" program. So the PSA campaign really provided context for framing physical activity as play. So we have two PSAs that I'll show you.

One is in partnership with the LPGA, that just launched this at an event with significant commitments from ESPN and others to support it, as well as Shrek and the DreamWorks partnership that you all heard about before.

(Videos play.)

MS. ARTHUR: We have these available in Spanish as well, so they'll be out there in a very significant way. So the idea is for members of the coalition to then extend this message in their own program, whether it's on packages, at events, on vending machines, on their own websites.

This is just an example of a program that Pepsico did in partnership with their Smart Spot products, and I believe it was Wal-Mart. I know that Kraft has done work, McDonald's promoted it through their Happy Meal promotion.

Then Subway took the "Be a Player." It's hard to see here, but the logo's on the bottom, and it had nothing to do with, you know, the DreamWorks icons there. But they promoted the Be A Player idea in the newsletter that went out to parents, to really help

them understand this in-school program that was being exposed to their children.

So measuring whether or not this is really going to make a difference is an important part of this program, and we're doing this in a number of ways.

It's not just about who did what and we're getting self-reporting as well as doing a landscape sweep on our own, but being able to measure on a regular basis whether or not we're changing the right attitudes around physical activity, portion control, energy balance and overall health and wellness.

We'll be sharing our first post-wave report in about six weeks, which is really starting to show some good movement in the right direction, particularly around physical activity. Kids saying they care more, they're more aware of the messages.

It's becoming something that they're reporting doing on a regular basis, as well as things like asking mom and dad for healthy foods when they're shopping together. So we'll be excited to share this report once it's finalized in about six weeks, and really keep the momentum going behind this program.

We have a website that's designed to share all of the research that we have with, you know, as many coalition members as possible. If you're

1	interested in hearing more about this, you can contact
2	the Ad Council or visit this website. Thank you.
3	(Applause.)
4	MR. WILSON: Thank you. Dr. McGrath?
5	DR. McGRATH: Well again, thank you very
6	much. Thank you for inviting me to speak here. I'm
7	happy to be here and I'm happy to share the panel today
8	with Linda Dorman and Natasha Rogoff, both of whom we
9	have worked with a lot over the years and will continue
10	to in the coming years.
11	This afternoon, I'd like to give an overview
12	of the product that several organizations within the
13	National Institutes of Health have worked on. First,
14	I'm going to give a very brief overview of the program
15	Next, I'd like to talk about how the program
16	is being used by various organizations around the
17	country, and finally just say a word to highlight the
18	importance of the program and what it's doing.
19	Before I start, I'd like to give just a
20	little background. This is information that has been
21	discussed before here, but I think putting it on a
22	chart gives it a little bit more perspective.
23	The frightening part of a chart like this is
24	to imagine what the chart would look like five or ten

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

25

years from now, if we're not successful today in doing

1 what we're doing.

The children who are overweight pay a heavy price. They pay a heavy price today in terms of issues such as self-esteem and image. They pay a heavier price down the road in terms of a lifetime of chronic conditions.

We have talked here earlier today a couple of times about the fact that there are multiple causes to this increase -- lifestyle, environment and many people are saying genes play a role in this.

As we have also heard, for the most part, the bottom line when you reduce all of this to the basic, it's calories in and calories out, and it is a matter of trying to create a balance.

What the National Institutes of Health has done is create a program called "We Can: Ways to Enhance Children's Activity and Nutrition." This program was launched in 2005 by Secretary Leavitt at a press conference here in Washington, and it emerged at a time when several forces came together to focus on childhood overweight.

Many of these forces were captured in the IOM report that focused on two basic fundamental areas of intervention: home and community.

So I'm going to talk about, as I mentioned,

1	the program that we have developed, and like many other
2	programs from the National Institutes of Health, it
3	follows in the footsteps of programs such as the
4	National High Blood Pressure Education Program,
5	Cholesterol Education Program and others, that had
6	these common criteria, that they're built on a strong
7	science base.

It's the science that pushes, that science that's NIH-supported, that's conducted around the country, that had results, and these are the results of that science.

It's built on effective partnerships. The idea is to develop a program that create value for partners. They involve various communities, geographic communities, social communities, often faith-based communities. They're relying on current communication tactics.

So when you put all of these together, the program elements consist of communities, partnership and a strong reliance on media. So what is this program that I'm describing called "We Can"?

There are two primary audiences for we can: parents and primary care givers of young people, and youth between the ages of 8 to 13 and some of our programs are skewed to the older part of that, some to

L	the	younger	part	of	that	age	bracket.

In terms of the materials for parents, it consists of a curriculum that is a six lesson course that can be developed, and you'll see how it can be given by any one of a variety of community organizations, in a variety of settings.

In developing this program, a couple of things came out. One issue was parents were very hungry for useable, down to earth sort of what we call elevator card information that you could take, understand and they could use right away.

The other part of the weekend program consists of three youth curricula or youth programs. The Catch Kids Club is an after school program for young children K to 5. SMART is a program that encourages children to find ways to reduce screen time, be it television or game time.

The third is a Media Smart Youth, and I'd like to spend just a minute on this third program, because I think it's illustrative of some of the things that we do at the National Institutes of Health.

The program consists of ten very interactive lessons for children. This is an after school program. One of the things we found out, as everybody who does this would find out, the first thing kids said in terms

of the feedback was if you want us to pay attention to this in so many words, you'd better make this fun. It can't look like school.

So we had to develop a program that had lots of different breaks in it, lots of different activities. One of the activities is something called the "Big Production."

The Big Production is a program that the children take part in as they go through these ten lessons, in which they develop a message using a media for their peers, usually the younger peers.

A key criteria of this program is that we asked children and we asked the facilitators of the program to develop a relationship with a local media in their community, so the children can not only talk about a program but actually go produce a message for their peers.

A key aspect of this program is encouraging the older children particularly, eleven to 13 year-olds, to develop critical thinking skills around the messages that they receive, particularly in terms of food and snacks.

So that's the We Can program. What are some of the resources? There are resources for communities, there are resources for parents, and there are

1 resources for organizations to implement this program.

Just one of the interesting things from our perspective is that each of the Institutes at the National Institutes of Health have a significant research stake, but they also have outreach. In this particular program, four of the Institutes of the National Institutes of Health came together to combine their resources to promote this effort.

So in summary, the program offers a turnkey operation for any organization in the community, a school or other setting, to develop, to take the program, develop it for their people, their children or their parents, and carry it out.

Okay. Brief overview of what it is. I quickly want to move to different ways this is being used. First, take a look at the different organizations that are using this program. Primarily it's hospital systems, park and recreation and school systems.

But several other organizations around the country are using the program. Currently, there are over 20 national partners within the program, and the partners actually just don't sign on. They take an active role in promoting it.

There are several participating corporations

L	that are with whom we have memorandums of
2	understanding, in which they actually link to our
3	website and promote this within their organization.

I mentioned that We Can is a key component of this program is media, and it's media not just for media's sake. It's media to promote the program in the organization. It's been covered on national media, on local media and we have a presence on the web.

Let me take a look at how people are using this around the country, and just to give a sense of it. In the Berkshire Medical System, Ed Perlach has been working with this program for over four years, and he has an active person in developing this and implementing it throughout the entire medical system, as is the University of Michigan Health System.

In Boston, some of you may know Cathy
Cunningham. But Cathy Cunningham has worked with this
for several years, bringing the nutrition elements into
the various communities that she's involved in.

Sally Fogarty, the Deputy Commissioner of
Health in Massachusetts, is interested in implementing
this throughout the health departments in
Massachusetts. There is a coalition in Oregon who is
implementing this.

Benton County is working with several

1	different organizations within their counties, within
2	the county, working with businesses and others to
3	promote this in the county.

What I think is very interesting is Gary,
Indiana is an example of a couple of cities that have
taken this on city-wide, and the actual mayors have
gotten behind this and decided to turn this into a city
program for the entire city.

In Tennessee, faith-based networks are using the program. Coalitions, in this case a coalition called "Choices," that reaches hundreds of different people, are using the program.

Universities, UNLV's Molly Michelson is using this, and for two years in a row, We Can was the focus of a -- was the centerpiece of Henderson City 4<sup>th</sup> of July celebration. Throughout Pennsylvania, the Advocates for Nutrition and Activity have adopted the program.

In terms of businesses, Mutual of Omaha not only is doing it with their employees, but Mutual of Omaha pulled together all of the leaders in Omaha, Nebraska, and encouraged the community leaders to take it on the city.

We've recently worked with Wal-Mart, and Wal-Mart not only is a major partner for us in this

particular promotion, but they too are trying to implement this not only with their employees, but with the children of the employees.

I think one of the most exciting things that we have started is to get something called a Weekend City. In fact, if you drive through either Roswell, Georgia or Gary, Indiana or South Bend, Indiana, some of our early cities, you might see on the way into the city a sign that says "We Can City USA."

It's a program in which the mayor of the city has gotten behind the program and encouraged the health department, the Parks and Recreation and all else, all other people in the city, to participate. This works with the proclamation and we think that it's --

It turns out that mayors who are balancing a number of things and always many of them find themselves in the midst of some type of controversy or trying to answer charges from the person who wants to be mayor next or whatever, finds that we can and focusing on childhood, promoting child health can be very positive in their community.

So I have one final point about whether or not we think this is important. We have evaluated this program, and in fact there will be a presentation in November at the American Public Health Association

1 meeting on the evaluation.

But even more than that, one of the issues that I think if you look at everything you've heard here today, is what our program, along with many others that you've heard about today, is pushing this issue on the agenda. We're pushing it in terms of solutions, not just talking about the problem.

So when we look at this as part of a much bigger movement in the country, we feel that that curve that I started with earlier can and will turn around fairly soon. So thank you very much, and I'm very happy to have presented today.

(Applause.)

MS. DORMAN: Okay. Good afternoon. I am delighted to be here this afternoon with you, and to have this very, very special invitation to present the BET Foundation and what we're doing in response to the epidemic of childhood obesity, with the support of BET Networks and our strategic partners.

Thank you to the FTC for inviting us and being a part of this program. I appreciate John, because actually what he didn't share is that their program is very wonderful, the Media Smart Program, and the We Can that we've been partnering with for some time. In fact, I'm one of the trainers for Media

Smart, so it's a deep relationship that we do
appreciate and we're glad to be a part of this esteemed
panel.

I wanted to -- there we go -- this first slide, when I do presentations about the BET Foundation, I really stick with the Foundation and what we're doing. But I wanted to share this particular slide with respect to BET Networks, which of course has founded our organization, to show in a slide the vast network and the assets that are available to the Foundation in promoting healthy living and healthy lifestyles.

For the past 26 years, BET Networks has delivered content that has been demanded, and also prosocial initiatives that have helped to improve the quality of life of African-Americans, and those who are involved in the network, either at the grass roots level or through the network programming, or in any of the special events here in the U.S. or offshore.

As you can see with the Third Tier, our Touch BET, which is our overall initiative, our corporate social responsibility initiative in which BET presents its pro-social agenda, including the award-winning Wrap It Up Program, which has certainly brought and shared the issues of HIV awareness and prevention to young

1	people	through	our	teen	forums	across	the	country	and
2	in the	Caribbea	an.						

What it also has done is to share also the concerns of access to higher education, voter registration, and has really taken a position to bring to the community those kind of programming, the prosocial initiatives that indeed improve the life of African-Americans.

In standing on that particular foundation, the BET Foundation in fact is a brainchild of Bob Johnson. Through a relationship with General Mills, we were able to seed the Foundation in getting it started. So we are grateful to that particular strategic partner.

It's a very young organization, so we have done quite a bit in the last four years. We were founded in 2003, again with the support of the General Mills Foundation and several of their brands, Honey Nut Cheerios, Chex and Cheerios specifically.

We are actually a 501(c)(3) organization, not the corporate foundation but the separate organization, to bring and use the multi-media relationships that we have to address this issue of childhood obesity and obesity among African-Americans.

So our charter of course is to promote health

1 and health awareness and behavioral changes among African-Americans. Again, our mission is to promote healthy lifestyles and to raise awareness.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We do this really through three tenets: health education, health literacy and then health action. Those are the areas that we focus in our initiatives on, and we assure that we cover all of those in what we do.

As a true non-profit, we are of course outcome-driven, and we measure our results in a number of different ways. We measure our results according to how many people participate, surveying behavioral changes and feedback that we receive through our various research methodologies.

We're continuing to do that as we grow. our outcome-driven focus is to increase understanding of the factors that lead to obesity among African-Americans, obviously to help reduce these health disparities in partnerships with corporations, nonprofit, government sectors and to do that very effectively, and to create most importantly new health advocates.

It's not so much as just sharing the information as it is creating a voice and new health advocates among African-Americans in particular and

1	their families and their community members. We
2	certainly, like any non-profit, we do not do it alone.
3	We have a diverse mix, and this is certainly just a
4	representative list.
5	We count BET Networks among our supporters.
6	Of course, the General Mills Foundation. We have
7	strategic relationships with a number of different
8	universities.
9	This is an example of the Medical University
10	of South Carolina and national organizations that we
11	tap into for our various speaking and other
12	relationships that we need, the National Medical
13	Association and municipalities.
14	We have just recently signed a Memorandum of
15	Understanding with the District of Columbia to develop
16	and to partner on various health initiatives that
17	impact the citizens of the District of Columbia in
18	particular, and many others.
19	I think this esteemed audience already knows
20	many of the statistics. I won't repeat them back to
21	you, but it's just an emphasis that what we see in
22	adulthood, there is a track obviously when we look at
23	childhood obesity and where it ends up.

