Clarification on Sponsorship of Health Professional and Scientific Meetings

The purpose of this online consultation is to gather relevant information from affected stakeholders and civil society to ensure the clarification is fit-for-purpose, acceptable and feasible, and to identify potential unintended consequences of this clarification for the implementation of WHO Guidance on Ending the Inappropriate Promotion of Foods for Infants and Young Children welcomed by the 69th World Health Assembly.


* Required

1. Name(s) *

Maryse Arendt

2. Role or Job Title *

Lactation consultant IBCLC

3. Organisational affiliation (if any)

Berufsverband vun den Lakatatiounsberoderinnen zu Lëtzebuerg
4. Country of residence *

Luxembourg

5. Email address for primary contact *

maryse.arendt@pt.lu

6. Is the meaning of the document clear? *

- Yes
- No (add comments below)

7. Please explain what is unclear and / or make suggestions for making it clearer.

It is a pity that it covers not all product under the Code and is not extending it at least to these products somewhere in the text! Selling conference space generates income for the organisation that organises a conference so for me this is sponsorship too. A way out would be to limit the price between what the organisers pay to rent the premises and the price they sell it.

8. Is there some type of sponsorship that is not discussed in the document but should be? *

- Yes (add comments below)
- No

9. Please explain what type of sponsorship is not discussed in the document but should be?
Conference sponsoring by BMS producers could happen by other means: paying registration fees, travel or accommodation to attendants. This is not covered and should be included.

The issue of foundations of BMS producers or other producers falling under the scope of the Code or of research institutes bearing the names of BMS producers are not touched upon.

10. Are there setting specific or contextual issues that should be considered? *

- Yes (add comments below)
- No

11. Please explain the setting specific or contextual issues that should be considered and describe how the content could be changed to accommodate them.

As some of the examples are taken from pharmaceutical sponsorship it would be good to say that for ethical consideration all sponsorships bear the same risks of influence to HP and should be refused/avoided (no free lunch organisation, as an example and not only in the references). This would allow to place it beyond the Code and integrate it in a more general ethical view.

12. Are there implication for implementation or feasibility that we should consider? *

- Yes (add comments below)
- No

13. Please describe the implications for implementation or feasibility that we should consider.

Framing it somewhere in a general ethical view of HP would not single out BF and the Code.

Feasibility and implementation depend on good will of organisers and the ESPGHAN declaration (and Italian scientific societies example) is far away from documenting any will for change.

Organising conferences without BMS sponsors is feasible and has been demonstrated by some conference organisers.

A list of those not adhering could be published or a positive list be published to have at
14. If there is something else you would like to say about the content, please write it in the box below.

As this relates only to sponsorship there is a risk that the sponsorship money will be redirected for unethical research or social media coverage or whatever else could be invented to increase the demands for the targeted products.