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Foreword

Food is a fundamental part of all our lives. It sustains us and is integral to many of our social and cultural experiences. Whilst food contributes significantly to our economy, it is also the source of much preventable chronic disease and food-borne illness.

The Tasmanian Food and Nutrition Policy adopted in 2004 represents a major commitment to achieve consistent and complementary policy across whole-of-government and, in partnership with the community and private sectors.

Achieving complementary objectives across a broad range of portfolio presents interesting, but worthwhile, challenges such as: developing food production systems and methods that are productive, sustainable and protect our natural environment; and, promoting food as a valuable export commodity whilst ensuring Tasmanians have access to a healthy and affordable local food supply.

There is no doubt that climate change and the global financial crisis will add to the challenge for food producers and the current economic situation will place an increasing burden on the capacity of households to meet their basic requirements for food and nutrition.
As a state we need to ensure high standards of food safety in order to prevent food-borne illness and to maintain our reputation as a quality food producer. While we have achieved some significant progress in the area of food safety regulation and in the reduction of food-borne infections, there is still much work to be done to assist the food industry to comply with food safety legislation.

The increasing rate of chronic lifestyle-related disease that can be largely prevented by healthy eating and active living is placing a huge financial burden on the state’s resources. Estimates from interstate predict that over the next 15 years hospital admissions will double, mostly due to the effects of chronic lifestyle-related disease, creating a significant financial burden for governments. While projections of this nature have not been calculated for Tasmania, it is likely the situation will be worse. Tasmania is experiencing the effects of population ageing to a greater degree and has a higher proportion of people of low socio-economic status than other states and territories. Both older people and those of lower socio-economic status experience a greater burden of lifestyle-related chronic disease.

This report outlines some of the key achievements, challenges and emerging issues that have arisen in the five years since the current Tasmanian Food and Nutrition Policy was adopted. The report highlights that Tasmania has the skills, networks and determination to rise to the challenges we face in the area of food and nutrition. By working collaboratively across levels of government and with our partners in the private and community sectors, there is much that can be achieved. By taking a food systems approach, as articulated in the Tasmanian Food and Nutrition Policy, we can maximise the use of our resources and achieve consistent and complementary objectives across portfolios.

Tasmania is the only jurisdiction in Australia to have achieved a whole-of-system food and nutrition policy, providing the opportunity to lead the nation in becoming: a state which produces quality, healthy, safe and affordable food, while sustaining the natural environment and strengthening the local economy; a community empowered to make food choices that enhance health and wellbeing.

Hon Lara Giddings, MP
Deputy Premier
Minister for Health Services
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Executive summary

The Tasmanian Food and Nutrition Policy 2009 Progress Report is an overview of progress towards achieving the goals and sub-goals outlined in the Tasmanian Food and Nutrition Policy 2004.

The purpose of the report is to provide feedback on policy progress, gather information to inform ongoing implementation, reconnect stakeholders and refocus efforts to achieve consistency and complementarity in food and nutrition policy across the whole of government to ensure the most effective use of resources.

The report identifies key achievements and challenges for each focus area and outlines emerging issues impacting on food and nutrition in Tasmania. Based on these findings, it identifies priorities for ongoing implementation. A full review of the policy is scheduled for 2014.

In compiling this report, over 40 key informants with expertise in one or more of the policy’s twelve focus areas were interviewed. Comments were also received from stakeholders in response to public consultation. Every effort was made to capture as many of the achievements and challenges as possible.

The key informant interviews demonstrated a high level of commitment to food and nutrition issues in Tasmania and a consistent view of the value of a whole-of-system approach to food and nutrition. However, key informants did express that the policy is only valuable if there is ongoing commitment to coordination, promotion and implementation.

Key achievements identified include:

- increased commitment and action across government, community and private sectors to promote food production practices consistent with environmental sustainability
- agreement to establish a Tasmanian Food Security Council with $1 million to be held in trust to support initiatives to improve food security
- introduction of legislative frameworks for food safety programs
- increased awareness and recognition of the importance of healthy eating and the financial burden to the state of chronic lifestyle-related disease
- development of the food industry Score Card to provide reliable information to industry and government on the value of primary industries from production to consumption.

Key challenges identified include:

- the ongoing need to balance food productivity with environmental sustainability while managing the impact of climate change and water resources distribution
- building the capacity of the food safety workforce to:
  - assist Tasmanian businesses to comply with food safety legislation
  - identify creative solutions to reducing food wastage
  - maintain preparedness to respond to food-borne illness events
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- building the capacity of the food safety workforce to:
  - assist Tasmanian businesses to comply with food safety legislation
  - identify creative solutions to reducing food wastage
  - maintain preparedness to respond to food-borne illness events
- enhancing efforts to prevent chronic lifestyle-related disease by creating a community in which healthy food choices are easy choices
- strengthening the capacity for effective monitoring and surveillance of:
  - the impact of food production practices on environmental sustainability
  - nutritional status and food intake, including breastfeeding and food security.

Emerging issues which will present additional challenges and opportunities for food and nutrition in Tasmania include:

- the global financial crisis
- climate change
- sustainable water resource management
- globalisation of food supply and implications for food safety
- rising prevalence of lifestyle–related chronic disease and the ageing population.

The following issues were identified which will benefit from increased communication, collaboration and policy integration across the whole of government:

- increased consideration of food safety in food production to ensure economic pressure does not compromise food quality
- consideration of nutrition issues in the primary production and food distribution sectors to ensure

Recommendations are made to improve and strengthen:

- policy coordination and awareness
- food productivity while addressing climate change and optimising water resource management
- food safety in the context of a global food supply
- efforts to address the rising prevalence of lifestyle–related chronic disease and the ageing population.

minimally processed, nutritious foods are readily available and locally affordable, particularly in lower income areas
- increased support for food service outlets to offer an increased range of healthy food choices – focussing initially on food service outlets within government institutions to reinforce the governments commitment to promoting healthy eating
- reduced impact of mixed messages to the community through the development of formal mechanisms to restrict advertising and marketing of unhealthy food products
- improved industrial relations policy and workplace practice reforms to support working mothers with babies to continue breastfeeding.

The following issues were identified which will benefit from increased communication, collaboration and policy integration across the whole of government:

- increased consideration of food safety in food production to ensure economic pressure does not compromise food quality
- consideration of nutrition issues in the primary production and food distribution sectors to ensure
Introduction

Food is a major contributor to the economy with over 70 per cent of the food produced in Tasmania sold overseas or interstate. The gross value of food sales in 2006-07 was $3.8 billion including overseas exports, net interstate trade and domestic sales.

However, much of this economic benefit, if not all, is overshadowed by our expenditure resulting from unhealthy eating and food-borne illness.

Tasmania, like elsewhere in Australia and overseas, is experiencing an emerging epidemic of lifestyle-related chronic disease which is closely related to diet and is predicted to place substantial strain on the health system. Leading causes of preventable death including obesity, heart disease, stroke, Type 2 diabetes and cancer account for approximately two-thirds of the $85.0 billion expended on health each year in Australia.

Significant illness in our community also results from disease or conditions that are commonly transmitted by food. In 2005 it was estimated that in Australia there were 5.4 million cases of food-borne disease annually, costing an estimated $1.2 billion per year. In the three months July to September 2008, 534 outbreaks of gastroenteritis were reported in Australia affecting 7,446 people, of which 210 were hospitalised and 31 died. During this period, the consumption of contaminated food caused 17 of the 534 outbreaks affecting 229 people, of which eight were hospitalised and eight died.

As a major food producer, Tasmania has the opportunity to become a leader in developing an approach to food production that supports healthy eating as the dominant food culture while maintaining high standards of food safety and promoting environmental sustainability.

The Tasmanian Food and Nutrition Policy was adopted by the State Government in 1994 with 11 government departments accepting responsibility for the implementation plan. A review and redevelopment of the Tasmanian Food and Nutrition Policy was initiated by the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) in 2002 and endorsed by the Tasmanian Government on 29 November 2004 with the vision to establish Tasmania as a state which produces quality, healthy, safe and affordable food, while sustaining the natural environment and strengthening the local economy: a community empowered to make food choices that enhance health and wellbeing.

The purpose of this five year progress report is to provide feedback on policy progress, gather information to inform progress on further implementation, reconnect stakeholders and refocus efforts to achieve the most effective use of resources.

The progress report outlines achievements and challenges identified for each of the 12 focus areas. Over 40 key informants with expertise in one or more of the policy’s 12 focus areas were interviewed. Comments were received from stakeholders in response to public consultation on the draft report. Every effort was made to capture as many of the achievements and challenges as possible. A comprehensive review of the policy is planned for 2014.
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The objectives of the progress report are:
- to determine the current and future relevance of the policy vision and purpose through the identification of the key achievements, key challenges, emerging issues and opportunities
- to identify priorities for ongoing policy implementation
- to promote the importance of food and nutrition to the economy, the environment, health and social well-being of the community to key leaders and decision makers
- to raise the awareness about food and nutrition issues within Tasmania to key leaders and decision makers, through the Tasmanian Food and Nutrition Policy.