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

African-American community, because it's not only

24

25

This is very daunting, particularly in the

1	generational; it is long, long-standing and it's very
2	difficult to break because there is a lack of trust in
3	large institutions, medical institutions and
4	physicians.

So we are looking at things like physician competency modeling, how we can we get African-Americans to appreciate, go to the doctor, follow instructions as an example. Then just simply being self-responsible. If you receive a bad report or you receive a report that you must seek treatment, then go get that treatment.

These are the kinds of issues that we're trying to address them on youth, as well as in the adult population that we serve.

As a young organization, we have to narrow our target and become very proficient in our messaging. So we have focused on African-American women ages 18 to 54, and African-American girls 10 to 18 through our various initiatives.

Why women and girls right now in the life of the Foundation? We look forward to expanding our reach to boys and men. But we realize that the heart of the African-American community is in fact women. That is what the research says.

Women take care of men and their families,

and women influence those kind of decisions. We want to be able to empower girls to make those kinds of health decisions early in life, as an impact on their families later.

So our initiatives. Again, as a very young organization, our initiative Healthy BET was designed with the support and very strong input of General Mills and the various brands that we support.

It includes a multi-platform media, and I'll explain that later, our National Fitness Challenge, our women's health events, our youth health empowerment, which I will elaborate on in just a minute, and our newest initiative, "Wroth More than Weight" and Healthy Eating Lifetime Partnerships or the acronym HELP.

I'll go briefly. I'm at my five minute mark, so I'm going to go a little faster. Our initiative with multi-media. Clearly, we use the BET Network platforms that I shared earlier, which reaches about 83 million households, about three to five million visitors on-line.

So we have a vast reach in delivering healthy lifestyle messages. We do so every single week of every single day within the year. We are on air with our 30 and 60 second PSAs and our vignettes. We clearly tap into the talent resource that's available

to us, to drive home the message to this particular audience that appreciates a celebrity voice.

We often will use real women and real girls' talent, because we recognize that this particular community likes to have an "authentic voice," and so we're very mindful of that.

Part of this campaign includes a very rich website. We have fitness experts that we engage on a monthly basis. We rely very heavily on the Bell Institute for Nutrition and Health to provide us with health content, and we worked very closely with them in developing our brochures, which are available outside to you.

We have special broadband programming that we do make available on-line, and we are featured right on the BET.com health channel. We had have our own separate URL that you can reach through www.ahealthybet.com.

We realize that not everyone is part of the digital age, so we have a toll-free hotline, where we have 24 hours scripted telephone service, in terms of getting tips, as well as allowing individuals to leave their name and/or press a button where they can get a live voice recording operator, to request our various brochures that we have available free of charge with

1 the support of our benefactors.

The brochures are very critical. We distribute probably close to over 100,000 in a year. So it is a very, very rich program for us to produce and to disseminate brochures through our various databases, through a community event that has asked us to submit them, and through our grass roots programs.

We are out in the community every single day. I'm going to be leaving here, taking a flight down to an event in Charleston, South Carolina. We just came back, actually with General Mills last week and we'll be somewhere next week, presenting a Healthy BET to that particular community.

Part of our program and our community event is our women's health symposium and our forums. Our healthy lifestyle camp, which I'll explain in just a minute, our healthy life style academies, which I'm pleased to share is an extension of the Media Smart youth program, and various community events that we involved ourselves in and are invited to.

We also tap into the rich programming network and our various special events at the network. We bring our program, a Healthy BET, to that particular venue, where we know it's going to be high traffic. A sampling includes our celebration of gospel, Rip the

Runway, which is a high energy fashion show, Spring Bling, which is an alternative to the spring break, and our famed BET Awards.

Another part of our program is our women's health forum. We've expanded this to address the issue of childhood obesity among adolescent girls. So our program now will include a component to include daughters.

The program averages about 800 per event, and it starts out with a master fitness class. If you can imagine seeing 800 women get up at six o'clock in the morning exercising, it's a beautiful sight.

We now are so pleased to have, be able to respond to their questions and their desire to incorporate this program to include their daughters.

So we of course have health panels and experts and free health screenings.

This is a free of charge event, so that we can level the playing field and access to the information needed within this particular community.

We also have a national fitness challenge that we run every single year. The big culminating experience here is to be able to walk the red carpet with the new healthy lifestyle goals achieved, as we have worked very closely with our various participants

1 in this program.

Our youth health empowerment is one of our -- is our overarching initiative to address childhood obesity. We're working with girls 10 all the way up to 18 in a variety of different initiatives, and I'll quickly go through those as well.

In our last two initiatives, Worth More Than Weight is the response to the community that says "We want to hear about obesity, but we are very sensitive to the issues of mental health disorders among African-Americans, that give life to obesity and give life to the issues that continue to exacerbate this particular disparity." So we are addressing it very uniquely in this regard.

Finally, a very fun program. It's an on-line virtual program called Healthy Eating Lifetime

Partnerships. It's designed for you to go out and get your fitness buddy, and to go on-line and to incorporate healthy living strategies and tools, and to let us know how you're doing in a fun, virtual viral marketing environment.

Just very briefly, our youth health initiatives. It looks like I'm going to get the two minute mark in just a minute again. Again, our summer camp for girls, and we're developing a partnership with

1 the 4-H Centers across the country.

It's a obesity camp, if you will. It's a seven day camp designed to actually teach girls how to improve their health and to engage in dialogue about their health issues and to be empowered.

Our young women's health forum again is the component of the women's health forum that we're expanding on, to address the 18 to 21 year olds. Our Healthy Eating Active Lifestyle academies or HEAL is our accredited after-school programs in which we are going to do much of what you hear Jon describe in the Media SMART program.

We've very excited, because we are in media, affiliated with the media, where we can actually produce that public service announcement and give a commitment to airing it across the network on behalf of that particular HEAL academy and program. So we're very excited that the network has given us that commitment.

Finally, we're bringing to Washington, D.C., and this is actually ages 10 to 18, a Youth Empowerment Summit YES, we want to empower the girls to come to Washington and share their stories, share their learning and share their interest in helping to shape policy over a two-day summit.

The summer camp for girls is really an
opportunity for parents to really recognize that they
must do something for their children. So we invite
parents to actually sign up their daughters, to
nominate them. We have an esteemed committee that
reviews all of the applications, and then we select the
girls.

I go to camp every year. I'll be in camp

August 4<sup>th</sup> through the 11<sup>th</sup>, and it's a wonderful

opportunity for the girls to actually really become

girls again, versus living in the bodies that

oftentimes people interpret as adults, and they're not.

They're young people who want to understand how to get

healthy, and how to live healthy and make the right

choices.

I won't go through our campaign component since time is running out. But I do want to at least make sure that you're aware of the camp component.

It's built on fitness and nutrition, self-awareness and thinking positive.

This is an important component, because we really help girls to identify why they're eating the way they're eating, why are they feeling the way they're feeling, and how to combat the issues that children have to experience in terms of, you know, the

1	very daunting issues that they experience in their
2	school like teasing.
3	We address all of those issues through art
4	therapy, guidance counseling and one-on-one peer
5	interaction. Then at the end of the day, we just
6	simply want the girls to have fun.
7	I'm going to move forward from this, because
8	I want you to see our actual I want you to hear from
9	the girls themselves. We have a clip from the camp.
10	(Video plays.)
11	MS. DORMAN: Well, I guess in that clip that
12	says it all.
13	(Applause.)
14	MS. ROGOFF: Hello. I'm Natasha Lance
15	Rogoff, and I am the executive producer of a new
16	television series on nutrition, education and fitness
17	for children, six to 11. I want to thank the FTC and
18	HHS for inviting us from KidsCOOK to come today, myself
19	and my colleague, Jane Albright.
20	We believe that Finky's Kitchen will become a
21	favorite with children, and a significant tool to use
22	in reversing the trends in childhood obesity. I
23	executive produced 182 episodes of Sesame Street in
24	Mexico and Moscow.
25	I've worked with many of the people that you

met earlier today from Sesame Street. We've worked with animators who were a part of designing Shrek and when I moved back to the States after living overseas, I was immediately struck by what children were eating, and also what they weren't eating.

In response, I assembled a team. Many of the people that I had worked with in the past, Emmy award-winning animators, producers, writers, musicians, Internet game designers, and we worked together to try to create a show on food and nutrition that would appeal to children and parents both.

We developed the content for the series with guidance from our experts, a board of advisors from Harvard, Yale University, the Rudd Center for Food Policy and Obesity, Columbia University. We designed the series using cutting edge animation, and our award-winning Internet team developed a fully interactive online experience for children.

My experience at Sesame Street and as a mom has taught me that humor is really one of the best ways to go in getting children to do anything. We conducted research and focus group testing with D.C. and Massachusetts public schools, in collaboration with researchers from the Rudd Center.

We sought children's perspectives on portion

control, fats, sugar, eating vegetables and fruit, and through interviews and surveys we evaluated the level of nutrition knowledge of our target audience. We also learned that over 92 percent of children ages six to eleven love to cook, yet few know how.

This is not surprising, considering that many two-parent or single parent households have little time to cook, much less teach their children how to cook.

But this hunger to learn to cook creates a very exciting opportunity for preventing childhood obesity.

As Jon said earlier, we look at the statistics on the dollars that are going towards eating out, the dollars from those dollars that are going towards fast food restaurants.

In our conversations with people in developing the show, we saw that when people would look at the pilot that we just finished, they would say "Boy, this is something I could really use," even though the show had really been created for children. It was about at the level that many of the parents felt was just right for them to work, to cook with their children.

Everyone knows that the first step to developing healthy eating habits is to learn about foods, its ingredients, its nutrients and how to cook

1	it so it tastes great. We also know that about 35
2	percent of the Food Network viewers are children under
3	11.

For all these reasons, we believe that

Finky's Kitchen will be a smashing success. Children

want it, parents want it and would be grateful to have

it. Sponsoring Finky's Kitchen will not only provide

corporations an opportunity to be part of a successful

TV series, but also demonstrate their commitment to

helping parents create a healthier future for their

children.

So what is Finky's Kitchen. I'm going to show you a clip from the pilot today. Finky's Kitchen is a situation comedy set in a local restaurant café. The series is centered around four children who hang out after school in this high tech, gadget-filled, futuristic kitchen restaurant.

The kitchen is owned by Chef Dave, who is the father of one of the children. The kitchen is also inhabited by Finky, a three-D animated Noodle, who is a master chef in a culinary digital software program. Finky appears on screens, across platforms, on I-Pods and cell phones. He even pops up on kitchen appliances.

The show presents characters and situations

that children will identify with and want to return to again and again. We've also developed outreach materials, curriculum-based mini-videos with companion lesson plans and teacher training guides on health and nutrition subjects for use in schools and after-school programs.

We've worked with NIH, with Jon and his colleagues, as part of developing the program's national video competition, so that we can have children who are taking part in the Media SMART youth campaign also contribute their videos to the series, and then they're incorporated into the storyline of the show so that kids can be part of that show, and then also access that and interact with that on-line and pass it to friends.

As a media company, we can see that much excellent work has already been done by government and public agencies to promote good nutrition, as well as corporations, and in particular among the TV networks, Disney.

What we see our goal as is using these well-researched materials that have been created by the people that we have seen today and all of you, as well as the government materials from USDA, HHS. The materials are there. Parents could access these

- 1 materials. They exist.
- 2 So what we see as our role is creating high
- 3 quality, entertaining, story-driven content that will
- 4 engage children and their parents in living healthy
- 5 lives. So we are building upon the materials that have
- 6 already been created.
- 7 Ultimately, children must choose for
- 8 themselves, choosing food that tastes good when they're
- 9 eating it, and that makes them feel good after they eat
- 10 it. What we have to do is to provide the opportunities
- 11 to help children discover what tastes good and feels
- 12 good.
- Before showing the video clip, I want you to
- 14 know that you're the first public audience to view this
- pilot. It was completed only a few weeks ago and aired
- 16 at an invitation-only event hosted by Senator Gramm and
- 17 Congressman Clyburn at the U.S. Senate. We're pleased
- 18 with the enthusiastic response we've had so far, and
- we're happy to speak with anyone who's interested in
- 20 becoming a sponsor.
- 21 The pilot research and production was
- 22 supported by the Department of Education, Unilever -- a
- 23 representative is here today -- Samsung and others, and
- 24 produced in association with South Carolina Educational
- 25 Television.

For The Record, Inc.

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

1	We hope you'll agree that Finky's Kitchen has
2	a Great mission, and that the time is right for a
3	national nutrition series for children and parents. If
4	you could roll the video please?
5	(Video plays.)
6	MS. ROGOFF: I think that might be it. So we
7	feel that teaching children how to cook is part of this
8	process too, and that at this point, it's very
9	important to give parents and children a solution to
10	this, to provide them with an alternative for what
11	they're learning is not healthy.
12	So I hope we look forward to working with
13	all of you in developing this type of public-private
14	partnership, and thank you for giving us the
15	opportunity to speak today.
16	(Applause.)
17	MS. ENGLE: All right. Thanks to that panel.
18	Because we're running so late, we're not going to have
19	time for questions. So I'd like to move on now to the
20	next panel.
21	The next panel will be looking at two recent
22	studies examining food advertising to children on
23	television. We'll be hearing from Dr. Pauline
24	Ippolito, who is an Associate Director in the FTC's
25	Ruroau of Economics

Dr. Ippolito's research and policy work at the FTC has included a wide variety of advertising and marketing matters, including those pertaining to food labeling and advertising.

