

**NICE PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAMME GUIDANCE  
Alcohol- use disorders (prevention)**

**2<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the Programme Development Group**

**Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> October 2008**

**Level 1A, City Tower, Piccadilly Plaza, Manchester M1 4BD**

**Final Minutes**

<b>Attendees:</b>	<p><b>PDG Members</b> Jane Benanti (<b>JB</b>), John Dervan (<b>JD</b>), Paul Edmondson-Jones (<b>PE</b>), Vivienne Evans (<b>VE</b>), Jayne Gosnall (<b>JG</b>), Sauid Ishaq (<b>SI</b>), Eileen Kaner (<b>EK</b>), Anne Ludbrook. (<b>AL</b>) Harshad Mistri (<b>HM</b>), Trevor McCarthy (<b>TM</b>), Lynn Owens (<b>LO</b>), Chris Record (<b>CR</b>), Don Shenker (<b>DS</b>), Ian Treasure (<b>IT</b>).</p> <p><b>NICE</b> Dylan Jones (<b>DJ</b>), James Jagroo (<b>JJ</b>), Antony Morgan (<b>AM</b>), Patricia Mountain (<b>PM</b>), Bhash Naidoo (<b>BN</b>),</p> <p><b>Contractors - SchARR</b> Liddy Goyder (<b>LG</b>), Rachel Jackson (<b>RJ</b>), Maxine Johnson (<b>MJ</b>), Robin Purshouse (<b>RP</b>)</p> <p><b>Observers</b> Gregory Jones (<b>GJ</b>) – NICE team – Communications team Taryn Krause (<b>TK</b>) – National Collaborating centre for Chronic Conditions</p>	
<b>Apologies:</b>	<p><b>PDG Members</b> Clare Gerada (<b>CG</b>), Nick Heather (<b>NH</b>), Paul McArdle (<b>PMc</b>), Jim McCambridge (<b>JMc</b>)</p> <p><b>NICE Team</b> Andrew Hoy (<b>AH</b>), Mike Kelly (<b>MK</b>) Linda Sheppard (<b>LS</b>).</p> <p><b>Co- Optees</b> Peter Anderson</p>	
<b>Authors</b>	Patricia Mountain	
<b>File Ref</b>		
<b>Version</b>	Final Minutes – PDG approved 2.12.2008	
<b>Audience</b>	<b>PDG members, NICE team, the public (via web publication)</b>	

Item		Action
1	<p><b>Welcome, Introductions and Aims of the Meeting</b></p> <p>The Chair welcomed everyone to the second meeting. PDG members, NICE staff, observers and contractors introduced themselves to the group and apologies were received.</p> <p>The Chair outlined the objectives of the day:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To discuss the findings of evidence reviews</li> <li>• To consider any implications from the evidence presented in this review for the development of guidance/draft recommendations</li> <li>• To further develop the scope of the guidance</li> </ul>	
2	<p><b>Minutes from the previous meeting, Declarations of Interest and matters arising</b></p> <p>The Chair asked the PDG Members for any accuracy amendments to the minutes of the previous meeting. These minutes were approved with some minor amendments. All actions have been completed. Members were asked for any new declarations of interests. Interests raised were;</p> <p>Anne Ludbrook – potential non personal pecuniary interest – as family members hold a small amount of shares in organisations that have retail alcohol sales; Tesco, Diablo and The Restaurant Group.</p> <p>Trevor McCarthy – potential personal pecuniary interest – self employed as a consultant, both directly by alcohol charities and indirectly by alcohol commissioning bodies.</p> <p>Don Shenker – potential personal non pecuniary interest as Chief Executive of Alcohol Concern, a professional organisation with a direct interest in matters under consideration.</p>	
3	<p><b>Clinical update</b></p> <p>Dylan Jones provided the PDG with an update from the third clinical guideline Guidelines Development Group (GDG). There were discussions around;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The biochemical and pharmaceutical care of dependent drinkers</li> <li>• Assessment tools to measure the degree and seriousness of withdrawal</li> <li>• Mental health and alcohol services as part of withdrawal support</li> <li>• The use of biochemical tests for abstinence, specifically around liver transplantation</li> </ul> <p>At the joint clinical guidelines and public health steering group for this guidance the scope of the clinical and public health questions were discussed to determine any potential overlap. Also, the final guidance products and their form were discussed. It was agreed that each of the</p>	