A Steering Committee made up of representatives from across government was convened to oversee and guide the progress report. The committee played a key role identifying additional key informants, advising on the key strategic issues and reviewing the draft report before seeking endorsement from the Tasmanian Government.

Key informants were identified through their involvement in the focus area, delegation from the relevant Head of Agency, nomination by the Steering Committee or their previous involvement in the Tasmanian Food and Nutrition Policy. Key informant interviews were conducted to gather information on progress of the implementation of the policy.

Key informants commented on:
- the ongoing relevance of the vision statement
- the currency of the endorsed policy framework and principles
- progress towards achieving the stated purpose of the policy
- the achievements, challenges and emerging issues in their relevant focus areas.

The committee, key informants and identified key stakeholders were emailed a copy of the draft progress report for comment. A public notice was published in the three newspapers statewide in early May 2009 which provided the opportunity for the public to provide written feedback on the progress report.
Awareness and recognition of the policy

Interviews were conducted with 40 key informants. From the interviews, three-quarters of key informants were aware of the Tasmanian Food and Nutrition Policy. Of those who were not aware of the policy, some stated that they were new to Tasmania. Awareness was generally higher among those from the health sector.

The majority of informants stated that their work aimed to contribute towards achieving the vision of the Tasmanian Food and Nutrition Policy in some way and just under half indicated the policy was a driver for their work.

Nearly all of the key informants believed it was valuable for Tasmania to have a policy that covers the whole food system from production to consumption. However, many key informants expressed the need for the policy to be actively promoted and actioned.

The majority of key informants interviewed expressed that they would be prepared to participate in an ongoing committee or ‘think tank’ to oversee the policy implementation and review. Establishing some form of coordination mechanism was seen as an important initiative to ensure the policy attained the status it deserves. Those who indicated they were not prepared to participate were happy to nominate an alternative representative from their department or organisation to participate in the review committee.

Key informants identified that in the main food and nutrition policy in Tasmania was consistent and complementary across all levels of government. However, a number of issues were identified where increased communication, coordination and policy integration could lead to improved outcomes. Examples included:

- increased consideration of food safety in food production to ensure economic pressure does not compromise food quality
- consideration of nutritional goals as a driver in the primary production sector in addition to employment, productivity, food safety and a focus on ‘value adding’ and ‘export marketing’ as a way to ensure minimally processed, nutritious foods are readily available and locally affordable, particularly in lower income areas
- increased support for food service outlets, particularly those within government institutions, to promote healthy food choices in order to reinforce the governments commitment to promoting healthy eating
- the development of sponsorship guidelines that restrict advertising and marketing of unhealthy food products which can lead to mixed messages to the community, for example, avoiding sponsorship of sporting events by confectionery companies
- ensuring industrial relations policy and workplace practices reforms assist mothers returning to work after having a baby to continue breastfeeding.
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The progress report identified a range of emerging issues that may impact significantly on the focus areas of the Tasmanian Food and Nutrition Policy. These include:

- the global financial crisis
- climate change
- sustainable water resource management
- globalisation of food supply and implications for food safety
- rising prevalence of lifestyle-related chronic disease and the ageing population.

While these emerging issues present challenges for food and nutrition in Tasmania they also present interesting opportunities for innovation and collaborative action across government. They highlight the importance of a comprehensive food and nutrition policy.

**Global financial crisis**

From a primary production perspective, the current economic situation has the potential to impact on the cost of food production and transportation.

Agricultural production contributes significantly to the Tasmanian economy. Tasmania is a major exporter of food staples such as beef, dairy and vegetables with a focus on production of high-end gourmet food such as oysters, salmon and cheese. In a time of financial constraint, gourmet food products are often the first item eliminated from households which may impact on sales of Tasmania’s gourmet food products.

**The global financial crisis is particularly challenging for Tasmanian food producers and food service outlets. Any downturn in these businesses has the potential to impact on employment in the food industry. Reduced viability of smaller food producers and food service outlets could lead to a reduction of competition in the market with resulting increases in food prices.**

The rising cost of living and rising food prices have the potential to impact on food security with Tasmanian households less able to acquire sufficient food to meet their nutritional needs.

Increasing pressure on new mothers to return to the workforce earlier than anticipated to meet demands of household budgets has the potential to impact on their ability to continue breastfeeding. Current consideration of paid parental leave may help to alleviate this pressure.

A potential opportunity from the global financial crisis is that people might reduce spending on ‘sometimes’ foods that are poor in nutritional quality such as confectionery, fried foods, sugary drinks. Alternatively, these foods are often less costly and may displace other more nutritious foods that tend to be more expensive.
Climate change

Mitigation

The most important role of agriculture is to provide food. As agriculture is a major contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, reducing emissions in this sector has the potential to significantly reduce the emissions from food production.

Reducing Tasmania's direct emissions from livestock and the use of fertilisers will require changes in technology and farming practices. The energy that is used in downstream processing, packaging and transport may also result in greenhouse gas emissions.

Individuals can reduce emissions along the food supply chain by reducing their consumption of certain types of foods, reducing food waste and supporting farmers and businesses that demonstrate a lower carbon footprint.

The Australian Government’s proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme will be the primary policy mechanism to reach the emissions reduction target. A decision will be made by 2013 as to whether agriculture will be included under the scheme. State governments can work with primary producers to help them reduce their emissions and prepare for the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme. The Tasmanian Government can also help ensure that Tasmanian products meet increasing community and market demands for food products with a lower carbon footprint.

Adaptation

Climate change could affect the environment in terms of food production and the introduction of new pest and weed species. For example, warmer summers may result in increased prevalence of blue-green algae which will affect water quality and supply. Production of food crops not previously grown in Tasmania may also take place which may impact adversely on existing crops. As well, some crops may not withstand future changes in climate resulting in a loss of diversity. Warmer sea temperatures and rising sea levels could impact seafood production and the areas in Tasmanian waters where shellfish can be farmed.

An increase in temperature could also impact food safety in Tasmania as higher temperatures can result in a higher incidence of food safety incidents and gastrointestinal infections such as Salmonella, Campylobacter and Cryptosporidium. Research suggests that increased temperatures resulting from climate change could result in increased diarrhoeal diseases and hospitalisation.

There is an important role for governments in supporting community adaptation to changing climatic conditions through the provision of information. The Tasmanian Government is supporting the Climate Futures for Tasmania project which is modelling climate change on a very fine scale.
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Food production relies on a reliable and good quality water supply. In recent years Tasmania has experienced significant deficits in water availability predominantly due to drought. This has been most evident in the south-east, Midlands, Flinders Island and southern areas. There have been record low flows observed in many rivers. In order to protect environmental flows, restrictions and bans on taking water for irrigation has been required on nearly all the major rivers and their tributaries in these regions.

The dry conditions have also resulted in extremely low inflows to major storage lakes and dams in eastern, central and northern areas. Low flows in the water supplies to towns and local domestic supplies in some areas were also directly affected, leading to water quality problems.

Completion of the Meander Dam in November 2007 meant that for the first time in many years water was available for most of the irrigation season in the Meander Valley district.

In the south and much of the east, autumn and early winter rainfalls in 2008 were at levels well below average. This prompted work to establish emergency water supply schemes in two catchments in case low water availability continued into the 2008–09 season. In the Coal River Valley, the lowest ever water levels in the Craigbourne Dam led to the construction of a pipeline to take water north from the Hobart town water supply infrastructure at Richmond. In the Clyde Valley, continued low water levels at Lakes Crescent and Sorell led to works to pump water to the Clyde from the adjacent Shannon River for essential purposes and limited irrigation.

The drought conditions experienced throughout Tasmania in recent times have highlighted the need for Tasmania to manage water supply and quality in a sustainable way, and employ emerging technology to maintain and grow the state’s reputation as a food producer. Tasmania has 12 per cent of Australia’s water supply. If managed effectively, the state can become an area of choice for growers resulting in increased productivity in the primary production sector.

There are a range of initiatives in Tasmania which place the state in a good position to manage water resources in a sustainable and efficient way. Examples include:

- irrigation development under the Tasmanian irrigation development strategy
- the CSIRO Sustainable Yields Project which will provide critical information on current and likely future water availability, estimating the impacts of catchment development and forestry land use, changing groundwater extraction, climate variability and climate change on water resources at a regional level
- CSIRO’s water sensor web project which will develop technology to allow different kinds of sensor systems to be combined, effectively creating one large instrument that promises to revolutionise hydrological monitoring and forecasting
- reforms of the reticulated water supply system in Tasmania with the aim of improving the States capacity to monitor water quality into the future
- ongoing investigation into agricultural practices to reduce water run-off.
Globalisation of food supply and food safety implications

Globalisation of the food supply is expected to deliver benefits for the State allowing less expensive healthy foods to be available for Tasmanian consumers. Competition with overseas producers also has the potential to promote productivity in the Tasmanian food sector resulting in lower-priced locally sourced food. Food producers and processors in Tasmania also gain from globalisation through access to markets for their products. This has provided significant economic benefits to the State.

However, globalisation of the food supply also brings with it challenges which need to be effectively managed to minimise risks to food safety and to the reputation of overseas products.

