Voice in discussion panel 1

Lifestyle is responsible in over 50% for our health, according to Lalonde’s health-fields. Tobacco smoking, alcohol, excess of sugar kill 7,2, 3,3 and 2,5 million people every year worldwide, respectively. These are all preventable deaths.

The most effective tool in life style shaping is health education started as early as possible in infancy, continued throughout the entire life. By definition this is the way to healthy societies but, also by definition, the goal takes generations to achieve.

Several strategies can be employed to strengthen the educational effect, including social healthy-behaviors-promoting-campaigns, banning of health-threatening habits in public space, limiting access to and high taxation of stimulants (e.g., tobacco, alcohol, high-sugar-content).

To help those adult society members who do already have bad health-related habits,

However, there will always be patients, already tobacco smoking or alcohol drinking, who will refuse to comply with any rehabilitation. Those should be helped by means of product proposals offering alternatives, which scientifically proven pose less risk to otherwise clearly unhealthy products.

In my opinion this group of citizens: addicted and no willing to rehabilitate should also be approached in Resolution.

Harm reduction, “soft”, attitude needs to be reflected in Resolution, since the lack of it will leave millions of people worldwide without any help in their potential struggle for healthier future.

Sincerely,

Andrzej M. Fal

President of PTZP
Voice in discussion panel 2

I assume that NCD Resolution should be future oriented. Numerous speakers have raised the different sources of NCDs and the risks they pose to millions of people. In the fight of NCDs prevention all efforts should be bundled, risks should be restricted, and new scientific achievements and product innovation should be assessed.

In my opinion the Resolution should also suggest ways of collaboration of academia, CSOs and private sector. The long-lasting process of NCDs eradication will be a costly one, therefore the private sector should be obliged to support it financially.

It is true that we should not reject a priori any research or claims made by any industry since we could in fact be acting against objectives of the NCD Resolution.

Hence in my view whether this is food, alcohol or tobacco, we have no other choice than to encourage transparent and verifiable processes to assess and verify the independent evidence base of the innovative products in each of these sectors.

Further, as mentioned before, a concept of harm reduction, clearly conditioned by and based on the scientific evidence, should be included in the text in order to push all concerned industries in the right direction.

Q: Wouldn't that be a mistake if we don’t include harm reduction as a complementary approach to accelerate our NCD objectives and targets?

Voice in discussion panel 4

Population health is a political choice.

The level of coordination of public health issues is crucial for its effectiveness. The European Union has adopted a Health in All Policies attitude, which works only if coordinated in every Member State on a sufficiently high level.

Let me appeal that the coordinator for Resolution implementation in every Member State will be placed at the level of Prime Minister’s or President’s Office to ensure maximum effectiveness and cooperation of all departments.

Sincerely,

Andrzej M. Fal

President of PTZP