
From: Julia Field
Sent: Monday, 9 November 2015 4:01 PM
To: Adjudication
Subject: A91506 & A91507 – Infant Nutrition Council – submission

Categories: Submission

To Whom It May Cocern,

I am writing to share my concern with the proposal to extend the current MAIF agreement without conducting a review. There are some serious concerns with its limitations. I believe that by leaving this agreement as is, you are directly affecting the health of future children. This agreement does not do enough to protect babies from the unscrupulous marketing practises of the producers of artificial baby's milk. I believe the following points provided a strong reason to only extend the MAIF agreement for only 1 year.

1. Formula has been directly linked to obesity. Currently the World Health Organisation (WHO) is reviewing its protection of marketing to children and their parents which is likely to result to the WHO code. This should be taken into consideration as part of a review, as the results of the WHO's review are not due out until early next year, a 1 year extension would be appropriate instead of a 10 year one.
2. Australia is currently reviewing their own breastfeeding policy. By extending this agreement now for 10 years, you are illustrating the inability of Australia's policy makers to act on a united front. It does not make sense to extend the current MAIF agreement while this review is underway. As this review is expected to be completed by the end of this year, again a 1 year extension would seem appropriate instead of a 10 year one.
3. The MAIF agreement has never met Australia's obligation to legislate the full WHO International Code of Marketing of Breast-milk Substitutes. Australia signed the WHO code in 1981, and still be have only implemented the voluntary MAIF Agreement. This shows the people of Australia that our policy makers will sign agreements so that on the surface they support the best interests of babies and children, but will not follow through on those agreements. A one year extension of the MAIF agreement would be more practical to allow a proper review to be conducted
4. The MAIF agreement is outdated. This agreement has not been updated since the introduction of social media, and the wide spread use of loyalty programs. It is essential that these been considered in a review of the MAIF Agreement. Again showing that a 10 year renewal would be impractical, given this agreement is already outdated. A one year extension would be more appropriate.
5. Breaches of the MAIF Agreement currently have no concusses. This agreement is meant to protect babies and infants, but the reality is that it does not such thing, except for offer good public relations press to the multinational companies that sell formula. By extending this agreement for a further 10 years, you are saying that it is good enough to just say you will protect children, but that the Australian Government doesn't actually care whether you do or don't.

In conclusion I believe the MAIF agreement should be extended for 1 year to allow time for the appropriate review to be completed, and then the MAIF agreement should be replaced with stronger legislation that will better protect our most vulnerable, the babies and children of our society.

Kind Regards
Julia Field