The melamine in infant formula incident from China in 2008 highlights the potential effects that food safety standards in other countries can have on consumer confidence in the safety of imported products. Melamine was used in China to make milk powder appear higher in protein. Contaminated milk powder was allegedly linked to kidney problems found in Chinese infants that resulted in a number of infant deaths.

Globalisation of the food supply can result in consumers being many steps removed from the source of food production. This has the potential to increase both the frequency of product handling and length of time between production and consumption. This is particularly problematic for foods that are required to be held at controlled temperatures, and thus increases food safety risks.

Increased international trade in food and animal feed combined with increases in international travel has the potential to increase the spread of pathogens and transfer of new diseases and highlights the need for stringent food safety standards and procedures. For example, a particularly virulent strain of Salmonella has been identified within the egg industry overseas which has not yet been identified in Australia. Well-managed surveillance efforts are required to manage the risk of such pathogens entering the Tasmanian food supply.

Increasing size of food production facilities by concentrating food production into fewer sites significantly increases the potential consequences of food-borne infections. For example, an outbreak of food-borne illness resulting from an infection originating in a meat supplier who provides 70 per cent of the meat nationwide will have a far greater impact than an outbreak of food-borne illness in a smaller supplier.
Globalisation of food supply and food safety implications

Globalisation of the food supply is expected to deliver benefits for the State allowing less expensive healthy foods to be available for Tasmanian consumers. Competition with overseas producers also has the potential to promote productivity in the Tasmanian food sector resulting in lower-priced locally sourced food. Food producers and processors in Tasmania also gain from globalisation through access to markets for their products. This has provided significant economic benefits to the State.

However, globalisation of the food supply also brings with it challenges which need to be effectively managed to minimise risks to food safety and to the reputation of overseas products.

The melamine in infant formula incident from China in 2008 highlights the potential effects that food safety standards in other countries can have on consumer confidence in the safety of imported products. Melamine was used in China to make milk powder appear higher in protein. Contaminated milk powder was allegedly linked to kidney problems found in Chinese infants that resulted in a number of infant deaths.

Globalisation of the food supply can result in consumers being many steps removed from the source of food production. This has the potential to increase both the frequency of product handling and length of time between production and consumption. This is particularly problematic for foods that are required to be held at controlled temperatures, and thus increases food safety risks.

Increased international trade in food and animal feed combined with increases in international travel has the potential to increase the spread of pathogens and transfer of new diseases and highlights the need for stringent food safety standards and procedures. For example, a particularly virulent strain of Salmonella has been identified within the egg industry overseas which has not yet been identified in Australia. Well-managed surveillance efforts are required to manage the risk of such pathogens entering the Tasmanian food supply.

Increasing size of food production facilities by concentrating food production into fewer sites significantly increases the potential consequences of food-borne infections. For example, an outbreak of food-borne illness resulting from an infection originating in a meat supplier who provides 70 per cent of the meat nationwide will have a far greater impact than an outbreak of food-borne illness in a smaller supplier.

Rising prevalence of lifestyle–related chronic disease and the ageing population

Chronic diseases such as heart disease, heart failure, stroke, type 2 diabetes, respiratory disease, kidney disease and some forms of cancer account for the majority of the top ten causes of death in Tasmania. It is projected that chronic health conditions related to obesity will cause the current generation of children to be the first in history to have a shorter life expectancy than their parents.

The rate of avoidable mortality (deaths before the age of 75 that could be prevented) is higher in Tasmania than the national average and than in all other states and territories other than the Northern Territory. Over the period 1997–2001 the age-standardised avoidable mortality rate from all causes in Tasmania was 192.0 per 100,000 population compared with 176.6 for Australia.

The prevalence of chronic diet-related health conditions and the associated need for health services increases significantly with older age groups, particularly after the age of 65 years. Tasmania is affected by population ageing to a greater degree than other states and territories with the average age being older than Australia as a whole, with the gap widening. The median age of Tasmanians is projected to be 49.8 years by 2051, an increase of 11.4 years.

It is inevitable that population ageing of this degree will have a significant impact on hospitalisation rates. Based on data from 2001 to 2005, the rate of hospitalisation doubles from age 40–59 years to age 60–79, with a further increase (>50 per cent) for persons aged 80 years and over.

In December 2008, the Australian Government and the State and Territory Governments entered into a National Partnership Agreement on Preventive Health under the Council of Australian Governments reform agenda. The agreement recognises the Australian Government and the states and territories have mutual interest in improving outcomes in the area of preventive health and need to work together to achieve those outcomes. Promoting good nutrition through a range of initiatives is a central platform of this agreement. This agreement binds Tasmania to report on a series of performance benchmarks including rates of the population who are of a healthy weight and consumption levels of fruit and vegetables. Performance against the benchmarks will be assessed in June 2013 and December 2014 with reward payments made to those states and territories that make progress towards meeting the performance targets. This is the first time in Australia that health funding has been tied to performance in preventive health and highlights the importance of good nutrition in improving health and social outcomes for Australia.
Achievements and challenges by focus area

Focus Area 1: Environment

Protection of our natural resources while maintaining viable primary industries and production has been a major priority in Tasmania for many years. It is widely recognised that the environment needs to be protected from damage and depletion of resources through effective conservation and sound land management practices. However, Tasmania’s future will depend on how we balance the use, development and conservation of the state’s natural resources.

Goal
To promote practices across the Tasmanian food system consistent with environmental sustainability.

Sub-goals
1. Ensure the safety of Tasmanian food and water supplies.
2. Preserve the integrity of the Tasmanian environment.
3. Promote sustainability of the Tasmanian food production system.

Key achievements

- The Tasmanian Government’s innovation strategy provides exciting opportunities for food production in Tasmania. Priority areas of the strategy include the opportunities that climate change will bring to promote food production in the state coupled with improvements in irrigation and infrastructure which have the potential for Tasmania to develop a reputation as the food bowl of Australia.
- There has been an increase in discussion about how to reduce carbon emissions by producing food with minimal processing and thinking about types of meat we consume. Agriculture is amongst one of the largest carbon emitting industries in the state. Discussions have commenced at a community, industry and government level to work out how Tasmania can minimise its carbon emissions.
- Increased investment and commitment to irrigation has been achieved from both the Tasmanian and Federal Governments with funding to the value of $220 million to invest in irrigation over the next four years, while considering the need to protect streams and wet land areas.
- A commitment has been made to several water management initiatives including the development of state drinking water guidelines, water and sewerage reform, water catchment management and the CSIRO water sensor web project (through the Tasmanian Information and Communication Technologies Centre).
- The Tasmanian Government now routinely monitors water quality by testing rivers and water courses. The results are publicly available and ensure that water quality measures are consistent with the objectives of the State Policy on Water Quality Management 1997. The main objective of the policy is to maintain or enhance water quality. Where testing has indicated unacceptable contamination of water courses, investigations are instigated.
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- Increased investment and commitment to irrigation has been achieved from both the Tasmanian and Federal Governments with funding to the value of $120 million to invest in irrigation over the next four years, while considering the need to protect streams and wetland areas.
- A commitment has been made to several water-management initiatives including the development of state drinking water guidelines, water and sewerage reform, water catchment management and the CSIRO water sensor web project (through the Tasmanian Information and Communication Technologies Centre).
- The Tasmanian Government now routinely monitors water quality by testing rivers and water courses. The results are publicly available and ensure that water quality measures are consistent with the objectives of the State Policy on Water Quality Management 1997. The main objective of the policy is to maintain or enhance water quality. Where testing has indicated unacceptable contamination of water courses, investigations are instigated.

There are provisions under the Environmental Management and Pollution Control Act 1994 to intervene in high-risk activities that have the potential to pollute waterways.

- There has been an increase in the adoption of environmentally sustainable food production practices including improvements in environmentally sustainable agricultural practices and recognition that the broader marine environment is an important source of food requiring appropriate monitoring and management.
- The Climate Futures for Tasmania Project has been established which aims to provide more detailed information to facilitate modelling the effects of climate change through collaborative research.
- In addition to government funded initiatives to enhance the food production environment, the private food industry retail sector, through one of the major food retailers, has invested funds to support farmers in the midlands of Tasmania to change on-farm practices in order to adapt to the changing climate and farming conditions.
- The emergence of community programs that focus on local food production (including community gardens, school vegetable gardens and home gardens) indicate that there is an increase in awareness at a local level about the skills required for growing vegetables. There is also an increased awareness of the benefits of producing fruit and vegetables locally in terms of availability and environmental sustainability.
- The implementation of the Australian Sustainable Schools Initiative in 55 Tasmania schools is promising as it encourages people to grow their own food in a sustainable way. It is likely the program will expand to other schools in the future.