After Dr. Ippolito, we'll hear from Dr. Dale Kunkel, who is a Professor of Communication at the University of Arizona. He's done extensive research on children and media issues, and recently served on a National Academy of Sciences Panel examining food marketing to children and its relationship to childhood obesity.

## PRESENTATIONS: NEW RESEARCH ON FOOD MARKETING

DR. IPPOLITO: All right. Well, thank you very much. Two years ago I was here, you were here. We were just beginning at the time. We were just beginning -- oh, the mike. We were just beginning what was supposed to be a major comprehensive review of children's exposure to television advertising.

I'm happy to report that a month ago, we released a report based on that study, and it's available outside if any of you haven't seen it. I can assure you we've learned a great deal about children's exposure to television advertising.

What I'd like to do today is just give you some types of results that we have in the study.

1	There's lots more in the report, but to give you a
2	flavor of the kinds of information that are in the
3	study.

If you have others who are interested, there's -- on the website, there's an e-mail address that other people can get copies of the study.

Okay. So the data from the study is from the Nielsen Company. It's very detailed data. We got census, that is, every ad shown on television for four weeks from sweeps months scattered across the year.

We were quite concerned that we covered the whole year, including the holiday season, which is a very different pattern of advertising. It's all ad supported television that's monitored by Nielsen.

You should be aware that for children, children get substantial exposure to non-ad supported television. Almost 30 percent of what children see is not ad-supported. So that's an important thing as you look across studies.

When we talk about ads, we distinguish three types of ads. Probably what you're all thinking of as ads, what we call paid ads, that is, companies buy time to advertise a product.

That's distinguished from public service announcements, which you've seen today, and also

1	promotions. That is, the companies using some of their	ir
2	own time to promote their own television programming.	
3	That's an important part of the landscape today.	

In our four-week sample, we had nearly a million national ads and nearly five million local ads. We took those four weeks of data, we waited appropriately, we expanded so that we got national, annual estimates.

Okay. For each ad in our data set, we had a variety of information. The most important for our purposes today are we had audience estimates of who was watching the ad. I'm going to focus mostly on children two to eleven today. The report has the breakouts for younger and older children. I'll have a little bit of information on teens and adults as well.

The other thing that we used in our assessments is the product code data that comes with the Nielsen data. In a couple of cases, we augmented that because of important characteristics for certain product categories.

So for instance, we independently got nutrition data, so that we could separate highly sugared cereals from other cereals, 100 percent juice products from other juice products.

Okay. So how many ads did people see in

1 2004? For children, our estimate is that they saw about 18,000 paid ads, 7,300 promos and PSAs, most of which were promos. So that we had a total of over 25,000 ads per year.

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 should note that that's considerably less than the 40,000 ads per year you see quoted in the press all the time. But other recent studies are coming out with estimates that are quite consistent with ours. I've also got teens and adults on this table, mostly to show you that teens see more than children, both paid ads and all ads. Adults see even more, considerably more.

For food ads, children see about 5,500 food ads, according to our estimates per year; adults about 7,200. So obviously children -- food ads are a more important part of the ads that kids see than they are for adults, 21.6 percent in our estimates.

Why do adults see more ads than kids? is most of the answer. This gives you how much TV viewing per day on cable and on broadcast children see, teens and adults. Cable doesn't vary very much. Children see one hour and 31 minutes; adults see one hour and 49 minutes.

The big difference is in broadcast viewing. Children see 46 minutes; adults two hours and 21

L	minutes. I know these graphs are hard to read, so
2	don't even try. I just want you to see certain
3	patterns in the data. This is children's TV viewing
1	over the day. So it starts at six in the morning on
5	this graph and goes to midnight.

The red line is weekday viewing; the green line is Saturday and the blue line is Sunday, if you can see that. But the important thing is look at cable. Cable doesn't have -- cable is relatively uniform viewing over the day. The only thing that stands out is the red line is a little bit lower during school hours, because part of this group of children is in school.

Now we have summer in here, and there are school vacation days, so they're not always in school. But otherwise, it's a pretty uniform distribution of viewing over the day.

When you look at broadcast, it's a very different picture. First, for most of the day, broadcast viewing by children is much lower than for cable. The exception is Saturday morning. It's almost at the height of cable, and then prime time. Children get a good deal of their ad exposure from prime time viewing.

The reason we looked into this is we were

trying to understand some of the different estimates
you see in the literature, that are giving you very
different pictures of ad exposure. Part of the reason
is the sample of ad viewing that they chose.

If you simply monitor Saturday morning and after school for children's programming, you're really not going to get a comprehensive picture of what children are seeing for these reasons. Okay.

This is I guess what most people are interested in. This is TV ad exposure for children, for select product categories. I have all of the major food categories here. So every food ad appears in one of the first eight bars, and then I have game, toy and hobby, and then screen and audio entertainment.

Before I talk about these, I want to talk about what's missing here. There are two categories that are missing. One is promotions, so promos and PSAs, and the reason they're missing is that promotions and PSAs are 7,300 ads. So you know, the bar goes way up into the second floor.

If you put them in the same graph, you wouldn't have been able to see any of the variation in these categories. So promotions and PSAs are missing, and that's huge, and then all over non-food advertising is 8,800 ads, which is also huge.

But for the food categories, the green on
this graph is the ads that come from shows where
children are 50 percent of the audience or more, what
I'll call children's shows. The blue, the darker blue,
is coming from general audience shows. So shows where
children are less than 20 percent of the audience, and
the bright blue is the between categories.

I've arranged the food categories in terms of the number of ads coming from children's shows. So if you know this literature at all, this set of food categories isn't a surprise, especially the big ones.

Cereal is the most frequently advertised product on children's shows, followed by deserts and sweets, restaurants and fast foods, snacks, dairy, sweetened drinks, prepared entrees and then everything else.

Okay. For many of the categories, children get most of their food ads from children's shows.

Cereals is dominant; deserts and sweets and snacks and dairy. Children are getting the majority of their food ads from children's shows.

For some categories, that isn't true.

Restaurant and fast food, sweetened drinks and the other food category, they're getting the majority of their advertising from general interest programming.

So in terms of any effect that you would have by focusing on children's shows, it depends very much on the category.

We were in setting out to do this study, our focus was primarily food. But we also wanted to look at what else was being advertised to children, with an eye towards the activity side of the equation. The two major categories advertised to children here are games, toys and hobbies and screen and audio entertainment.

We looked carefully at the kinds of products in the toy category. It's all sedentary entertainment, with a few trivial exceptions. The other major category that isn't here is promotions, which is promotions for television programming.

So if you take those three major categories of non-food products advertised to children, they're all sedentary entertainment. So that's also a part of the equation here. When you add those three categories up, those three categories alone are more than twice as many ads as all of the food ads put together.

Okay. So where this chart was designed to show you where children's food ad exposure is coming from, in terms of audience composition and size of audience. So let me get you to focus on the right three bars.

These are three bars giving the percent of the total food ads coming from shows where children are 50 percent of the market, 50 percent of the audience, okay. The right bar shows where children are 50 percent of the audience and more than three percent of all children in America are watching the show.

So these are the high children's share big audience shows. The middle bar is where children are - where the audience has one to three percent of all children in America, and then the left bar is the small children audience shows.

Okay. So these are the big shows where children dominant the audience. The biggest thing to notice here is that the bars are green. Cable owns this category. This little blue on the top of the two right bars, that's broadcast's share. But this ad exposure is coming strictly from cable.

If I can get you to focus at the other end of the chart, these are the shows where children are less than 20 percent of the audience. So these are the general audience shows. Here, we're getting quite a bit of exposure. This is where kids are getting a lot of their food advertising.

Broadcast is playing a much bigger role here, but cable is still important. The shows where our

1	small audience shows, that is less than one percent of
2	America's children are watching the shows, but there's
3	a lot of these shows.

So you know, children are getting a lot of food ad exposure here. This is prime time mostly, or this is where a lot of the prime time viewing is coming from, which you saw was the major component of children's viewing.

There really isn't much in between. So children are getting their food ad exposure from the kids shows on cable, and from the general audience shows, especially the small size audience shows. Okay.

Well, we were concerned also when we started this project, many people were arguing that the quantity of advertising that children were seeing had really exploded, and that was an important reason that children were getting heavier.

So we had data from the 1977 rulemaking that the FTC had initiated. We dug out those old studies. All of our allergies went crazy. We dug them out. We digested them. It turns out they were useful; they did provide a baseline for us. So we designed our current study in part so that we could compare to the old data.

We used three major studies from that effort. The first was the Adler study, which was the National

1	Science Foundation review of what was known about
2	children's advertising at the time; the Beales study,
3	which was a study of spot ad exposure on all shows and
4	then on programs with 20 percent, 30 percent and 50
5	percent child shares.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Then the Abel study, which was children's ad exposure from national ads, on programs with 20 percent, 30 percent and 50 percent child share. Unfortunately, the Abel study didn't do all shows.

So we had to use the Adler study, which gave us the total and other information from the period to estimate the breakout of food and non-food ads. details are all in the report.

So these are our best estimates, we think a pretty conservative estimate for the 1977 data where we had to fill in, which suggests to us that food ads have dropped. Children's exposure to food ads has fallen somewhat in the 30 years since 1977.

Paid non-food ads has also dropped. Promotions has exploded. We get more than twice as many exposures to promotions today than we did back then. If you -- those of you who are old like me, if you think back to 1977, it was a very simple world back then.

We had three networks, there was one PSA

station, one public station in most markets. Cable was in its infancy. It was a very simple market. You didn't have a lot of competition. You didn't have to try to generate that audience. So this isn't a surprise.

But the growth in overall ad exposure is primarily coming from the growth in promotions. If you are nervous about our estimates, this is one picture of the underlying data, where we're not filling anything in. It's just the raw data, expressed in terms of the percentage of ads of a given type that were for foods.

So if you look at network ads, these are the ads coming directly from the network in 1977 in the Abel study, and you look at children's shows, which are the brown bars here, you can see that food was very important back then in the national advertising.

More than 60 percent of all the exposure that children got were for food ads on children's shows.

Today, on the comparable network ads, it's down to 32 percent or something like that. Then you can see for 20 percent shows, that is, all shows where children were at least 20 percent of the audience, both dropped, but the ratio remains about the same.

If you look at non-network ads, which are the spot ads, the differences are the same, though not as

1	arge. So there's clearly been a reduction in food's
2	dominance in children's programming, children's
3	exposure, I'm sorry.

So among our conclusions are that children's exposures to food ads on television has declined modestly since '77. Children are seeing fewer paid ads, but more ads overall because of the increased promotions. Children see twice as many ads for sedentary pursuits as for foods in 2004.

A greater proportion of children's ad exposure is from children's programming today compared to 1977. Children's food ad exposure is disproportionately from cable in 2004, and then children's ad exposure is not highly concentrated by time of day or day of the week in 2004. Thanks.

(Applause.)

DR. KUNKEL: I don't see my cursor. Oh, there it is. It's not surprising that I wouldn't be able to work this. It's not a MacIntosh. I'm in shock.

Let's see. If Chairwoman Majoras is right that battling this issue is a marathon or a triathalon, then the point of my presentation today is to give you a report on the race on the 10K mark. What I'm going to do, with the help of several colleagues, one of whom

is here, Christopher McKinley, who's a Ph.D. student from the University of Arizona, is a co-author on this paper.

We're looking at the advertising environment on children's television programs, which we think is important. Dr. Ippolito's made a number of important points about the diverse nature of children's exposure to food ads on TV.

But with that said, if you are going to take industry initiatives, policy or regulatory initiatives, you would focus first on the environment where children are most dense or most concentrated, and that would be programs targeted at children.

So that's what we're looking at. What we're doing in this study is at one level we're going to provide some descriptive data, just in terms of the volume of food advertising.

We're going to compare 2005, the point in time that is just before the Institute of Medicine released its report on food marketing to children, and as part of that report, a key recommendation, which I know a lot of the policy debate is focused on, a key recommendation was that within two years of the release of that report, there should be at least a balance between healthy foods advertised to children and less

healthy or non-nutritious, so-called junk foods
advertised to children.

That's not a long term goal. I don't think anyone who's a child advocate or a public health professional is going to be very comfortable saying that it's okay to allow America's children to view half of all the foods marketed to them to be foods that are non-nutritious or unhealthy when consumed in abundance.

But it's a good near-term goal, and it's the benchmark that was set out in the Institute of Medicine report. So what we wanted to do was to track the food advertising just before the IOM report was released. So that's back in 2005, and to look at it halfway to the point where the recommendation really takes force, because the recommendation from the IOM is rather explicit.

It says if the food marketing and advertising industries can't achieve this benchmark, that it is recommended that Congress legislate in this realm to accomplish that outcome.

Now what we've heard today suggests -- it's very heartening, and it suggests that the food marketing and advertising industries are moving towards the goal that was set out by the IOM, to achieve in two years that balance.

1	You know, you could quibble over the timing.
2	They've got some implementation and rollout issues.
3	But they're trying to move quickly, it's clear, and
4	they're trying to move in the direction of healthy

foods.

I think before I'm finished, you will see that a key question that's going to be posed here is the industry is offering Better For You foods. Are Better For You foods good for you, because the IOM recommendation said that there should be healthy foods, at least half of the foods marketed to children should be for healthy foods.

So let me explain, you know, just very briefly, because everything we'll do here today is brief. But this is a study where we sampled children's programs on the major broadcast and cable networks.