	<p>three pieces of NICE guidance that relate to alcohol use disorders will be published separately as three discrete pieces of guidance. There will also be a fourth product from NICE with an overarching narrative describing the conceptual framework in order to provide clear integrated guidance. This was welcomed by the Chair.</p>	
<b>4</b>	<p><b>Modelling - the link with the economics</b></p> <p>Bhash Naidoo gave a brief presentation on link between cost effectiveness reviews and economic modelling. This was followed by a discussion on how health economics will relate to the final piece of guidance produced by the PDG.</p>	
<b>5</b>	<p><b>The process of creating recommendations</b></p> <p>Antony Morgan gave a presentation to remind the group of the NICE process for drafting recommendations. The recommendations need to be; clear, based on the best available evidence, reflect the views and experience of those being advised to take action or the recipients of that action and implementable. The process of drafting the recommendations must be explicit and transparent.</p> <p>Antony referred the PDG to the CPHE Methods Manual that is currently out to public consultation for more detail of the process.</p>	
<b>6</b>	<p><b>Overview of the effectiveness and cost effectiveness reviews</b></p> <p>Rachel Jackson and Robin Purshouse from SchARR presented the updated effectiveness and cost effectiveness reviews.</p> <p>The Chair thanked SchARR for their hard work and opened the discussion with the PDG.</p> <p>It was noted that it was necessary for SchARR to try and incorporate, where applicable, all of the feedback provided by the committee on the reviews. Where it was not possible there is a need for SchARR to explain as to why it was not possible to amend the reviews.</p>	
<b>7</b>	<p><b>Discussion on the effectiveness and cost effectiveness reviews</b></p> <p>As an objective of this meeting was for the PDG to provide feedback to the collaborating centre on how to proceed to next stages of the review, a discussion then followed with both general ideas and suggestions.</p> <p>The Chair asked SchARR to redraft the further analysis section to ensure that it is tied to the effectiveness review. The Chair encouraged SchARR to explore further the research from Accident and Emergency departments and to add descriptive detail to their narrative as necessary.</p> <p>There was discussion around the agencies that may be appropriate to invite to PDGs at a later date and the NICE team agreed to consider who and when outside organisations should be invited.</p> <p>Due to the ever increasing size of the reviews, it was agreed that an</p>	<p><b>SchARR</b></p> <p><b>NICE team</b></p> <p><b>NICE team</b></p>

	attempt would be made to highlight only those sections which were new to the review, for subsequent meetings	
<b>8</b>	<p><b>Draft Recommendations</b></p> <p>Dylan Jones presented an early first draft of two recommendations on brief interventions (questions 6 and 7) for the PDG to consider and amend. The Chair thanked Dylan and opened the debate on the two draft recommendations. As Trevor McCarthy had declared a potential personal pecuniary interest the Chair directed that he should not participate in the discussion but was welcome to observe.</p> <p>The committee were consulted as to whether they preferred to be giving a blank sheet to work from, or whether they preferred to be given draft recommendations which they could alter as they saw fit, which are based on their discussion within committee. The committee agreed that they preferred the latter.</p>	
<b>9</b>	<p><b>Discussion on the draft recommendations</b></p> <p>The PDG had a structured discussion on each of the recommendations and amended according to the criteria Antony presented earlier. The Chair directed the NICE team to refine the recommendations outside the meeting and present and update at the next meeting. She explained that the PDG will look at all recommendations again prior to the draft consultation period</p>	<b>NICE Team</b>
<b>10</b>	<p><b>Macro Level prevention review clarification of areas for consideration</b></p> <p>Robin Purshouse from SchARR gave a brief presentation to explain their ideas of how to progress the review of macro level interventions. Robin told the PDG of the options that are available at a macro level relating to price, availability and promotion.</p> <p>A discussion followed to help SchARR framework this. It was agreed that SchARR should scope the literature for the availability question. The PDG would then help SchARR to prioritise. The Chair requested that the NICE team ask Peter Anderson be involved in this</p>	<b>SchARR</b> <b>NICE Team</b>
<b>11</b>	<p><b>Discussion on Industry involvement</b></p> <p>A discussion was held on the involvement of the industry. It was decided to aim to engage directly with the full range of industry participants such as retailers, producers etc. It was suggested that due to the large number of potential participants they should be invited to attend fieldwork sessions. The Chair asked the NICE team to consider further.</p>	<b>NICE Team</b>
<b>12</b>	<p><b>Next Steps</b></p> <p>Antony reminded the PDG that the next meeting is 27<sup>th</sup> November and that the papers will be sent from NICE 17<sup>th</sup> November.</p>	

<b>13</b>	<b>Any Other Business</b>  None	
<b>14</b>	The Chair thanked all attendees and closed the meeting at 4pm.	