Key challenges
- Creating more adaptive farm practices to deal with climate uncertainty is a key challenge. For example mixed farming practices and mixed crops may impact on farm productivity.
- As dry land gets more intensively farmed there is increased risk of:
  - grub and grass hopper attacks
  - increased exposure of bare earth as a result of over grazing by native animals
  - increased water run-off from rain.
- There are competing interests in land use management. Particularly in relation to environmental sustainability and productivity in the agricultural sector.
- Primary producers are under continual pressure to increase productivity to remain viable in the short-term. However, with this pressure comes the challenge to balance the intensity of food production with longer term sustainability of the farming environment.
- Developing effective, evidence-informed policy in an environment of rapid change can be a challenge. There is an expectation government will respond to complex and urgent issues in a timely and responsive manner. At times the Tasmanian Government will be called upon to respond before the evidence of the most effective way forward has been fully assessed.
Focus Area 2: Food safety

Food safety is critical across the whole food system including production, transport, processing, storage, handling and retail. Consumption of unsafe foods can result in a range of problems from gastroenteritis through to potentially life-threatening adverse reactions. As well as the adverse health effects of unsafe food to the consumer; food-borne illness imposes significant costs on the food industry and government. Food production and manufacture are vital to the Tasmanian economy and food safety is critical when it comes to maintaining access to international markets and protecting Tasmanian exports and reputation as a supplier of safe food. Sustaining this reputation places extra responsibilities on the food industry to maintain high standards of food safety and quality control.

Goal
To ensure the safety of food and drinking water for all Tasmanians

Sub-goals
1. Improve food safety practices in Tasmania.
2. Strengthen collaboration and cooperation between Tasmanian Government Agencies with a role in food.
3. Improve monitoring of, and research into, the safety of food and drinking water.
4. Strengthen the capacity of state and local governments to address food and water safety issues.

Key achievements

- Improvement of the legislative framework at both a national and state level in relation to addressing high-risk food safety practices is a key achievement. This has resulted in a more coordinated and consistent approach to food safety between all Australian states and territories.

- Food Safety Programs have been recognised as the most effective way to reduce the burden of food-borne illness in Australia. In December 2002, the Australian and New Zealand Food Regulation Ministerial Council decided to introduce standards requiring each business operating within four identified high-risk sectors to establish appropriate food safety management systems audited by an approved auditor. These sectors were:
  - food service, whereby potentially hazardous food is served to vulnerable populations
  - producing, harvesting, processing and distributing raw oysters and other bivalves
  - off-site catering operations serving food to the general public
  - producing manufactured and fermented meat.
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- Improvement of the legislative framework at both a national and state level in relation to addressing high-risk food safety practices is a key achievement. This has resulted in a more coordinated and consistent approach to food safety between all Australian states and territories.
- Food Safety Programs have been recognised as the most effective way to reduce the burden of food-borne illness in Australia. In December 2002, the Australian and New Zealand Food Regulation Ministerial Council decided to introduce standards requiring each business operating within four identified high-risk sectors to establish appropriate food safety management systems audited by an approved auditor. These sectors were:
  - food service, whereby potentially hazardous food is served to vulnerable populations
  - producing, harvesting, processing and distributing raw oysters and other bivalves
  - off-site catering operations serving food to the general public
  - producing manufactured and fermented meat.
- Separate standards requiring the adoption of these mandatory food safety management systems across the identified high-risk sectors are at various stages of development and implementation and include:
  - the Food Safety Standard for Food Service to Vulnerable Persons (3.3.1) which is currently in the implementation phase and will be effective in Tasmania from June 2009
  - the Food Safety Standard for Food Safety Programs for Catering Activities (3.3.2) which is under development
- Three Standards already in effect are:
  - the Primary Production and Processing (PPP) Standard for Meat (4.2.3)
  - the Primary Production and Processing Standard for Dairy Products (4.2.4), implemented by the Tasmanian Dairy Industry Authority and applicable to dairy producers, processors and transporters including a requirement to have an audited food safety program
  - the Primary Production and Processing Standard for Seafood (4.2.1). This is an outcomes-based standard that sets the minimum standard for seafood food safety nationally. Within Tasmania, DPIPWE has taken a lead role. A number of the seafood industry sectors and the Tasmanian Government are working together on developing food safety plans and systems to provide industry participants with a means of clearly demonstrating compliance with the Primary Production and Processing Standard for Seafood.
- The introduction of the new standards has resulted in improved food handling techniques across high-risk food businesses including childcare centres, nursing homes and hospitals. This achievement is a combination of the upgrade of the food safety standards, more connection with vulnerable/high-risk groups and an increase in the skills and knowledge of food safety management.
- DHHHS is actively supporting the care sector in Tasmania to implement food safety programs and once the implementation phase is completed, compliance levels across government owned and government funded care facilities will be determined by examination of audit reports.
- Many large food businesses have implemented quality assurance programs to ensure high standards of food safety are met. For example, one major retailer demands that all their suppliers (exceeding 2,000) adhere to extensive and rigorous testing in relation to food safety.
- Tasmania now has considerable input into national policy and regulation for food safety which did not happen before the policy’s implementation in 2004. Tasmania now has representation on the Food Regulation Standing Committee and the Implementation Sub Committee through DPIPWE and DHHHS. The Food Regulation Standing Committee is responsible for providing advice to the Australia New Zealand Food Regulation Ministerial Council and the role of Implementation Sub –Committee is to oversee a consistent approach across all states and territories with the implementation and enforcement of food standards and regulations.
- At a state level, the Tasmanian Food Safety Forum agreed in 2007 to develop a Memorandum of Understanding between DHHHS, DPIW, Local Government Association of Tasmania and the Tasmanian Dairy Industry Authority. The memorandum clearly defines each party’s roles and responsibilities in relation to food safety management. It also identifies the responsibility of each agency in an actual or potential food safety incident where a co-ordinated or cooperative response is required in order to avoid duplication of effort. The memorandum was signed by all organisations in July 2009.
- Manufacturing Controls for Raw Egg Products were developed in 2008 in response to a number of food-borne illness outbreaks related to raw eggs. A manual was developed by DHHHS Population Health with the aim of minimising the risks of food-borne...
illness by implementing appropriate controls at the point of manufacture. It details a process of safely manufacturing raw egg products and imposes a condition on food manufacturers who want to continue to use raw eggs in food products that they have to follow a food safety program. Several hundred copies have now been distributed to food businesses across Tasmania.

- Tasmania is challenged with providing safe drinking water to a highly dispersed population, and in the main does this well for the majority of the population however current levels of infrastructure, resources and skills to address water quality issues in this state are stretched particularly amongst the smaller council water suppliers. The sewerage and water reform instigated by the state government, will introduce institutional change in the provision of water and sewerage effective on the 1 July 2009. All the resources, skills and knowledge of the water industry will be pooled into three large regional water corporations which will have the capacity to improve water quality and hence achieve better public health outcomes beyond that being currently achieved.

Key challenges

- Tasmania was unable to meet the national effective date of October 2008 for implementation of Food Safety Standard for Food Service to Vulnerable Persons (3.3.1) so implementation was delayed until June 2009. The implementation of the new standard is a challenge and it also exposes difficulties in terms of the workforce capacity to implement and monitor this change. This is particularly challenging given the workforce shortage in the food safety sector and the ageing workforce in the food auditing profession.

- Determining the cause of outbreaks related to raw egg products and ensuring effective cooperation between government departments has been a challenge from a resource and political perspective. Fortunately, the cause of several outbreaks was discovered and as a result, specific targeted food safety interventions have been implemented through the Manufacturing Controls for Raw Egg Products 2008.

- Food-borne illness resulting from *Salmonella* and *Campylobacter* infection is an ongoing challenge requiring further work. However, there appears to be a declining trend in the number of people infected by *Campylobacter*.

- The withdrawal of federal funding for the Tasmanian Institute of Agricultural Research’s Food Safety Centre presents a significant challenge to support strategic and applied research in Tasmania. While alternative funding will help re-establish capacity, the current situation also presents an important opportunity to form effective partnerships among state government, food companies and the Food Safety Centre in the delivery of research outcomes and training. The Food Safety Centre’s support to DHHS in 2008 in validating egg recipes that inhibit growth of *Salmonella Typhimurium* is an example of the effective partnerships that are possible.

- Changing lifestyles resulting in reduced time for meal preparation also creates challenges for food safety. Increased consumption of raw, lightly cooked and cold foods can potentially increase the risk of contracting a food-borne illness. Consumption of food prepared outside of the home, changing agricultural practices, changes in micro-organisms and the emergence of new pathogens are also viewed as challenges to the safety of food in modern society.

- Tasmania’s ability to maintain preparedness and have the capacity to deal with any new and emerging pathogens is a continual challenge particularly with the increasingly long food supply chains due to the global nature of the food market.

- Encouraging and facilitating an increase in third party food safety auditor capacity in Tasmania to ensure businesses are complying with legislation will be required.
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Case Study
Egg-associated outbreaks of food-borne illness in Tasmania

Between June and December 2005, five outbreaks of Salmonella Typhimurium phage type 135 (STm135) were identified in Tasmania, leading to 125 laboratory-confirmed cases. Public health investigations included case and food handler interviews, cohort studies, environmental health investigations of food businesses, microbiological testing, traceback, and inspections and drag swabbing of an egg farm. These investigations enabled identification of foods containing raw egg or foods contaminated through inadequate food handling or storage procedures as possible vehicles for infection. A particular poultry farm was reported as the common source of eggs. Interventions targeting the general public and food handlers to promote better handling of egg products, and advice to egg producers regarding harm minimisation strategies were implemented.