I've actually got one study in press at a journal called Health Communication. That's the 2005 data set that you'll see here today, and this has been the overtime comparison that's coming up, based roughly on first quarter data from 2007.

What we've done is we've analyzed all the ads on a total of 250 programs. It's a composite weekday and Saturday as a choice of a weekend day design, and I don't have unfortunately the time to go into the

details of that. It's our best effort to be representative without getting a million dollar grant from the Kaiser Foundation. Sorry Vickie.

But I mean it's not of the caliber of the Kaiser study that you saw released recently. But I think the size of the data set that we have here is pretty solid, appropriate to make some stable estimates.

So what we're doing is we're examining product type, the appeals that are used. You probably know that to sell hamburgers and other foods at McDonald's, they don't tell you a lot about the products.

They tell you about Ronald McDonald and they say it's fun and happiness, so fun and happiness might be described as the dominant theme, although it's not the data I'm going to go into today here though.

Because the focus that I want to share with you today is on this last point on this slide, that we evaluated the products for their nutritional quality, and this is what I told Dr. McGrath he would enjoy. We used a basic consumer-friendly nutritional category scheme that comes from the We Can program devised by the Department of Health and Human Services, and I'll go over that with you very quickly.

There are three different food categories
that are explained to parents, to help them choose
nutritional foods for their family. One is called Go
Foods. These are foods that are good for you. You eat
them any time. They're rich in nutrients and low in
calories.

Some examples would include fruits, vegetables, reduced fat milk. As far as getting a little more pragmatic for the advertising industry that's promoting snacks to kids, it would include baked chips, lowfat yogurt, frozen fruit juice bars, fig bars or ginger snaps without added sugar. So there are products that are mass marketed that could be in this category.

Then there's a slow category. These are foods that you should eat sometimes, but according to the HHS at most several times a week. They have increased levels of fat, salt and sugar over the Go Foods. Examples of that would be pancakes, waffles, peanut butter, lowfat products that's a little better for you than the high fat version that you might buy.

Then finally you have the Whoa category.

Whoa products, it's a category that you should only eat once in a while or on special occasions. Somebody mentioned a birthday cake. I think that was Jim

1 Kotler. So a birthday cake would be an example. These 2 are foods that are high in fats, salts and sugars.

So we're going to use this frame to look at what's the profile of food marketing to children in '05 and '07. But first let's just take stock of what's the volume of food advertising and how has that changed in the time since the IOM report has been released.

First, I'm going to break down my data by broadcast versus cable, and then I'll bring it together for overall. I want to note initially in this study, unlike the Federal Trade Commission, we do not count PSAs or program promos as ads. I think that may be consistent with the way the industry defines ads.

It certainly is consistent with the statute adopted by Congress, the Children's Television Act, that limits advertising to children. It doesn't apply to PSAs or program promos. So we're only counting paid ads in this analysis.

I want to remind you, as Dr. Ippolito said, that children get a minority, only about a third of their ad exposure on broadcast television. But with that said, then you see there's a palpable, a statistically significant decrease in the number of food ads, and you'll see it also down in the bottom half of the table, in the amount of time devoted to

food ads in the last two years.

There's no question that that looks like a significant decrease. We'll talk in just a moment what it means. But that's all food advertising. Not necessarily good foods or bad foods, but all food advertising is down.

That's consistent with what we heard from Kraft earlier today. Kraft said their ad expenditures for TV marketing are down. They're looking towards other media, and there may be some other factors going into play there. I can't say.

But in context, there's a slight reduction in the ad time on broadcast television during children. Some people have worried that if food ads are pressured out of the market, that that could lead to reduction in the support for kids programming. There could be a very slight indication of that on broadcast.

But I'd caution you, the broadcast data, the N is very small. As everyone is aware, there's a very limited amount of children's programming on broadcast television. The much bigger picture for children's programming comes from cable.

Now on cable, you'll see that the patterns

I've identified with broadcast are pretty much the

same, not quite as marked. That is to say, that there

is still a statistically significant reduction in the number of food ads and the amount of time devoted to food ads between '05 and '07 on cable. It's just not as large a decrease as on broadcasting.

Here on cable, you should also note that there is a stable ad environment. That is, if you look at the number of minutes per hour devoted to all ads at the very bottom of that column, you'll see that it's a marginal difference. That's essentially a flat line.

So as some of the food ads have been, what would you say, migrating away from cable, they're not migrating; there are just fewer food ads on cable, then it seems like they're being filled in by others.

What's the overall picture? The overall picture is that there is a reduction in the number of food ads that's shown on television today, as compared to '05. It's gone from 10.9 to 8.5. That's an average per hour. Of course, you're going to see a corresponding decrease in the amount of time devoted to food ads, and that's the top line at the bottom half of the table.

Overall, the number of minutes per hour devoted to ads, that's the very bottom entry in that column, is pretty stable. The reduction that you see is a function of broadcasting.

All that does is set the foundation for measuring the nutritional quality of the food that's marketed to children. So here what we're going to do is look at three different graphs that show, with the bar on the left in the light blue representing the '05 data; the bar in the pink or purple on the right side of each pair showing the '07 data.

What you can see, if we just start with the '05 data on broadcast television, Whoa foods predominant. That isn't news to us. I didn't need to do the study in 2005 to document this. This was well-established from previous research when we did the IOM report. So it's a pretty non-surprising or uninteresting finding.

I think the more interesting finding is how did things look at year after the IOM report. How do things look a year into the point in time where the industry is making efforts to alter the nutritional profile of the foods marketed to children.

The answer is they don't look a lot different. If the goal line in the near term is the 50 percentile mark, yes, 76 is closer to 50 than 82, but we've still got quite a ways to go. Then you can see similarly that slow and go, go the really healthy foods, are pretty scant on broadcast television.

1	How does cable television look? Pretty
2	similar. In fact, I'll jump just back and forth for a
3	moment to let you see. It looks really ugly if I put
4	them all on one slide, is why I put them separately.
5	It just gets vou can't follow it.

It just gets -- you can't follow it.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But you see the pattern is very similar on broadcast to cable. The numbers vary a percent or two, but basically what you see is that there's a slight movement in the desired direction, a reduction in the Whoa foods, a slight increase in the slow or go foods. The healthy foods have gone from three percent to four percent on cable.

Then if we look at the overall, this is the bottom line. This is what's going on on the ad environment directed to children on television. that we've gone from 84 percent non-nutritious foods to 79 percent non-nutritious foods. As far as getting the go category to the 50 percentile, we've moved from three to four.

So let's see. Before I wrap up, I just wanted to add one table. I mentioned there are a lot of other data in this study, and we don't have time to go into many of them. But I thought a couple would be interesting, just to look at some of the advertising tactics.

Premiums, whether it's a premium as a toy with a Happy Meal or a toy in a cereal or something like that, but the use of premiums to market foods to children, you can see that it's used more frequently with non-nutritious foods, the Whoa foods than it is with healthy foods.

You can see that same pattern with licensed characters. There's probably a little less policy concern on physical activity today than there might have been yesterday. I think a lot of people were worried that the industry initiative would use physical activity in lieu of a commitment to market healthier foods to kids. So we wanted to look at that.

If you're talking about selling foods to kids and telling them it's just like fruit, it tastes like fruit, again, you can see that's done more commonly with unhealthy rather than with the healthier category of foods.

One of the biggest changes that we've seen is that website promos in ads on TV, where you're throwing, the advertiser is throwing the child audience to the web as a function of the TV ad, that's up. It was only 20 percent two years ago, and now at the bottom of that middle column it's nearly half of all ads.

1	So let me just go through a couple of quick
2	conclusions here. Number of food ads is down.
3	Nutritional profile of the foods marketed to children
4	is largely unchanged, and it's certainly largely
5	unbalanced. So we need to go further to achieve that
6	goal. Only about one in 20 or fewer than one in 20
7	foods marketed to children are for truly healthy food
8	products.

Licensed characters we identified are most often found in the unhealthy food products. That won't happen in anymore, I think. We'll see. That's the point I want to raise in just a minute at my conclusion. One in three food ads has physical activity or exercise. It's most likely to be associated with a non-nutritious product.

I really think this is where things go from here. The industry has made a commitment that they're going to either go 50 percent, 100 percent of foods that are better for you. The analytical framework I'm applying and that I believe is appropriate to apply is are the foods good for you.

If you take an Oreo that's essentially a nonnutritious food and you take out 15 percent of the sugar, is that going to be called a Better For You product? Because this analysis, that's from a

1	nutritional	perspective,	is	still	going	to	call	it	a
2	non-nutritio	ous product.							

So I think we're going to need to continue to analyze the data and to monitor how things are moving with this initiative. As I said, I'm very heartened by what I've heard today, and I think it's a big step in the right direction by the industry.

I think it's going to take some time and some careful scrutiny of the nutritional criteria to determine whether or not it's going to get us to the step that the IOM recommended, of having at least a balance between healthy and unhealthy food to children. Thanks very much.

MS. ENGLE: We have time now for just a couple of questions. So if anybody has a question raise their hand, and the microphone will be passed to them.

## QUESTIONS FROM THE AUDIENCE

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Hi. I'm sorry to go
backwards in time, but we weren't allowed questions
earlier. Is Chris Wilson still here from Health and
Human Services. Heidi Arthur, you're here, right?
A question for you. Before the deal was done
for Shrek to represent, Get Up and Play, did the Ad

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

Council know that the character also would be

representing more than 70 junk food products?

MS. ARTHUR: I don't know if we knew the exact number. We knew obviously that Shrek did have licensing agreements with other products. But being that we were focusing on physical activity, we really wanted to use the opportunity to shine the spotlight with Shrek.

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: (Not on microphone) And my second question is back to your slide where you list all the corporate members of the panel, many of those corporations would be synonymous with the Coalition for Healthy Children.

I'm wondering what the standards are to join that coalition? I see that Pepsi and Coca-Cola are both prominent members, and we know that soda is a top causal agent in child obesity. So I'm curious how organizations like that are highly represented in something called Coalition for Healthy Children.

MS. ARTHUR: Sure. We have membership guidelines, which basically outlines it's an agreement to use the messages as appropriate, and report back to us how they're being used.

We actually have nutritional guidelines that are modeled after, you know, similar to the Clinton initiative, as well as consistent with the U.S. dietary

1	guidelines. So you can't put
2	FEMALE PARTICIPANT: So any organization can
3	join if they've got the money to pay, and the products
4	are irrelevant?

MS. ARTHUR: But I just want to clarify.

This is not give us money and join the coalition.

There's no funding requirements on the part of the participants.

We have a grant from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation to conduct all of the research that goes into developing messages that are proven to affect the attitudes and behaviors of parents and children, as well as to track whether or not the way they're being used are going to have an ultimate impact on attitudes and behaviors.

So there's no funding requirements, and any time the message is used and counted towards a coalition initiative, it follows our nutritional guidelines.

20 FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Well undoubtedly, it's -

MS. ENGLE: Excuse me, I'm sorry. We need to move along now. If there's anybody else who has a question for Drs. Kunkel or Ippolito, could you raise your hand? Otherwise, we'll go to a break, because we

1	are running behind schedule at this time.
2	MS. RIDEOUT: Yes. Vickie Rideout, Kaiser
3	Family Foundation, and the new standards that were
4	announced today are going to apply to ads that are in
5	certain shows only, primarily children's shows or shows
6	where children are a certain percent of the audience.
7	Pauline, your study is the only place I think
8	that we have data that show us how many food ads that
9	kids see, what proportion of their food ad exposure is
10	in those shows; hence, what proportion of their food ac
11	exposure will be affected by these changes.
12	Am I correct, as I looked at your numbers and
13	kind of added them together from some your charts; they
14	went by a little quickly, but it looked like about a
15	third of the food ads that kids two to eleven see are
16	in general audience shows; that is, in programs that
17	would not be affected.
18	DR. IPPOLITO: I wouldn't want to be quoted
19	on the third, but it's in that ballpark.
20	MS. RIDEOUT: Okay, and so that would
21	obviously
22	DR. IPPOLITO: More than half are coming from

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

MS. RIDEOUT: Okay, okay, and that would

obviously be a little bit more  $\operatorname{\mathsf{--}}$  for the older kids in

children's shows. I'm sure of that.

23

24

25

1	the program, fewer ads would be affected by the changes
2	than for the younger kids?
3	DR. IPPOLITO: The 50 percent standard is
4	using an audience of two to eleven year-olds.
5	Obviously, if you take any subportion of that, it's
6	much harder to reach a 50 percent standard.
7	MS. RIDEOUT: When I looked at the when I
8	was adding them up and saying like a third seemed to be
9	in shows where kids weren't even 20 percent of the
10	audience, or less than 20 percent of the audience.
11	DR. IPPOLITO: Right, right. That's right.
12	MS. RIDEOUT: Okay, thanks.
13	MALE PARTICIPANT: I know Professor Kunkel,
14	so I'll call you Dale. To what extent will your
15	research be used by the IOM to help evaluate what
16	recommendations at the two year mark may be called for?
17	DR. KUNKEL: Well, I don't think the IOM is
18	engaged in the political process. I mean they're an
19	advisory group that basically puts their positions,
20	their recommendations of their expert bodies out for
21	agencies like the Federal Trade Commission, the
22	Congress and so forth to deal with and to decide how
23	much stock they want to put in that.
24	So I don't think it's going to go back to the
25	TOM. I'm not, you know, really familiar with any

1	ongoing activities that the IOM has. Certainly, if
2	there was another study in this area, it would be data
3	that would be relevant to be considered.
4	MS. ENGLE: Okay. I apologize for having to
5	cut short the Q and A period. Let's take now just a
6	five minute break, so we can reconvene at 3:10. Thank
7	you Pauline and Dale.
8	(Applause.)
9	(Whereupon, a short break was taken.)
LO	MS. HARRINGTON: Thank you. We're going to
L1	begin the last panel. So if you could all stop talking
L2	right now and take your seats please. I'm Eileen
L3	Harrington, and the chief quality that I bring to this
L 4	venture is that I'm very good at keeping things on
L 5	time. So that's what we're going to do here.
L 6	We have a wonderful panel. The richest part
L7	of this session will be in the discussion among the
L 8	panelists. So each of the panelists has committed to
L 9	five minutes, not a second longer, and we will be
20	enforcing that, so that we can get right to the
21	discussion, which really will be the rich part. Wally
22	Snyder, you're up first.
23	PANEL: SCORING THE PROGRESS SINCE SUMMER 2005
2.4	MR. SNYDER: Well, 25 years ago, the Federal

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

Trade Commission set the course of action for

25

children's advertising in America. After an extensive rulemaking proceeding that lasted almost five years, the Commission adopted the FTC staff recommendation to terminate that rule, on both legal and policy grounds.

But the conclusion also adopted was that the best way to instruct children about the consumption foods was not through government intervention, but by, I quote from the staff report, "Individual companies, trade associations, self-regulatory groups, interested consumer organizations or a consortia of all of them."

This public policy has stood the test of time, and it bodes well for the future. With that beginning 25 years ago, the industry has been following the FTC recommendation that it do more to self-regulate children's advertising, and to respond to concerns about food advertising and childhood obesity.

Two years ago, the FTC and HHS reviewed what the industry had accomplished in this important area. At that time, food companies described how they had responded by introducing new product formulas, new packaging and changes in how they advertised to children.

CARU gave us a complete report that demonstrated its success in seeking voluntary changes in how individual foods are advertised to children.

The industry has continued to act on those recommendations that came out of the 2005 hearing.

But as Chairwoman Majoras has noted, the obesity issue, like any other challenge, quote "Requires continued effort and vigilance." As was suggested in the 2005 workshop report, the National Advertiser Review Council conducted an extensive review of the children's advertising review unit, and made a number of important changes to its children's marketing guidelines.

For the first time, CARU now has the authority to target advertising to children that is unfair, in addition to misleading. The guidelines prohibit content that blurs the distinction between advertising and programing in misleading ways, and requires advertisers to clearly distinguish advergaming as such.

Concerning food advertising, CARU guidelines specifically prohibit ads that disparage healthy foods, like fruits and vegetables, or ads that promote excessive consumption, like ads showing children consuming more than a serving size of a product.

Our review of the CARU guidelines also led to the new food and beverage initiative that was agreed upon by food companies that advertise the most,

comprising over two-thirds of the children's food and beverage television advertising expenditures.

We learned this morning that 11 companies have joined that initiative, and they have agreed to devote at least half their advertising to children, to promote better nutrition and healthy lifestyles. They will limit advergaming and they will not advertise food or beverages in elementary schools.

In fact, they've gone well beyond that now, as announced, that 100 percent of their advertising directed at children will be for Better For You products. So I think there have been significant contributions along that line.

In addition, you heard the Ad Council, which has become a major player in educating children and their parents and care givers. This healthy lifestyle campaign, launched in 2004 with HHS, has achieved impressive results, and the Ad Council's Coalition for Healthy Children, initiated in 2005, is providing research and targeted messages to combat childhood obesity.

In short, I believe the industry has responded positively and aggressively to the FTC's challenge to improve its self-regulatory response.

Now certainly there are critics of this self-

1 regulation, and there should be and there always will

- 2 be. There are those who do not yet believe that
- 3 business can be trusted to police itself. But it is
- 4 the FTC public policy, endorsed 25 years ago and
- 5 reaffirmed in 2005, that we have been implemented.

I believe the industry continues to

7 enthusiastically support this policy, and in fact will

8 continue to do so in the future.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You heard this morning something I think was very significant. When one of the panelists said staff regulation drives innovation, and that is what it has done. It has driven innovation in product composition, innovation in how to advertise appropriately to children.

He also said self-regulation builds over time. That time is moving very quickly, because since 2005, 11 companies representing two-thirds of the industry have agreed to take significant advertising actions on behalf of children.

There have been questions about what media will do. Will media be like what is done by Disney? I think it will be for four quick reasons. One is there will be an impact from the advertisers themselves.

This initiative will really affect what children see on media.

1	Second, there will be competition in the
2	marketplace, to really want to be like Disney. Third,
3	there will be a great deal of concern from parents and
4	care givers that will continue to be in this area to
5	regulate this area. So you'll see media come along
6	too.

Final point. It is the Federal Trade

Commission that is the federal body in charge of

setting public policy in regard to children's

advertising. This institution has decades of

experience with advertising regulation; a sophisticated

understanding of how advertising can work to respond to

the concerns of consumers; improved products and ensure

consumers' greater choice in the marketplace.

In 2005, the agency challenged us to do better. I feel that we have done so and I really ask for the FTC to retain oversight in this area. Thank you.

MS. HARRINGTON: Thank you, Wally.

20 (Applause.)

MS. HARRINGTON: The title of this panel is "Scoring the Progress." I'll be scoring the presenters on time. Wally, you got a good solid C plus. About 90 seconds too long. Now let's see if we can up the stakes on the panel here.

1	MR. SNYDER: Better give every one that
2	grade.
3	MS. HARRINGTON: No. Everybody's going to
4	get graded here. Scoring the presenters. Mary? Let's
5	see if you can be fast.
6	MS. SOPHOS: All right, but let's see if I
7	can get the technology working here.
8	MS. HARRINGTON: We won't start until your
9	slide starts.
10	MS. SOPHOS: There we go.
11	MS. HARRINGTON: Okay. You're on.
12	MS. SOPHOS: Well, we've heard today from
13	some individual companies about their efforts, but I
14	wanted to give you a sense of the collective efforts of
15	the broader GMA food and beverage membership in a
16	couple of key areas.
17	So over the past several years, we have
18	periodically surveyed our members on their activities
19	to promote health and wellness. Forty-nine companies
20	representing 250 billion in annual sales have
21	responded, and I'm pleased to give you some highlights
22	of our 2006 survey.
23	As you know, advertising of Better For You
24	products is made possible for a company's success and
25	innovation, and that and product development. Over

the past five years, that innovation has resulted in over 10,000 new or reformulated products with nutritional improvements.

In addition, the industry has taken up the challenge to promote healthy choices, through a unique partnership with retailers called "Take a Peek," that brings the U.S. dietary guidelines and My Pyramid into supermarkets across the nation.

Finally, we are frequently asked to provide data about trends in marketing and advertising, and trends in the marketplace, and I'm going to provide some highlights of a recent study that we and the Association of National Advertisers commissioned on food and beverage TV advertising trends.

So first, through our survey, we've seen some major changes over the past five years, as virtually every company is providing enhanced nutritional choices. These reductions, we've seen reductions in saturated fats, trans-fats, reduction in calories, reduction in sugar, sugar and carbs, increased vitamin and mineral fortification and sodium reduction across the board.

In addition, 55 percent of our respondents have created new sizes of packaging for kids or are in the process of doing so.

You saw some great examples of how companies
are promoting nutrition and health, but this is a
phenomenon that is going is happening across the
industry. Ninety-six percent of respondents are
marketing improved products. Ninety percent are
conducting healthy lifestyle promotions.

Seventy-seven percent are conducting customer health promotions in communities. Eighty-nine percent of companies are supporting national or local initiatives, managing over \$40 million a year in nutrition and health-related activities and grants to communities, representing over 30 percent of the charitable contributions for the industry.

As I mentioned, Take a Peek is a landmark effort to move the federal government's dietary advice, from My Pyramid from the Internet to the grocery aisle, where consumers are making choices. It's an in-store promotion program that since its January launch has resulted in 2,300 items featured in 5,000 stores across the nation.

Only products that meet specific nutrition criteria and provide a meaningful contribution towards My Pyramid goals are featured.

Retailers are signing up for multiple promotions based on success, including record coupon

redemptions. It's also driving record traffic to the Mypyramid.gov website. This is also a program that retailers can tailor to the ethnic and cultural needs of their local shoppers.

Let me talk a little bit about some of the data and trends, as we are frequently asked what -- how are we tracking the changes. GMA and ANA commissioned the Georgetown Economic Service to look at food and beverage ads on television between 2004 and 2006. This extends the work we began with our study submitted to the FTC in July 2005.

What's happening with advertising trends? We compared our study to other studies, and this is based on Nielsen, actual data of impressions. We all agree on the big issue, the number of food and beverage advertisements seen by children two to eleven on all television has decreased over the last 30 years.

Since 1994, the Nielsen data shows a 22 percent decrease and a third of that decrease, over eight percent, has been in the last two years. On kids TV, the number has declined twice as fast, down 20 percent in the last two years.

This is important, because as we've heard, more than half of the food and beverage ads that kids see air on kids TV.

In beverages, some of the changes that we're
seeing are fewer ads for fruit and other drink mixes,
fewer ads for regular soft drinks, more ads for diet
soft drinks, more ads for fruit and vegetables, juices,
and a big increase in ads for bottled water, although
bottled water ads are still relatively low. These are
all on TV.

On kids TV, fruits and other drink mixes and soft drinks got more. Diet soft drinks, which gained on all TV, dropped on kids TV. Juice and bottled water gained much more on kids TV, but they start out very small. This is a small base that we're seeing here.

So there's been a lot of discussion about shifting the mix, but we're beginning to see the mix shifting already. In some other categories compared to 2006 and 2004, we're seeing fewer ads for cookies, snacks, candy, gums and mints and snacks.

On kids TV, cookies, snacks and candy dropped even more. Finally, on the -- in terms of meal components, we're seeing -- there you go, sorry.

I'll keep the slides up -- we're seeing drops in ads for cereal, breads, rolls, waffles and pancakes, frozen pizza and more ads for fruits and vegetables, although this starts from a very, very small base.

There's no doubt that we're climbing from a small base.

On kids TV, the cereal, breads, rolls and pancakes drop even more.

Let me conclude by saying that we're hopeful that we will have continued to see these innovations and the advertising to support these products in the marketplace accelerate over time. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. HARRINGTON: B minus. Margo, can you do better?

DR. WOOTAN: We'll see. As some of you might remember, the Center for Science in the Public Interest was pretty skeptical about the CBBB announcement for the food and beverage advertising initiative last November. But I am very pleasantly surprised with the commitments that companies have made today.

The food company pledges are a really good step forward toward reducing the marketing of the very worse junk food on television, kids' magazines, radio and the Internet. It's terrific to see Hershey, Mars and Coke agree to not target kids under 12 with any advertising, and for other companies to agree to very reasonable nutrition standards for their marketing.

Actually, I would say to agree to any nutrition standards for their marketing. I think two years ago, when I was up at this podium, I must have

said nutrition standards, nutrition standards a hundred times over and over again.

It was hard to get companies to even talk about nutrition standards. Just the fact that they've adopted nutrition standards for marketing at all, I think, is a huge step forward.

We were very concerned in November that the initiative was only going to require companies have half of their ads be for healthier products. We're very pleased to see that companies have done the right thing and have agreed to make 100 percent of their advertising be consistent with their nutrition standards.

Also, we're very pleased that companies have not chosen to use the loophole of balancing ads for low nutrition foods with healthy lifestyle messages, that we never thought it's a good idea to have physical activity and health messages incorporated into junk food ads. We think that actually does more harm than good. So I'm glad companies have shown a commitment to responsible advertising and not used this loophole.

Well, one of the things -- I think one of the negatives of today is who's not at the table. We strongly encourage other food companies to adopt strong policies for food marketing to kids.

Burger King, ConAgra, Nestle and Chuck E
Cheese are noticeably absent, given the amount of
marketing that they're doing to kids. I think I
noticed our litigation team jotting down their names.
While we heard which companies were participating and
which weren't.

Also I think missing are the entertainment companies, and I know the initiative was designed mostly for food companies. But there's no reason why it couldn't be expanded to include entertainment companies. We've been impressed with what Disney and Sesame Workshop has done and the nutrition standard that they put into place for their licensed characters, and very pleased to see what Disney has been doing in their theme parks.

I know as a mom, there's a noticeable difference in being at Disney theme parks, how many healthy options are there, how attractively they're packaged, and how affordable they are.

Nickelodeon and the Cartoon Network are miles behind the pack. Entertainment companies have as much responsibility for responsible food marketing to kids as the food companies do.

That may be even more, since they're the ones that are actually airing these ads. So Nick and the

1	Cartoon Network should adopt nutrition standards; they
2	should apply those to the use of their licensed
3	characters.

All the entertainment companies, Disney as well, need to apply their nutrition standards or have nutrition standards for their advertising on television and for marketing on their websites.

So while the food companies' announcements are a great step in the right direction, I think there are a few places to look at in the future. Maybe not today, but later on.

Companies should follow Kraft and General Mills' lead and agree not to market low nutrition foods in any schools. Applying these standards only to elementary schools -- they're not marketing only in elementary schools -- isn't enough.

Schools are a different place. We parents entrust our kids into the care of schools for many of their waking hours. We need to cover all schools, elementary, middle and high schools.

The sale of foods at vending machines and other venues in schools is an important way that many companies are marketing their products to kids.