Despite these series of public health interventions, two more egg-associated outbreaks occurred in Tasmania in March 2007 and January 2008 leading to a further 66 cases of STm135. There was very strong epidemiological evidence indicating the point source of infection in both outbreaks. The evidence suggested that a hazard in the form of Salmonella was introduced into the food preparation environment implicated in each outbreak on eggs (or possibly in cracked eggs) and the organism was then able to multiply in foods and/or spread through cross-contamination, thus becoming a public health risk and leading to an outbreak of STm135.

These outbreaks of Salmonella Typhimurium 135 in Tasmania emphasise the need for a through-chain approach in managing food safety risks. It is clear that vigilance must be exercised at all points in the food supply chain to remove as far as possible on-farm risks and to ensure that appropriate interventions are in place to remove remaining risk prior to sale for human consumption.

The Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) Population Health Unit created the Manufacturing Controls for Raw Egg Products manual in 2008. This aims to minimise the risks of food-borne illness by implementing appropriate controls at the point of manufacture. Several hundred copies have been distributed to food businesses within Tasmania and to date, there have been no further egg-associated outbreaks of Salmonella Typhimurium. The Tasmanian Institute of Agricultural Research’s Food Safety Centre provided valuable support to DHHS in validating egg recipes that inhibit growth of Salmonella Typhimurium.
Focus Area 3: Promoting healthy eating

Good nutrition is vital for the health and wellbeing of the community and plays a major role in the prevention of many chronic lifestyle-related diseases. Healthy eating is essential for the growth and development of children into healthy adults.

**Goal**
To promote healthy eating for Tasmanians and reduce the impact of diet-related disease

**Sub-goals**
1. Make healthy eating and prevention of diet-related disease a priority goal for the Tasmanian population.
3. Increase the proportion of Tasmanians who are a healthy weight.
4. Promote healthy growth and development of infants and children (including prenatal development).
5. Maximise effectiveness of nutrition promotion.
6. Strengthen nutrition monitoring and surveillance and nutrition research in Tasmania.

**Key achievements**

- Heightened awareness and understanding of the importance of promoting healthy eating has resulted from increased recognition of the social and economic burden of chronic diet-related disease, including type 2 diabetes, heart disease, stroke, some cancers and obesity.
- The 2008 National Partnership Agreement on Preventive Health sets out clear objectives for promoting healthy eating with benchmarks linked to reward payments for increases in fruit and vegetable consumption and increases in the proportion of the population of a healthy weight.
- Funding under the Australian Better Health Initiative has enabled DHHS to consolidate employment of staff in the Community Nutrition Unit. Prior to 2004 over half the Community Nutrition Unit staff were employed on short-term projects with time-limited funding creating uncertainty about sustainability and longer-term commitment to community-based projects. Increased funding security has lead to a firmer commitment to the community and a longer term vision to program development and implementation.
- In 2008, the Department of Education (DoE) moved from the Essential Learnings framework to the Tasmanian Curriculum. Organised into seven areas, the Tasmanian Curriculum has a specific focus area on health and wellbeing enabling students to
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- The 2008 National Partnership Agreement on Preventive Health sets out clear objectives for promoting healthy eating with benchmarks linked to reward payments for increases in fruit and vegetable consumption and increases in the proportion of the population of a healthy weight.
- The increase in farmer's markets is an achievement as they allow people to access fresh, local, sometimes organic, cheap produce and also support local farmers. The markets can also count towards mitigating climate change with vastly reduced transport of the food when local farms sell local produce.
- The Community Nutrition Unit within DHHS has strengthened its capacity building approach through nutrition training for health and community workers.
Prior to 2004, the unit offered training on an ad-hoc and informal basis. In recent years the Community Nutrition Unit staff has received formal qualifications in training and have where possible consolidated and formalised training programs. Examples include:

- a Memorandum of Understanding with the DHHS Child Health and Parenting Service to provide ongoing professional development updates
- incorporation of nutrition education into TAFE Tasmania’s childcare training
- a service improvement program, focussing on improved food service and nutrition care instigated through the Home and Community Care Program.

• Diabetes Tasmania has increased their collaborative work with the Tasmanian Divisions of General Practice, the University of Tasmania and other non-government organisations to ensure there is no crossover of services and work together to service a larger proportion of the population.

• Researchers in CSIRO’s Preventative Health Flagship are working on the tailored diet information project which aims to provide overweight individuals and their families with dietary and health information relevant to them. The CSIRO is working on using mobile phone and web technology to deliver this information in an effective and engaging way.

• The Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and the Environment (DPIPWE) is involved in a number of initiatives that promote healthy eating and encourage Tasmanians to have a healthy lifestyle.

These include:

- Healthy Parks Healthy People program encouraging Tasmanians to be active
- Seed to Plate which aims to train teachers in running kitchen garden programs. This is being undertaken through the Royal Tasmanian Botanical Gardens, DEPHA and the Moonah community as Moonah Primary School is being used as a pilot school for the program.

• The Department of Premier and Cabinet (DPAC) has recently made a commitment to the healthy@work program which includes the promotion of healthy eating in the workplace. DHHS has also initiated the Work Well Live Well program and is currently considering renaming this healthy@work to harmonise with a whole-of-government approach to worksite health promotion.

Key challenges

• While the current media focus on obesity, especially childhood obesity, has been helpful in raising awareness of the importance of healthy eating it has also created a number of challenges by:

- diverting attention from nutrition issues that are not directly associated with obesity prevention such as nutrient deficiencies, healthy growth and development of children and breastfeeding (although there is increasing evidence of a link between breastfeeding and obesity prevention)
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- Diabetes Tasmania has increased their collaborative work with the Tasmanian Divisions of General Practice, the University of Tasmania and other non-government organisations to ensure there is no crossover of services and work together to service a larger proportion of the population.

- Researchers in CSIRO’s Preventative Health Flagship are working on the tailored diet information project which aims to provide overweight individuals and their families with dietary and health information relevant to them. The CSIRO is working on using mobile phone and web technology to deliver this information in an effective and engaging way.

- The Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and the Environment (DPIPWE) is involved in a number of initiatives that promote healthy eating and encourage Tasmanians to have a healthy lifestyle.

These include:

- Healthy Parks Healthy People program encouraging Tasmanians to be active
- Seed to Plate which aims to train teachers in running kitchen garden programs. This is being undertaken through the Royal Tasmanian Botanical Gardens, DEPHA and the Moonah community as Moonah Primary School is being used as a pilot school for the program.
- The Department of Premier and Cabinet (DPAC) has recently made a commitment to the healthy@work program which includes the promotion of healthy eating in the workplace. DHHS has also initiated the Work Well Live Well program and is currently considering renaming this healthy@work to harmonise with a whole-of-government approach to worksite health promotion.

Key challenges

- While the current media focus on obesity, especially childhood obesity, has been helpful in raising awareness of the importance of healthy eating it has also created a number of challenges by:
  - diverting attention from nutrition issues that are not directly associated with obesity prevention such as nutrient deficiencies, healthy growth and development of children and breastfeeding (although there is increasing evidence of a link between breastfeeding and obesity prevention)

Case Study

Collaborative partnerships between health and education sectors in promoting healthy eating in the school environment.

An active partnership between the Department of Education (DoE) and Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) has led to two significant strategic initiatives to improve healthy eating in the school environment to assist in the prevention of a range of chronic conditions such as obesity, diabetes, heart disease and dental decay.

Move Well Eat Well is a state-wide initiative funded under the Australian Better Health Initiative (ABHI) and managed jointly by DoE and DHHS. Move Well Eat Well promotes a healthier Tasmania in which children can enjoy healthy eating and physical activity every day. Schools are supported to meet key criteria which reinforce healthy eating and promote physical activity. The Move Well Eat Well Award is available to schools from the commencement of 2009 when they meet a series of criteria across seven categories including active promotion of water as a preferred drink, increasing fruit and vegetables consumption, limiting ‘occasional’ foods, being active, reducing sedentary activity and using active transport. Already 76 schools have signaled interested in becoming a Move Well Eat Well school.

Cool CAP is the Tasmanian School Canteen Accreditation program run by the Tasmanian School Canteen Association and jointly funded by DoE and DHHS. The joint funding arrangement commits both departments to achieving outcomes for school canteens so that healthy and safe foods are on offer to students and that canteens are managed effectively. In-kind support in the form of nutrition expertise (DHHS) and ease of access and knowledge of effective communication methods with schools (DoE) greatly enhances the effectiveness of the program. Over 50 per cent of schools with canteens are now involved with the program and it is anticipated that the link between Cool CAP and the Move Well Eat Well program will further enhance participation.

This case study illustrates effective partnerships across government that have led to an efficient and sustainable use of resources.
- Drawing attention to those who are already overweight or obese rather than focussing on prevention which can be particularly problematic among overweight children who may bear the brunt of bullying and stigmatisation
- Inadvertently leading to increased dietary practices that are not conducive to good health such as fad dieting.