Coke and Pepsi need to show that they are truly serious about limiting soda sales in schools, in

a way that is assured and enforceable. They need to move beyond voluntary guidelines and actively support Senator Harkin's bill to set national nutrition standards for all foods sold in schools.

Companies also should follow Kellogg and General Mills' lead and apply their nutrition standards to on-package marketing. Limiting the use of licensed characters in ads is a good start, but it should also apply to on-package.

The last concern I'll mention, as I see my time has run out, is that the initiative wasn't able to get industry-wide agreement on national nutrition standards for food marketing to kids, and we need that. This current mix of different nutrition standards by different companies is just way too confusing for parents, and for implementation and monitoring.

We need to be able to know what foods can be marketed, and which foods can't. Also, we need to continue to strengthen the nutrition standards over time. That I don't think most health professionals would agree that Rice Krispie Treats, Frosted Flakes, Coca Puffs and Cookie Crisp cereals are health foods. We need to move towards stronger nutrition standards.

So get the loopholes out of the standards, which some companies like Kraft and Pepsico have. One

1	would include not allowing foods that provide a
2	functional benefit like sports drinks to be marketed to
3	kids. Coke and Pepsi should stop pushing so hard to
4	keep sports drinks in schools, and Pepsi should agree
5	not to advertise Gatorade on television.
6	So I think as a country, we've made some
7	really good progress over the least three years. I
8	think today is a day to celebrate. But we'll be
9	watching to see if more food and entertainment
10	companies come on board, and also to see how CBBB, the
11	CBBB participating companies fulfill their commitments.
12	Thank you.
13	(Applause.)
14	MS. HARRINGTON: Thank you, Margo. A B
15	performance there. Kathryn.
16	DR. MONTGOMERY: Thank you.
17	MS. HARRINGTON: Make it a solid B.
18	DR. MONTGOMERY: I'm going to try. I'll try
19	my very best to, but I'll do this first though.
20	MS. HARRINGTON: This is a wonderful panel so
21	far, don't you think? We're moving it right along.
22	DR. MONTGOMERY: We're trying to move it
23	along. Okay, so the clock just starts now.
24	MS. HARRINGTON: Yes.
25	DD MONTCOMEDY. All right I want to make

1	three points basically, and I agree with Margo. I
2	think this is an important moment here. I see some
3	very significant progress today.

I do want to remind everyone, however, that these announcements are coming at a time of unprecedented intense legal and political pressure, brought by health advocates, regulatory agencies and Congressional members from both parties, including pressure through threatened lawsuits from some of my colleagues here.

As we've seen in the past, for selfregulation to work the most effectively, it really
needs to be backed up by government laws and
regulations enacted in order to enforce these
guidelines, particularly if we're going to establish a
level playing field for, of course, the companies and
for all consumers, and to establish uniform standards
as opposed to the kind of mix of complicated differing
standards that we've seen today.

I think one good model is the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act, where the Federal Trade Commission went to Congress to get the authority in order to create a rule, a set of rules that would apply to all of the industry.

I also want to remind everyone that times

have changed since the 1970's. We didn't have a childhood obesity crisis and we do now and it's very, very serious.

My second point is that any guidelines that are developed must address not only television but the full range of new and emerging digital strategies for marketing food.

Excuse me a moment. We released a report that I co-authored a couple of months ago on the -- documenting the range of marketing techniques that companies are using now, food and beverage companies, to reach young people.

These are designed to reach every touchpoint of a person's life, 24-7. It's a fundamental departure from traditional advertising. For example, we see mobile marketing, where they're using cell phones and text messaging to reach young people; behavioral profiling, where they can track every move, on-line or off, and compile elaborate profiles and aggregate that data across different media and over time.

Inserting brands in video games and responding to individual players' actions in real time, and giving people the opportunity to order foods online. Recruiting teens and kids to create ads themselves and market to each other peer to peer on-

line. Making branded profiles for various food
products on My Space and other social networks.

Then in the newest frontier, using avatars for advertising in Second Life and other three-dimensional virtual environments. That's just a very, very quick fast run-through. I urge you to go to Digitalads.org to see the rest of our report, and we will continue to follow these trends and these practices.

Also, we have urged the Federal Trade

Commission, in its investigation of food marketing, to

look at the full range of these techniques as it

investigates marketing practices.

Finally, industry guidelines must protect all children, not just the youngest children. Adolescents have to be included. I'm a mother of a teenager myself, and I can tell you that these young people are also very much influenced by marketing, and they are very much at risk for obesity as well.

They don't just automatically become immune to marketing when they turn 12. I don't even know why we picked that age. But we've got to look at teenagers. Teens spend their own money on food. They make more of their own food choices independently of their parents. They do more of their food consumption

1	outside of the home. They frequent fast food
2	restaurants.
3	As our research has documented, food
4	marketers can now target teens through a variety of new
5	digital venues, completely bypass, completely under the
6	radar of parental oversight.
7	In anticipation of this meeting, I went on-
8	line to the Wendy's Frostyfloat.com website and entered
9	and said I was 14. Now I'm getting e-mails reminding
10	me to please come back and by a Frost Float so I can
11	enter the contest and win an Nintendo Wii game console.
12	I don't have a slide for that, but nonetheless, you
13	might try it.
14	Anyway, I think this raises important privacy
15	issues, and it also raises a lot of other serious
16	issues. How are we going to create a healthy media
17	environment for young people, and I hope you'll
18	consider some of these issues. Thank you.
19	(Applause.)
20	MS. HARRINGTON: Thank you, Kathryn. That's
21	an A. That's an A.
22	DR. WARREN: Golly, I didn't dress for a
23	track meet, so
24	(Laughter.)

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

DR. WARREN: I'm Ron Warren of the University

25

of Arkansas. I just want to start by thanking the FTC for inviting us today. We've already heard about some of the initiatives announced as early as 2005, and most recently the NRC's initiatives.

What I wanted to do is just explain a little bit about studies that we did on advertising content at our university, and really set them in sort of a time line. These data are from -- are just past the first wave of initiatives. We analyzed over 7,000 food and beverage advertisements in daytime and prime programming, and did that over two time periods, from November 2004 to February 2005, and then again from January to May of 2006.

In the interest of staying within my five minutes and trying for my A, I'll just summarize very quickly. We analyzed product types, types of persuasive appeals used in the ads, and the use of production techniques that in the literature on children and media have shown to sort of both heighten children's attention to comprehension of and recall of television messages, but also potentially distract them from other elements of the message.

So things like animation, special visual effects, sound effects, musical jingles, that may distract a child from pertinent product information

that an advertiser's trying to communicate. Basically
what we found is very little change in the two years of
our sample, and the types of products that were
advertised, the kinds of appeals that were used to

5 advertise those products.

So while I'll certainly provide copies of that research to those who were interested, several people in the room have already read it. One thing I want to underscore from that research is that our concern is that it creates an environment where emotional appeals about food products, the use of these production techniques creates a kind of atmosphere or an attitude about food in children that may not serve them in the long run.

So there were two things, though, that I wanted to point out just very quickly. This was the same for all ads in our study, but it was also quite consistent in ads that were targeted at children, and aired during child-rated programs, programs that were rated TV-Y, TV-Y7 and TV-G.

But we did notice two improvements in our data. One was that unlike decades past, nutritional claims about the products advertised on television are one of the more frequent appeals that consumers will see now on TV.

When you look at only child-rated programs, of course, we found that dairy products have now entered the list of most frequently advertised products. That hasn't been true in decades past.

Now the last thing I sort of want to do is just introduce a few questions, and maybe we'll have time to discuss these or maybe not. But some of the potential gaps in self-regulatory efforts, as we see them, is this question we've heard sort of touched on once or twice a day about do we monitor only children's programming, or do we monitor shows that all kids watch?

A sizeable number of children watch prime time programming. Some of the most popular programs on TV are prime time programs for kids.

Secondly, is it enough to enforce product restrictions or change the product mix that we're advertising to children, which is an excellent and laudable step. But at the time same, can we use the same techniques that we've seen effectively market junk food to children, can we see them used to change kids' attitudes about food?

Have we been linking the consumption of food in children's minds to feeling better, and if so, we can turn that around and now tie nutritional

information into that same sort of an appeal?

So three things that I just want to sort of underscore here for our discussion. First, we think it's absolutely crucial to keep monitoring the industry's efforts to self-regulate food advertising, and I would add that independent evaluation of that will be an important component.

That effort to change the kind of content that children will see when they see persuasive messages about food consumption will be important to communicating that information, to helping kids develop better attitudes about food, and doing that within the network of very complicated social circles that kids live in on a day to day basis. That's something we haven't heard too much about today.

Children live in cultures that are their own, and while marketing is very effective at reaching those kinds of peer cultures for kids, we need to think of ways that we can also reach those kinds of peer cultures with these kinds of messages.

If you have any more questions, I'm certainly free to answer them after the panel or during the discussion, and my colleague, Jan Wicks, is with me today. Either of us can provide more information if you'd like. Thank you.

1	MS. HARRINGTON: Thank you, Ron. Ron
2	finished with a minute left, which he is ceding to the
3	gentlewoman from Senator Harkin's office.
4	DR. KRISHNAMOORTHY: I'm going to be quick.
5	MS. HARRINGTON: Hi Jenelle.
6	DR. KRISHNAMOORTHY: Thank you very much.
7	Senator Harkin very much wanted to come today, but as
8	you may know, we had an all-night vote-a-rama going on
9	or speaking going on, I should say, and we also had
10	several votes today and a committee markup. So he
11	could not make it.
12	However, there are several points he wanted
13	me to make on his behalf this afternoon. He did have
14	the fortunate opportunity to come to the summer
15	workshop in 2005, and I was looking at his remarks. He
16	said to the participants, he encouraged them to put the
17	interests of children first, and to hammer out a
18	meaningful, effective approach to self-regulation.
19	So today is the day we get to see what has
20	happened. He believed that the food and beverage
21	industry are headed in the right direction in the
22	ongoing battle to combat childhood obesity and the
23	surging rates of diabetes in children.
24	By their participation in this effort, the
25	industry has realized that it makes good business sense

to provide healthier	f	ood op	tions	and	l to	use	their	-
marketing creativity	t	o help	parer	nts	and	chil	dren	make
better choices.								

But -- there's always but, and this is key. While some companies have been leading the charge and have come up with bold initiatives, there are others that are still sitting on the sidelines. We need more companies to join this fight and to show real leadership.

Senator Harkin encourages more food and beverage companies, quick service restaurants, employers in the media industry to get involved with this initiative, and to make some more innovative pledges.

Senator Harkin and Senator Sam Brownback from Kansas have been participating in a complementary initiative over the last several months, the FCC Task Force on Media and Obesity.

They hope that these efforts today will lead to media companies stepping up, making commitments to using their marketing creativity to address kids' eating habits, and to also help our children make healthful food choices.

In sum, Senator Harkin commends the food and beverage industries for the important and in many cases

1	bold steps that have been taken today. But he will, as
2	always, continue to follow closely the implementation
3	of these pledges, and the enforcement. Thank you.
4	(Applause.)
5	QUESTIONS FROM THE AUDIENCE
6	MS. HARRINGTON: Thank you, Jenelle. All
7	right. Now the fun begins, for our panel and for you
8	in the audience. I think we'll have some good
9	interaction on these questions.
10	The first two questions, and if we can have
11	the first one just a popcorn response right down the
12	line. The title of this panel is "Scoring the
13	Progress," scoring the progress that we've made to date
14	on meeting the recommendations from the 2005 workshop.
15	So scoring with letter grades, starting with
16	you, Wally, how do you score the progress?
17	MR. SNYDER: Well, I'm certainly you gave
18	me a C plus in my speaking, but I certainly am going to
19	give
20	MS. HARRINGTON: Your content was excellent.
21	MR. SNYDER: I'm going to go higher than
22	that. I'm certainly going to say it's a B plus,
23	because CARU has been worked over. We also have the
24	initiative and who would have thought we would move
25	this quickly on the initiative with 11 companies  Tt's

1	really great to get this positive response from
2	consumers groups across the board.
3	So yes, there's more to be done, especially
4	bringing more companies in, more media companies in
5	particular. But it's certainly a B plus and I think
6	it's going up.
7	MS. HARRINGTON: Okay. Let's go to a tougher
8	grader. Kathryn?
9	DR. MONTGOMERY: Well, I'm concerned about
10	grade inflation.
11	(Laughter.)
12	DR. MONTGOMERY: I'd probably say C plus.
13	MS. HARRINGTON: Okay. Mary?
14	MS. SOPHOS: Well, I think if you look at the
15	challenges that we've been addressing, and particularly
16	those that were laid about the FTC and IOM, I think
17	we've made we ought to be judged at least a B plus,
18	because I think we've hit almost every single area that
19	we've been asked to address.
20	MS. HARRINGTON: Ron?
21	DR. WARREN: As an academic, I tell my
22	students I never grade first drafts. So in our study,
23	we noted some small steps of progress. But I think I'm
24	encouraged by a lot of what I hear today. So there's

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

excellent promise in the revision.