- Tasmania, as a small jurisdiction does not currently have sufficient capacity, in terms of infrastructure and expertise, to accurately monitor the nutritional status and eating habits of the population. This lack of comprehensive nutrition monitoring and surveillance at a local level means that policy and practice are often informed by national data and in some instances outdated data. It also compromises effective evaluation of policy and programs. In an attempt to resolve this situation Tasmania has been active in promoting the need for a comprehensive national monitoring and surveillance system.

- While there has been increased investment in community nutrition education, this is not sufficiently reinforced by practices in food service, food retail and food advertising and marketing. The ready availability and affordability of food of limited nutritional value (energy-dense nutrient-poor food) creates barriers to making healthy choices. In addition, the extensive marketing and advertising of energy-dense nutrient-poor foods, including sponsorship of sporting events can counteract the best of efforts in community nutrition education.

- Attempts to achieve legislative change at national level, for example, in relation to restrictions in the marketing and advertising of food to children have met with political resistance. While such initiatives alone may have limited impact, they demonstrate a significant commitment from government about the importance of healthy eating. While these changes have been difficult to achieve nationally it may be possible to make some changes at a state level in the future.

- Encouraging the community and non-government sector to be active in nutrition promotion has led to exciting partnerships and increased mobilisation of grant funding. However, in some instances this has placed significant management strain on small community organisations, governed by volunteer boards with limited management experience who suddenly find themselves with increased budgets and staff to manage. Ways to better support community organisations so they are able to more effectively manage grant funding are required.

- A challenge has emerged with farmers markets with the influx of commercial distributors who are selling produce that is not locally produced. This is inconsistent with the basic principles of a farmers market.

- The restructure of the education framework within DoE has led to a focus on the early years (Launching into Learning), literacy and numeracy and post year ten retention. This has directed attention away from the health and wellbeing curriculum.
Focus Area 4: Breastfeeding

Breastfeeding offers many benefits with direct physical and psychological benefits for the mother and child and economic benefits for the family and society. In recognition of the value of family and community support, a guideline to encourage and support breastfeeding is included in the Dietary Guidelines for Australian Adults.

Goal
To promote and support breastfeeding in Tasmania.

Sub-Goal
1. Increase community and environmental support for breastfeeding.
2. Increase the percentage of infants breastfed at discharge from maternity services.
3. Increase the percentage of infants exclusively and partially breastfed at six months of age.

Key achievements

- All Tasmanian hospitals have achieved accreditation through the Baby Friendly Health Initiative. This global project developed by the World Health Organization and UNICEF, accredits hospitals that support breastfeeding by following the guidelines set out in the initiative.
- The Australian Breastfeeding Association has established an accreditation system for Breastfeeding Friendly Workplaces. Several workplaces in Tasmanian have become accredited and it is anticipated more will follow.
- The Tasmanian Breastfeeding Coalition has continued to grow in membership and strengthen its commitment. The coalition is a network of organisations which work collaboratively to improve breastfeeding rates in Tasmania and is the first of its kind in Australia.

- Since 2004, the Child Health and Parenting Service in DHHS has improved and strengthened the capacity to monitor breastfeeding data through routine service delivery. However, as not all babies undergo routine checks with the Child Health and Parenting Service, and there have been some changes to data collection procedures, there are some limitations associated with interpretation of this data source.
- The establishment of a new national helpline (1800 mum2mum, 1800 686 2 686) coordinated by the Australian Breastfeeding Association has improved support for mothers discharged from hospital.

Key challenges

- The current focus on obesity in Australia has potentially overshadowed breastfeeding as a priority nutrition issue. This is concerning given that research...
is showing the important role breastfeeding has in lessening the likelihood of obesity in later life.

- Increased awareness of the benefits of breastfeeding is needed to achieve the priority status that breastfeeding deserves. Breastfeeding makes an important contribution towards improving infant health, reducing the burden of disease later in life and has a positive impact on the environment. In addition, there is now evidence clearly demonstrating that breastfeeding is a more cost effective and efficient method of infant feeding than infant formula feeding.

- Ensuring breastfeeding education is integrated into the school curriculum, health related undergraduate degree courses and supplied to primary health care providers (such as general practitioner training programs) is necessary to create a culture of breastfeeding as the best option of infant feeding.

- There is currently limited breastfeeding research capacity in Tasmania. This could be addressed by establishing collaborative links between universities and research institutes.

- The Marketing in Australia of Infant Formulas: Manufacturers and Importers Agreement is based on the principles of the World Health Organization's International Code of Marketing of Breast-milk Substitutes (WHO code). However, unlike the WHO code, the agreement only applies to manufacturers and importers of infant formulas (not retailers) and does not include other milk products, foods, beverages or feeding bottles and teats. In addition, not all infant formula companies in Australia are signatories to the agreement. There are many examples of advertising of infant formula that conflict with the WHO code.

- While active promotion of breastfeeding is needed, care needs to be taken to ensure those who are unable or choose not to breastfeed are not made to feel inadequate or stigmatised.

- Since 2004, there has been a trend towards earlier hospital discharge of mothers and babies with the majority being sent home before breastfeeding has been established. Combined with insufficient numbers of midwives for home visiting to give early support for parents after discharge, this is a barrier to successful breastfeeding.

- Implementation of a national approach to paid maternity leave across all workplaces would encourage more women to stay home after childbirth and breastfeed longer. However, the current economic crisis may result in women returning to work earlier; putting even more pressure on breastfeeding.

- Rates of breastfeeding are significantly lower in low income groups and among young mothers. These groups are traditionally harder to reach and strategies to promote breastfeeding need to be evaluated to make sure they are effective among these groups with breastfeeding education in both primary and high school a priority.

- The lack of a well-developed system for monitoring and surveillance of breastfeeding makes it difficult to emphasise the importance of action to improve breastfeeding rates.

- The majority of infant formula is produced overseas. The recent issue of melamine in milk products reinforces the greater risk to which formula-fed infants in Australia are exposed.
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Case Study

Baby Friendly Health Initiative – Protecting, promoting and supporting breastfeeding in Australia

The Baby Friendly Health Initiative is an international project that aims to give every baby the best start in life by creating a health care environment where breastfeeding is the norm and practices known to promote the health and well-being of all babies and their mothers are followed. The Baby Friendly Health Initiative Ten Steps to Successful Breastfeeding are the global standard by which health services are assessed and accredited. A ‘Baby Friendly’ health service is one where mothers’ informed choice of feeding is supported, respected and encouraged. Tasmania’s first hospital to become Baby Friendly Health Initiative accredited was Calvary Hobart Hospital in 2003, they have been re-accredited twice and are about to undergo their third accreditation process. As of 2009, all Tasmanian hospitals hold the Baby Friendly Health Initiative accreditation.
Focus Area 5: Food security

Food security refers to the ability of individuals, households and communities to acquire food that is sufficient, reliable, nutritious, safe, acceptable and sustainable. The Australian population is generally considered to be food secure. However, there is evidence of food insecurity among sections of the population. Groups that are more vulnerable to food insecurity include people on low incomes, people who are unemployed, people who are homeless, young people, people paying rent, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander groups, refugees and other migrants are also vulnerable to food insecurity. Other groups with specialised nutritional requirements are also at risk of inadequate intake. People who are frail or aged, people with mental or physical disabilities, chronic wasting illnesses such as cancers, Hepatitis C, HIV/AIDS, alcohol or other drug dependencies or eating disorders are nutritionally vulnerable.

Tasmania has a higher level of socioeconomic disadvantage compared to other states in Australia. Hence, it is likely that food insecurity will be experienced by proportionately more people in Tasmania than elsewhere in Australia.

Goal
To ensure all Tasmanians have adequate access to nutritious and safe food to meet their nutritional needs

Sub-goals
1. Increase awareness of the factors that influence food security in Tasmania.
2. Reduce social, cultural and economic barriers to food security.
3. Reduce geographical and physical barriers to food security.
4. Ensure the nutritional needs of Tasmanians with special nutritional requirements are met.

Key achievements

- The Tasmanian Food and Nutrition Policy has recognised that food security is an issue that needs addressing in Tasmania by including it as a focus area.
- In response to the Social Inclusion Commissioner’s report, A Social Inclusion Strategy for Tasmania, the Premier has announced $1 million over two years to be held in trust by a newly established Tasmanian Food Security Council in a Food Security Fund to support initiatives directed at improving food security for Tasmanians.
- In 2008, a food security planning meeting was held between DHHS, the Tasmanian Council of Social Services, the Tasmanian Association of Community Houses and Eat Well Tasmania. This meeting
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Tasmania has a higher level of socioeconomic disadvantage compared to other states in Australia. Hence, it is likely that food insecurity will be experienced by proportionately more people in Tasmania than elsewhere in Australia.

Goal
To ensure all Tasmanians have adequate access to nutritious and safe food to meet their nutritional needs

Sub-goals
1. Increase awareness of the factors that influence food security in Tasmania.
2. Reduce social, cultural and economic barriers to food security.
3. Reduce geographical and physical barriers to food security.
4. Ensure the nutritional needs of Tasmanians with special nutritional requirements are met.