25

1	MS. HARRINGTON: Wow, okay. Margo?
2	DR. WOOTAN: I'm going to dodge too, and I'm
3	going to say wait for our grades, because they'll be
4	coming out soon.
5	MS. HARRINGTON: Okay, and Jenelle?
6	DR. KRISHNAMOORTHY: I would say a cautionary
7	B plus, in that we're, you know, really want to
8	again, the proof will be as we move forward, and to see
9	how these pledges are implemented.
10	MS. HARRINGTON: Okay. Now we're going to
11	poll our audience, but before we do, let me give you
12	the next question to be thinking about. As they say in
13	Great Britain, "mind the gap." Where are the gaps?
14	Where are the gaps?
15	All right. So what do you people think? We
16	have a range here from where were you, Wally, a B
17	plus?
18	MR. SNYDER: B plus.
19	MS. HARRINGTON: Anybody out there in the B
20	range? B? The C range, the A range?
21	FEMALE PARTICIPANT: (Not on microphone) I
22	say A minus for the companies that are in the
23	coalition.
24	MS. HARRINGTON: There we go, okay. There's
25	the gap.

1	DR. MONTGOMERY: Can I say something, being a
2	professor too. This is a kind of a group project, you
3	know. So like you all get the grade in a way. I mean
4	if you look at it from the consumer point of view, it's
5	a whole we have to look at the whole industry.

Yes, the people in this group who have done well would get A's, but we have to give them a group grade. So you know, they've got to get their classmates to come up to speed.

MS. SOPHOS: Well, if we do that, we need to reflect that we're talking about two-thirds of the advertising to kids that's in the universe. So it's not simply, you know. We've gotten over half, well over half of the folks involved. So I think you need to factor that in.

MS. HARRINGTON: There's a school that I'm a big fan of that gives two grades, an achievement grade and an effort grade. None of the students in the class can get an A if their classmates are failing. I think that's your point.

All right. Anyone else in the audience have a comment on scoring the progress to date before we come back to the gaps? Yes.

MS. RUBIN: (Not on microphone) My name is
Ms. Rubin, and I have to say I'm a hard grader, because

1	my bottom line is my three daughters.
2	MS. HARRINGTON: So what's your grade?
3	MS. RUBIN: My grade is a D, okay. Twenty-
4	five years ago, the FTC possibly could have prevented
5	some of the problem we're dealing with now if it had
6	been a little harder on marketing directly to kids.
7	When my kids watch junk food ads on TV, you
8	undermine my parental authority, and you make my life a
9	lot harder in the market. So I'm going to turn off the
10	TV and I'm going to try to keep my kids away from more
11	and more screens.
12	MS. HARRINGTON: Okay. You know, the
13	interests change over the years. Twenty-five years
14	ago, the issue was cavities, oral hygiene. So we're
15	dealing with a different issue.
16	MS. RUBIN: Ours is a higher objective. We
17	need to go back to school for nutrition, because my
18	kids were eating garbage.
19	MS. HARRINGTON: Okay, thank you. Back to
20	our panel, and we'll come back to you. Don't worry,
21	audience. Where are the gaps? What is the principle
22	gap that you're seeing? Margo?
23	DR. WOOTAN: Well, I mentioned a few. One is
24	the companies that are missing, the food companies, the

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

fast food companies, and some of the entertainment

24

25

1 companies, and I think bringing the whole entertainment 2 industry under this.

The other is I think we need industry-wide nutrition standards. I can't even keep track of all the different standards. I'm constantly e-mailing different companies about "I saw this ad for this particular cereal. I thought it didn't meet your standards," and then, you know, them getting back to me. Here I am following this as a professional, you know, not only as a mom.

It's very confusing. I think we need consistent standards. We need to get rid of loopholes like 25 percent reduced fat, sodium and sugars. The foods need to meet the standards, in a straightforward way. This reduced category or, you know, allowing reduced products. Reduced doesn't mean low enough.

Also, the functional benefit, I think especially with sports drinks. You know, if I were the beverage companies, I would just give up on pushing hard on sports drinks and advertising in schools, so that this issue will go away, so that the advocates or parents don't have anything to complain about. Have a nice, clean policy.

If the companies keep pushing on sports drinks in school, we're going to keep complaining about

1	sugary beverages in schools. Then on schools overall,
2	I think it has to include middle and high schools,
3	because of that's where the problem is. It's not
4	enough to just address the sale of low nutrition foods
5	or the marketing of low nutrition foods in elementary
6	schools. It needs to be in middle schools and high
7	schools as well.

MS. HARRINGTON: Okay, Wally?

MR. SNYDER: I think that -- I don't agree that there has to be one standard, one nutritional standard. I think that if we had waited for that, we would not have this progress we have right now. The other thing we have to remember is there's a great deal of transparency here, as to exactly what these companies have promised.

They've said exactly what they will do, and there will be oversight of that by the initiative, so we will know where they stand on these issues. I think that's better.

I know there's a lot of complication here, but I think parents have to really be able to believe that what the kids see on those ads on children's programming is for better foods, and that progress had been made.

MS. HARRINGTON: Do you see gaps?

1	MR. SNYDER: I think the gaps that really can
2	be addressed are not all the companies are in. But
3	when Margo says it, I think that's very positive,
4	because that can be addressed. I think more and more
5	companies will come into this quickly as we move
6	forward. That's a gap right now.
7	MS. HARRINGTON: Jenelle?
8	DR. KRISHNAMOORTHY: I think something that
9	Senator Harkin has definitely been concerned about is
10	getting more of the media companies involved, and with
11	different entertainment, the entertainment companies,
12	as we have more films come out and things like that
13	that we're watching, where licensed characters are
14	going and how they are being used.
15	So we again, you know, we're hoping that with
16	the FCC Task Force and the report due out in early
17	September, that possibly the media companies and the

So we again, you know, we're hoping that with the FCC Task Force and the report due out in early September, that possibly the media companies and the entertainment sector can really step forward with, you know, a bold initiative to follow in suit with the food and beverage companies today.

MS. HARRINGTON: Ron?

DR. WARREN: I certainly want to underscore some of what Margo has said, you know. In our data, pizza and fast food ads were one in four food ads in over 7,000 ads that we analyzed. So I'd certainly

1 underscore what Margo said a few minutes ago.

I would also again just sort of underscore the fact that it is absolutely excellent and laudable that we have self-regulation on programming that's directed at children.

I want to underscore the fact that that's not all the programming that children watch even on television, and television is certainly not the only medium that children use. So that's a gap I sort of want to underscore too.

One point that I guess I didn't mention in my effort to stay under the five minutes there was that speaking from a research perspective, the literature is not exactly voluminous yet on what's happening with marketing messages when they reach the home, and what parents and children are doing together to sort of negotiate marketing's influence on their diet and what's in their cupboard. So that's a gap I would certainly underscore as well.

MS. HARRINGTON: Mary?

MS. SOPHOS: Well, I don't know if this is a gap or just an opportunity that we should seize, and that is I go back to what I think Chris Shea was talking about, and that is that there is a unique opportunity for the media and food and public sector to

talk a little bit more to the consumer about calories and about energy balance.

They need a context for understanding how to manage their diet, and they do not understand calories. They don't understand the concept. I think that this is an opportunity. If you're talking about people in media and entertainment and food and everywhere else stepping up and doing something that's useful, I think that would be a tremendous opportunity.

MS. HARRINGTON: Kathryn?

DR. MONTGOMERY: Yeah. I've laid out some of mine already. I think there are several key gaps here. First of all, I agree with Margo and others that, as I said, that the standards are very confusing. They're not uniform and I was worried that maybe I have to take a test on it to see who -- which companies had which standards. It's very, very complicated.

I think that could be made much simpler and easier to understand, and I would hope that the industry would work toward that and that government could play a role there. I just want to underscore what I said earlier about the nature of the digital media culture. Television is not part of this new culture.

It's not something different from it. It's

1	not as if the Internet is something separate. We
2	really have to make sure that we're not just developing
3	guidelines that apply to television. There are some
4	that apply to the Internet, but definitely not enough.
5	I mean some of the advergame requirements, for example,
6	for companies sites, that's very limited.

It has gone way beyond that and it's going much, much faster than any of the changes we're seeing industry make, and I think they need to step up to the plate there, and I think the FTC needs to play a strong role and I hope they will.

MS. HARRINGTON: Okay.

MS. SOPHOS: If I could just add one point --

MS. HARRINGTON: Sure.

MS. SOPHOS: Or a caution really on the one nutritional standard. I think part of the flexibility that is in place in this is it's actually designed to create the largest possible impact. We're talking about small differences, but to the consumer, the net result is a whole range of improved foods.

I think what you've seen is by the data that I laid out, we've seen tremendous innovation and product reformulation driven by competition. If everybody's conforming to a single standard, I'm not sure you would get the broad impact and the variety of

1 engagement from products across the board in terms of this overall improvement.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think that's just a caution, as you look at this, because we should be looking at outcomes, not whether there's differences, minor or otherwise, in nutrition standards across product categories and product portfolios that are very, very different.

DR. WOOTAN: I think, you know, that's -- I think the standards for today are great, and today should be mostly about celebrating and companies should feel really good about how far they've come and what they're doing. But I think we should be moving toward a single standard.

The hodgepodge of standards is going to be very difficult for monitoring. I mean it's going to be hard enough for CBBB and Elaine to monitor. You know, I find, as a consumer advocate, it very hard to monitor, and I am constantly calling and e-mailing companies, saying I saw this ad.

I don't think it met your standards, what's going on, that how complicated some of the standards are and the differences between the different standards and how they're applied make it very difficult for even people who are doing this for a living to monitor, much less for parents to be able to keep an eye on whether

1	or not the companies are following it.
2	So I think to really get the public engaged,
3	to make it easier to monitor, easier to enforce, we
4	should be moving toward a single standard, a strong
5	standard but a single standard.
6	MS. HARRINGTON: Okay. We're going to have a
7	couple of very quick comments from the audience right
8	here.
9	MS. PATTON: First of all, I just want to say
10	that, you know, being a mother and being
11	MS. HARRINGTON: Can you identify yourself?
12	MS. PATTON: Diana Patton from Toledo, Ohio.
13	MS. HARRINGTON: Thanks.
14	MS. PATTON: I'm a mother/nutritionalist and
15	life coach. Last time, I don't teach calorie counting.
16	I don't know. Does anyone count calories here? You've
17	got a gram counter? Okay. I just want to make
18	certain, because I understand this being the standard,
19	but I just want to say to the youth, this is not
20	something that they are going to relate to.
21	I think the advertisers know that emotion
22	to what you said Ron is what people relate to. So I
23	think if we want to get to these to our youth, is

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

having them draw the correlation between what they're

doing and what they're eating, to what they're feeling

24

25

1	and	how	they'	re	reacting.

Advertisers know that. We know that. So all I'm saying is is going out and just preaching nutrition education is one thing, which tends to fall on deaf ears because we've been doing it for a very, very, very long time, and we are not seeing the results.

So I see the gap being on emotion, and making certain that we have our children understand that this leads to chronic disease. One suggestion. Implement some warning labels to these foods, that these foods have been known to contribute to chronic disease. How about that?

Okay, because we do it with smoking and cancer is a big issue and so is obesity. So I have one other comment, thank you, and to stop the undermining of deceptive advertising. For example, that licorice is a low fat food. Thank you.

MS. HARRINGTON: Thank you. One quick comment back here.

DR. KUNKEL: Yes. I'm Dale Kunkel from the University of Arizona, and I wanted to pursue the point that Mary Sophos was making.

I appreciate the argument you're offering, which is that companies, for example like Hershey's or Mars, may not be able to be part of this program if you

1 use absolute standards for nutrition.

I don't mean to pick on those, because I

don't know their nutritional qualities. But candy

companies, for example, may have difficulty coming in

with one standard. So you're saying that the program

has merit because it brings in more participants.

But this is a counterpoint that I think is likely to result from having differing standards. In a paper I published in the last few months in the *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior*, we looked at the early food rating systems like Smart Spot and Sensible Solutions, and we found they're both well-intentioned efforts by different companies, but they employ differing criteria.

So what it comes down to is you can find products like one bag of potato chips that qualifies as a healthy food in one framework but not in the other. If you get to the point where consumers, parents then see that reported in the press, if they see that "Oh well, it came from Kellogg's, so for Kellogg's a healthy product but it wouldn't be if it came from Pepsico," I think the public is likely to lose confidence in your program.

I think that's the reason why Margo and others are suggesting so strongly that you think about

Τ	moving towards the prospect of uniform standards. Do
2	you see that point?
3	MS. HARRINGTON: Thank you.
4	DR. KUNKEL: Or do you want to respond, I
5	should say?
6	MR. SNYDER: I think we did.
7	MS. HARRINGTON: Yes, I think we've had a
8	response on that, and I have a new question for the
9	panel. Let's look to 2008 now, you know. Gaze into
10	your crystal ball.
11	What is going to happen in 2008, either
12	broadly in the childhood obesity debate/discussion,
13	initiatives or specifically with regard to food
14	marketing? Where are we going to be? What will happen
15	in 2008 and what are we going to be facing? Because we
16	want to be ready and figure out what we need to score
17	progress on next.
18	MR. SNYDER: I think that what you will see
19	in 2008, additional companies that agree to be part of
20	this initiative. How many, I'm not sure
21	MS. HARRINGTON: We're going to get the other
22	third, or are we going to get all of them?
23	MR. SNYDER: Well, you're going to get, I
24	think, a substantial number that are going to be coming
25	in, because they're going to see how this works for

1	their	competi	itors.	. I	think	they're	going	to	see	that
2	it's v	working	well	for	them.					

So I believe you'll see more coming in, and I think that once we've started down this road, it's going to continue to expand. There's not going to be a retreat.

MS. SOPHOS: I think what we're likely to is the impact of the changes and the implementation of a lot of the initiatives we've seen, and we're going to start to see reports from the CBBB on their monitoring of how effectively the companies are living up to their commitments. I think that will be a key benchmark.