Key achievements
- The Tasmanian Food and Nutrition Policy has achieved an increased awareness about food security amongst the organisations, helped to galvanise thinking about food security and was a constructive initial step towards creating partnerships amongst the organisations and to maximise the impact of individual action to address food security.
- The Tasmanian Council of Social Services interest in food security resulted from research done in 2008 showing many Tasmanians struggle to put nutritious food on the table. The report, “Just scraping by?” Conversations with Tasmanians living on low incomes, was released in 2009.
- The Tasmanian Association of Community Houses identified local needs though community consultation and round table discussions with local community services and agencies which has led to the development of initiatives such as school breakfast programs, community gardens and community kitchens.
- Population Health has prioritised resources to investigate and address food security.
- The growth of community programs and partnerships focussed on local food production, nutrition education and socialisation is an achievement, although the impact on food security has not been assessed. Examples of community programs include:
  - the growth of community gardens and similar networks in lower socioeconomic areas such as the Grow and Learn project in Bridgewater encourage local and accessible fruit and vegetable production through the community garden and supporting people to start their own food garden at home
- the Smith Family has partnered with disadvantaged communities around the state to fund programs that address local need (Grow and Learn is one of these programs)
- the Eating with Friends program is now auspiced by the Tasmanian Association of Community Houses and involves bringing people together to share meals and increase social contact amongst the elderly population in Tasmania. This has been successful in decreasing social isolation. Environmental Health DHHS is supporting community houses to ensure food safety and address food safety legislation changes
- a variety of school breakfast programs have made a contribution to food security in primary school children by providing a healthy breakfast. However, not all programs are sustainable (due to short term funding) or provide the long-term solution to food insecurity
- the family food PATCH program is another collaborative project which has been successful improving the nutrition and physical activity knowledge and skills of parents of children aged 0–12 years by training peer educators from communities throughout Tasmania
- Eat Well Tasmania links parties interested in promotion and supports local health promotion programs including food security.
- Other community support programs which address food security include:
  - community and neighbourhood houses which assist people to manage their finances better including food budgets and access to affordable and healthy food
Key challenges

- There is a lack of coordination of local data on the extent of food security in Tasmania. There is no clear picture of how many people are affected by food insecurity and how it affects them, or the best strategies to address the issues. It is difficult to establish the extent of the problem or monitor trends over time on food security.

- The global financial crisis means more people will struggle to put food on the table, not just people in poverty. The rising cost of living, unemployment and food prices will put increasing pressure on the ability of an increasing number of Tasmanians to provide safe, nutritious food.

- The economic impact of poor nutrition and food insecurity in terms of direct health outcomes and productivity may not be top of mind for policy makers. Food insecurity contributes to poor health. An Anglicare survey conducted in 2005 indicated up to 40 per cent of Tasmanians with health care cards may suffer some degree of food insecurity.

- Around one third of Tasmanians rely on a government benefit as their main source of income. National research indicates that people on government benefits are struggling to get by. The gap between the rich and the poor appears to be widening.

- Access to transport is recognised as a key determinant of food security. Transport affects people’s ability to travel to shops and access food, particularly in the lower socioeconomic areas. Tasmania has a de-centralised population and it is a challenge for those in rural and isolated areas to access affordable and nutritious food. The Premier has indicated transport is a priority but Tasmania currently has limited infrastructure for public transport.

- Increasing food transport costs is contributing to increasing the price of food for Tasmanians.

- emergency relief programs such as the Food Bank at Deloraine Community house, although community houses mainly refer to other emergency relief agencies like the Salvation Army and Anglicare.

- The Tasmanian Government passed the Civil Liability Amendment Act 2008 which amends the Civil Liability Act 2002 in order to provide greater legal protection to persons in the community that assist ‘person in distress’. This includes food donors provided that the food complies with normal food safety storage and handling requirements.

- The legal protection afforded to food donors should increase the proportion of food that can be donated and thereby reduce overall food wastage. Organisations such as SecondBite have expressed a strong interest in establishing food banks in Tasmania now that this legislation is in place.

- Advocacy in this area is being led by agencies such as Anglicare and the Tasmanian Association of Community Houses and the Tasmanian Council of Social Services has released a report titled Just scraping by? Conversations with Tasmanians living on low incomes.

- In an effort to provide opportunities for exercise, socialisation and education for new migrants to Tasmania, the Royal Tasmanian Botanical Gardens provided Grow Your Own classes, aimed at introducing migrants to local gardening methods, local vegetable and fruit varieties, their cultivation and use. Due to funding issues the Royal Tasmanian Botanical Gardens can no longer run the program, but part of the program is now being run by TAFE using the Migrant Community Garden on the Eastern Shore.
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Case Study
Eating with Friends

The Eating with Friends program is now auspiced by the Tasmanian Association of Community Housing and involves bringing people together to share meals and increase social contact amongst the elderly population in Tasmania. This has been successful in decreasing social isolation. Since its inception in 2000, Eating with Friends has become a community driven initiative with approximately 25 Eating with Friends groups operating throughout Tasmania. There are a number of organisations involved in running the groups including community groups, schools, churches, neighbourhood houses, ethnic communities and health centres. Volunteers and workers from these organisations plan and run the group’s activities.

A Steering Committee has been active since the early days of Eating with Friends. The committee has encouraged and supported new and existing groups by providing advice, support and resources. The Eating with Friends Steering Committee has successfully gained funding through Home and Community Care (HACC) to employ a co-ordinator to support existing Eating with Friends groups and to assist with the development of new groups. This new funding commenced in January 2009.

Interest has been expressed from interstate groups (New South Wales and Queensland) in the Eating with Friends model. The committee has assisted a Queensland group who have adapted the program to address malnutrition in their target group.
• The work to date around food security is mainly
done at a consumer level. More focus is required on
food supply chains in the state.

• Food security is often neglected as a social
issue and partnerships across sectors are not
established. Building partnerships across all sectors
and different organisations is required to properly
address this issue.

• Food chain issues which result in exporting food
out of the state then importing back to Tasmania
and costs involved with those transactions may add
to the cost of food. Increasing local production and
distribution of food may support food security.

• Business development tends to focus on exports.
There is a challenge balancing sustainable industry
and being able to provide local food security. For
example, substantial sectors of the Tasmanian
seafood industry are export oriented for clear
market reasons. For these producers to shift to
supplying local markets would require significant
direct government intervention – which the seafood
industry does not support.

• Tasmania is a major vegetable and fruit supplier
for Australia. There are opportunities to explore
how to foster connections between food producers
and local communities to make locally produced
food available.

• The effective duopoly of supermarkets limits
competition and price discounting, which can mean
food is more expensive.

• Unit pricing of foods will make it easier to allow
people to choose foods based on cost per unit
(for example cost per 100 grams). Food labelling
may make it easier for people to choose healthier
options but there is a risk that too much information
could make it harder for people to understand.
Community education is required with the
introduction of unit pricing, without it this could be
more confusing for consumers.

• Tasmanians have a history of home produce gardens.
Water metering (charging for water use), where it
exists, may be a disincentive for people to grow their
own vegetables.

• There are opportunities to promote community
gardens especially in public housing communities.

• Continued time limited funding to address the food
security issue prevents sustainable action
and outcomes.

• Emergency food relief fills a vital need but providing
food does not get to the root cause of food
insecurity. That is, emergency relief addresses the
symptoms of food insecurity (ie hunger), but not the
root cause (ie poverty).

• National organisations like Second Bite could provide
a more coordinated approach to emergency relief
but may also reduce the impact of community
building that stems from local food suppliers
donating food.

• Currently, major food retailers have food wastage
as it is currently disposed if not used or sold. A
challenge is to find an effective method by which
major retailers can donate food that is safe in order
to reduce food waste. At least one large retail chain
has a target to reduce food waste to zero in the
general waste stream by 2015.

• Lack of food knowledge and basic cooking skills can
limit people’s ability to improve food security.

• There is increasing recognition of the link between
nutrition and wellbeing. Tasmanians are generally
aware of better food and better health outcomes.
However, for many Tasmanians who are food
insecure it is difficult to meet the healthy eating
recommendations.

• The impact of climate change on food production
with increasing cost of power (carbon trading) and
water (drought), and the flow on effects to food
security have not been well considered.
Focus Area 6: Primary production

Primary production is a major contributor to the economic wealth of Tasmania. The diversity and quality of Tasmanian produce has also become integral to the tourism industry. Primary production in Tasmania continues to grow with producers accessing national and international markets. This has increased the expectation for high standards in food safety and quality. Within primary production, consideration needs to be given to:

- contribution to the state’s economic wealth – including employment
- quality food production
- food standards and regulations (for example, organic and biodynamic produce)
- research and development

Food and nutrition policy in Tasmania needs to maximise economic benefits to the community through employment and market contribution while also meeting consumer demand for minimally processed and quality local produce.

Goal
To ensure Tasmania has a primary produce sector that is economically viable and produces safe and quality food

Sub-Goals
1. Support primary industries in the production of safe food.
2. Promote quality food production by primary industries.
4. Strengthen research and development in the primary production sector.