## MS. HARRINGTON: Margo?

DR. WOOTAN: I would agree with Wally. I hope we'll see more companies joining in, especially the entertainment companies. I think that companies that have made pledges today will be working toward implementing those pledges.

So I mean it looked like that was going to take through 2008. So then in 2009, I think we'll start to think about enhancements and some of the gaps in the policies. I think the other thing, where parents have really focused on food marketing is in schools, especially on the sale of low nutrition foods and soft drinks in schools.

1	That's the biggest concern of parents.
2	That's been the major focus by the public health
3	community. I think if we don't pass national standards
4	for and get soda and low nutrition foods out of schools
5	nationally, that parents will not see the overall
6	initiative as a success.

I think that's the thing they're working on. They're looking at if we don't pass Senator Harkin's bill, parents will think we haven't really begun to address obesity.

DR. MONTGOMERY: I know that we will see more and more food and beverage marketing moving further into the digital media, into 3-D virtual reality, into social networks and even newer platforms that are emerging.

So I hope we will see from industry some very clear and strong guidelines for addressing those. I haven't yet really heard of that, so I'm looking forward to what you all will bring to the public next year.

DR. WARREN: Well, I certainly think that we should see a shift in the types of products that are advertised to children. I certainly hope that. I hope we also see changes in the types of products that are advertised in general, especially in dominant media.

I expect that we'll see less of a change in the kinds of persuasive appeals that are used to market products to children, and I certainly don't think food is the only example I could offer of the use of those kinds of appeals. But it would be nice to see those appeals directed towards healthier alternatives.

I expect that in -- well, I hope, I hope for all the world that in a year, we're ready to move on and start looking at how policy makes an impact in the home. There's not a lot of attention in this day and age to the way that parents and children can make use of these kinds of policies.

I know that it's the FTC's concern and mission to make sure that consumers have as many tools in their arsenal as possible to fight the good fight.

So I hope that a year from now, we're ready to focus on those kinds of issues as well.

MS. HARRINGTON: Jenelle?

DR. KRISHNAMOORTHY: I will just add that I think, as Mary said, you know, hopefully there will be this competition that you're saying, and that this is just the beginning, and that people are going to ratchet it up. There's going to be more reformulation of foods, and those are the foods we're going to see these healthy foods being advertised.

1	I'd also say from Senator Harkin's
2	perspective that we want to reevaluate these and see
3	where are other areas that we can have more public-
4	private partnerships to assist in giving more healthful
5	choices to our kids and to adults.
6	MS. HARRINGTON: We have time for a couple of
7	audience questions. Back here?
8	MR. HOFFMAN: Yes. My name is Adonis
9	Hoffman. I'm a Fellow at the Center for Responsible
10	Media and Marketing at the American Business Leadership
11	Institute.
12	My question goes to, I guess, address the
13	question you posed, Eileen, with respect to gaps.
14	African-Americans and Hispanics are over-indexers.
15	They over-index in media consumption, they over-index
16	in the purchasing of food and grocery products. They
17	over-index in the consumption of the foods in question,
18	and they over-index in health disparities. But they
19	under-index in the dollars that are targeted to efforts
20	to address these problems.
21	The question I have to the panelists, both on
22	the advocacy side and the industry, is what are you
23	doing specifically to address these, the
24	disproportionate impact that obesity has in these
25	particular populations?

MS. HARRINGTON: We'll start on the other end
this time. Jenelle, can we begin with you and just
move down the panel?

DR. KRISHNAMOORTHY: That's a very good question. I know that just in the more government arena, we have definitely been trying to find more research in these areas, and trying to examine where the federal government can put more initiatives, so we can -- and we have a minority health bill that we're considering right now on the Health Committee, that would give more attention to these issues.

DR. WARREN: I think my first response would be yes to everything that you said, of course. But to also recognize that there's an opportunity now with the sort of media mix that we have available to kids, especially from minority families. There's a real opportunity to start to reach out to those kids, and to reach out to families who, I think, need a lot of help getting these kinds of things done.

So you know, earlier today we heard from the folks at the BET Foundation. I would love to see those efforts quadruple. I hope they will. I don't know if they will, but I think that's got to be a primary goal in whatever policy the FTC decides to craft in this area.

1	DR. MONTGOMERY: You've raised a very
2	important point, and I'm sorry that there was no one
3	really on the panel to talk about the marketing part
4	targeted at multicultural target markets of young
5	people.

We did cover some of this in our report a couple of months ago, but it's a very, very important area that the FTC needs to look at, because there is a great deal of very aggressive marketing that's aimed specifically at these target demographic groups, where there are particular vulnerabilities. It's got to be on the agenda. It's got to be addressed.

DR. WOOTAN: Well, I think the pledges that companies have made today will be of great benefit to low income and minority children, that for children under 12, the kids are all watching the same programming. There isn't black children's television and white children's television. I mean the kids basically all watch the same programming.

It's just that lower income and black children watch more of it. So I think by changing the mix of advertising, reducing the marketing of low nutrition foods, that will be a huge benefit to low income children.

Also, we're working on improving school

nutrition environments, improving school meals, and trying to get the low nutrition foods out of the vending machines at school stores, a la carte. That's going to help all children, low income, high income, all over the country.

So I think again, I don't know how many times I've said it, we've got to pass Senator Harkin's bill and get the soda and the low nutrition foods out of schools, because that really undermines children's diets, it undermines nutrition education, it undermines parents' efforts to feed their children healthfully, that it sends the wrong message to children about healthy eating.

I think another thing we need to look at is restaurant food consumption and fast food consumption that in a lot of low income neighborhoods families rely a lot on fast food restaurants to feed their families. There aren't supermarkets and there are fast food outlets. That's a key category that's marketed to children.

One policy that we're working on to help parents to make better choices for their children in fast food and other chain restaurants is to require chain restaurants to list the calories on the menu board, so that people can make informed decisions.

Senator Harkin has a national bill and there
are bills that have been introduced in over 20 cities,
counties and states across the country. The first to
pass is in New York City, and the second to pass, I
hope, will be tomorrow in King County in the state of
Washington.

But this is a growing movement across the country, and I think will really help families for what is a growing and often problematic part of their diet.

MS. SOPHOS: Yes. Let me mention just a couple of things, and we know it's documented that certain groups are more vulnerable to the obesity crisis. It's blacks and Hispanic community as well.

In 2003, the food and beverage industry established the American Council for Fitness and Nutrition, whose goal was to promote partnership to address childhood obesity.

We have partnered with the American Dietetic Association and their practices in black and Hispanic communities, to develop specific blueprints for community engagement, recognizing that you need to talk to folks who are used to building community efforts.

We've worked with them to disseminate those blueprints across communities across the country.

We've also, when the USDA promoted or first

1	published their new dietary guidelines, we translated
2	those, that curriculum into English and Spanish
3	versions that could be sent out through the Weekly
4	Reader, and help give teachers some easy curriculum and
5	parents also, so that these had parents take-home
6	projects and so forth.
7	There are a number of other areas that we've
8	tried to focus on, but I think a great deal more needs
9	to be done.
10	MR. SNYDER: I really agree with the way Ron
11	put it. I think that we need to continue to reach out
12	to minority families and children with education, and
13	to do so in relevant ways, culturally and ethically so
14	that really these messages work.
15	I really was very much taken by Linda Dorman
16	on the BET Foundation and all the work that's being
17	done right there. So that's the groups we should be
18	partnering with.
19	MS. HARRINGTON: Well, I think we could
20	probably go all night. But there's one person
21	designated to have the last word today, and that's
22	Lydia Parnes. But let's thank our panel first.
23	(Applause.)
24	REMARKS - LYDIA PARNES
25	MS. PARNES: Well, what oh. I'm going to

1	just put this down. What a spectacular day this has
2	been. I want to thank all of our speakers, panelists
3	and all of you folks who attended this conference, for
4	participating in today's forum.
5	If you'll indulge me for just a moment, a
6	very special thank you to the FTC staff who did such a
7	fabulous job of putting this forum together.
8	(Applause.)
9	MS. PARNES: I'm going to name names. Mary
10	Johnson, Carol Jennings, Sarah Botha, Keith Fenton-
11	Miller, Dana Feingold, Aaron Malik, our summer college
12	interns and the entire Air Practices support staff. So
13	thank you all for all of the tremendous work that
14	you've done.
15	(Applause.)
16	MS. PARNES: I know we've got a lot of folks
17	here who have traveled and you're eager to get home.
18	So I'm going to talk fast and if Eileen was still here,
19	she would give me an A on this.
20	(Laughter.)
21	MS. PARNES: Some of you, you know, we've
22	been talking about, you know, television and
23	advertising on television. So I'm going to refer back
24	to a television series from the 1970's that some of you

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

25

may remember, Kung Fu. It starred David Carradine and

1 he was a wondering monk.

In a flashback to his childhood, his master unravels a large roll of rice paper along the floor, and asks the young monk to walk on the rice paper. The master says that when he can walk on the rice paper without leaving a trace, he'll be ready to leave the monastery and go out into the world.

In a similar way, we in the government, industry, educators, advocates, as parents, we all need to be masters as well. We need to educate and motivate our children to lighten their caloric footprint, so that they can walk through this world without the burdens of overweight and obesity.

Childhood obesity is such a difficult problem to tackle, because as all of our panelists today have discussed, it results from a confluence of factors.

Less physical activity at home and at school; changes in family eating patterns; competitive foods and beverages in schools; and a popular culture that encourages over-consumption in general, and that's just to name a few.

Although food marketing to children also may play a role in childhood obesity, our purpose today was not to debate causation or to assign any blame.

Instead, we focused on the strategies that food and the

media industry members have adopted or pledged to adopt
for our children's health.

Based on what I've heard today, I am very optimistic that industry self-regulation will continue to adapt and help make healthy choice the easy choice.

Our 2006 report on childhood obesity announced several recommendations to improve self-regulation in the food marketing industry, and as we heard today, there are significant industry members who have stepped up to the plate, most significantly consider the 11 members of the children's food and beverage advertising initiative.

Three have pledged not to advertise to kids at all. Eight have adopted minimum nutritional standards for marketing to children under 12. All foods these eight will advertise to children will soon meet Better For You nutritional standards.

These companies account for two-thirds of television food ads directed at kids. So in the years to come, as our recent panelists noted, we should see a real change in the types of food ads that our children see.

But to the companies responsible to the remaining one-third of ad expenditures, I join our panelists in asking why aren't you here today with your

pledges? We expect you to join this self-regulatory effort sooner rather than later.

There's been follow-through on several other recommendations from the 2006 report. First, CARU now has the authority to take action against unfair advertising targeted to children, and to address newer forms of marketing, such as advergaming, buzz marketing, enviromarketing.

Second, food companies like Kraft, Kellogg's and General Mills have designed packaging to control portion sizes and have reformulated existing products or created new ones that are lower in calories or are more nutritious. Personally, I really love the 100 calorie packs of anything. I think they're great.

Third, cereal boxes for General Mills and Kellogg's and packaging for many Kraft and Pepsico products among others, carry nutritional information or icons to help consumers easily identify nutritious and lower calorie products.

One question that's been discussed today and that remains is whether consumers would benefit from a uniform front of the package seal to identify healthier foods. The Keystone Center for Food and Nutrition Roundtable has begun to explore this very idea, and I am sure that we'll be hearing more on that front.

Fourth, leading food manufacturers and the
major beverage companies have partnered with the
Alliance for a Healthier Generation, to establish
nutritional guidelines for beverages and competitive
foods in our schools. We've also heard that food
companies have enhanced their public education efforts
on nutrition and fitness.

Fifth, media and entertainment companies like the BET Foundation and corporate partners of the Ad Council have continued to disseminate effective messages to children and parents about nutrition and fitness. The Walt Disney Company and the Sesame Workshop have adopted policies that gear the use of licensed television and movie characters towards more nutritious, lower-calorie products.

Their bold new policies are commendable, but the remaining movie studios and television content providers must follow suit. Like Disney and Sesame, these companies well understand the persuasive power of their characters.

So we expect that they too will go beyond public service announcements and rein in the use of their licensed characters to sell less nutritious foods. What will the FTC be doing?

Well, we'll be carefully scrutinizing the

industry pledges announced today. We'll monitor both
the level of compliance and if necessary the
sufficiency of penalties imposed against members who
break their pledges. We'll also assess the quality of
the pledges themselves.

To assist our analysis, within weeks, we will be serving compulsory process orders on 44 food and beverage companies that market to children and adolescents. The study will establish a baseline of child and adolescent-directed marketing practices by which to measure the success of industry initiatives.

It will provide us with a comprehensive look at how the food industry uses measured media, such as television and print advertising, and unmeasured media, such as in-store marketing, character licensing, viral marketing and product placements, to target children and adolescents.

Once we've analyzed the data, we will issue a report on these methods and expenditures. In addition, we'll be issuing our own report card on industry responses to the recommendations we made in the 2006 report.

As Chairman Majoras said this morning, the battle against childhood overweight and obesity is a marathon. I am very encouraged that members of the

1	food marketing industry are on their way in this
2	marathon. It's up to the rest of the industry to join
3	the race.
4	Thank you again so much for attending, and we
5	look forward to seeing you maybe next year.
6	(Whereupon, at 4:26 p.m., the meeting was
7	concluded.)
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	CERTIFICATION OF REPORTER
2	
3	CASE TITLE: WEIGHING IN: MARKETING, REGULATION AND
4	CHILDHOOD OBESITY
5	HEARING DATE: JULY 18, 2007
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
10	the FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION to the best of my
11	knowledge and belief.
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	