Key achievements
- There has been increased recognition of the value to Tasmania of primary production and how much it contributes to Tasmania’s gross state product. The food industry Score Card has been developed to a stage where it provides comprehensive information on the value of the food industry to Tasmania and tracks value along the food chain – from the farm gate or beach, to our customer overseas, interstate and locally in Tasmania.
- Productivity and product improvements including:
  - scab resistant potatoes (improves potato productivity)
  - development of cherries that grow with reduced splitting
  - enhanced productivity plans for wine production in Tasmania.

- Tasmanians have a history of home produce gardens. Water metering (charging for water use), where it exists, may be a disincentive for people to grow their own vegetables.
- There are opportunities to promote community gardens especially in public housing communities.
- Continued time limited funding to address the food security issue prevents sustainable action and outcomes.
- Emergency food relief fills a vital need but providing food does not get to the root cause of food insecurity. That is, emergency relief addresses the symptoms of food insecurity (ie hunger), but not the root cause (ie poverty).
- National organisations like Second Bite could provide a more coordinated approach to emergency relief but may also reduce the impact of community building that stems from local food suppliers donating food.
- Currently, major food retailers have food wastage as it is currently disposed if not used or sold. A challenge is to find an effective method by which major retailers can donate food that is safe in order to reduce food waste. At least one large retail chain has a target to reduce food waste to zero in the general waste stream by 2015.
- Lack of food knowledge and basic cooking skills can limit people’s ability to improve food security.
- There is increasing recognition of the link between nutrition and wellbeing. Tasmanians are generally aware of better food and better health outcomes. However, for many Tasmanians who are food insecure it is difficult to meet the healthy eating recommendations.
- The impact of climate change on food production with increasing cost of power (carbon trading) and water (drought), and the flow on effects to food security have not been well considered.

- The work to date around food security is mainly done at a consumer level. More focus is required on food supply chains in the state.
- Food security is often neglected as a social issue and partnerships across sectors are not established. Building partnerships across all sectors and different organisations is required to properly address this issue.
- Food chain issues which result in exporting food out of the state then importing back to Tasmania and costs involved with those transactions may add to the cost of food. Increasing local production and distribution of food may support food security.
- Business development tends to focus on exports. There is a challenge balancing sustainable industry and being able to provide local food security. For example, substantial sectors of the Tasmanian seafood industry are export oriented for clear market reasons. For these producers to shift to supplying local markets would require significant direct government intervention – which the seafood industry does not support.
- Tasmania is a major vegetable and fruit supplier for Australia. There are opportunities to explore how to foster connections between food producers and local communities to make locally produced food available.
- The effective duopoly of supermarkets limits competition and price discounting, which can mean food is more expensive.
- Unit pricing of foods will make it easier to allow people to choose foods based on cost per unit (for example cost per 100 grams). Food labelling may make it easier for people to choose healthier options but there is a risk that too much information could make it harder for people to understand. Community education is required with the introduction of unit pricing, without it this could be more confusing for consumers.

- There are opportunities to promote community gardens especially in public housing communities.
- Continued time limited funding to address the food security issue prevents sustainable action and outcomes.
- Emergency food relief fills a vital need but providing food does not get to the root cause of food insecurity. That is, emergency relief addresses the symptoms of food insecurity (ie hunger), but not the root cause (ie poverty).
- National organisations like Second Bite could provide a more coordinated approach to emergency relief but may also reduce the impact of community building that stems from local food suppliers donating food.
- Currently, major food retailers have food wastage as it is currently disposed if not used or sold. A challenge is to find an effective method by which major retailers can donate food that is safe in order to reduce food waste. At least one large retail chain has a target to reduce food waste to zero in the general waste stream by 2015.
- Lack of food knowledge and basic cooking skills can limit people’s ability to improve food security.
- There is increasing recognition of the link between nutrition and wellbeing. Tasmanians are generally aware of better food and better health outcomes. However, for many Tasmanians who are food insecure it is difficult to meet the healthy eating recommendations.
- The impact of climate change on food production with increasing cost of power (carbon trading) and water (drought), and the flow on effects to food security have not been well considered.

- Tasmanians have a history of home produce gardens. Water metering (charging for water use), where it exists, may be a disincentive for people to grow their own vegetables.
- There are opportunities to promote community gardens especially in public housing communities.
- Continued time limited funding to address the food security issue prevents sustainable action and outcomes.
- Emergency food relief fills a vital need but providing food does not get to the root cause of food insecurity. That is, emergency relief addresses the symptoms of food insecurity (ie hunger), but not the root cause (ie poverty).
- National organisations like Second Bite could provide a more coordinated approach to emergency relief but may also reduce the impact of community building that stems from local food suppliers donating food.
- Currently, major food retailers have food wastage as it is currently disposed if not used or sold. A challenge is to find an effective method by which major retailers can donate food that is safe in order to reduce food waste. At least one large retail chain has a target to reduce food waste to zero in the general waste stream by 2015.
- Lack of food knowledge and basic cooking skills can limit people’s ability to improve food security.
- There is increasing recognition of the link between nutrition and wellbeing. Tasmanians are generally aware of better food and better health outcomes. However, for many Tasmanians who are food insecure it is difficult to meet the healthy eating recommendations.
- The impact of climate change on food production with increasing cost of power (carbon trading) and water (drought), and the flow on effects to food security have not been well considered.
• A major research project into the Montagu water catchment has demonstrated the nature of run-off into river systems. This has led to a greater understanding of how to manage run-off and excess phosphorous. A key finding of the project demonstrated that if a paddock-by-paddock evaluation of phosphorous levels is undertaken, many do not require fertiliser.

• Completion of a project looking at herbicide binding in Tasmanian soils which will inform herbicide application models so they are better suited to Tasmanian soils and systems. This will result in more accurate application of herbicides and pesticides and reduced likelihood of run-off.

• Development of controlled traffic systems in the vegetable industry will significantly reduce the effects of soil compaction in crop growth zones. This is achieved by permanently separating wheel traffic lanes from the soil in which the crops grow (see Case Study: Controlled traffic farming for further information).

• Expansion of the Tasmanian Institute of Agricultural Research – $6 million ($1.5m over four years) to improve food production capacity in the dairy and vegetable industry.

• Expansion of the salmon industry and promotion of the nutritional value of high omega-three fatty acid fish.

• Primary production in Tasmania provided significant income generation and employment opportunities, for example, in 2006-2007 the Tasmanian seafood industry alone generated $475,429 million in income and provided employment for over 7,000 Tasmanians.

• Primary production standards for seafood were developed and implemented in 2006. This has enhanced the industry’s ability to demonstrate the production of safe food at the farm level and at harvest.

• The Ministerial Organics Advisory Group was formed in 2003 and continues to assist the development of the organic industry in Tasmania.

• The organic industry (through the Organic Coalition of Tasmania) and DPIPW have been working collaboratively on skilling industry in supply chain issues. DPIPW, DEDTA and the Organic Coalition of Tasmania are collectively encouraging large scale conventional farmers to investigate the option of organic conversion.

• The Tasmanian Government through DPIPW has had a representative on the Standards Australia Committee currently drafting a domestic standard for organic production and processing, and there has been considerable consultation with industry during all phases of this process. A domestic standard (which will be voluntary) will provide a clearer pathway for all industry and farming sectors on what is required as a basis for their organic production needs.
A major research project into the Montagu water catchment has demonstrated the nature of run-off into river systems. This has led to a greater understanding of how to manage run-off and excess phosphorous. A key finding of the project demonstrated that if a paddock-by-paddock evaluation of phosphorous levels is undertaken, many do not require fertiliser.

Completion of a project looking at herbicide binding in Tasmanian soils which will inform herbicide application models so they are better suited to Tasmanian soils and systems. This will result in more accurate application of herbicides and pesticides and reduced likelihood of run-off.

Development of controlled traffic systems in the vegetable industry will significantly reduce the effects of soil compaction in crop growth zones. This is achieved by permanently separating wheel traffic lanes from the soil in which the crops grow. Controlled Traffic Farming is a farming system that permanently separates wheel traffic lanes from the soil in which the crop grows. It is based on the simple logic that crops grow better in soft soil and wheels work better on roads.

Controlled Traffic Farming works equally well for crops planted on raised beds or on the flat. It is a system where compaction can be managed for benefit.

Controlled Traffic Farming is being taken up in the grain and sugar industries due to the many benefits offered. These include:

- reduced energy requirements for tillage and traffic, therefore reduced fuel use and reduced capital investment in tractors
- improved soil structure for crop growth
- improved soil biology
- improved infiltration and water holding capacity, therefore more efficient storage and use of rain and irrigation water and reduced run off and erosion
- higher, more uniform yield.

Further information about controlled traffic farming can be accessed from www.dpiw.tas.gov.au.
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- reduced energy requirements for tillage and traffic, therefore reduced fuel use and reduced capital investment in tractors
- improved soil structure for crop growth
- improved soil biology
- improved infiltration and water holding capacity, therefore more efficient storage and use of rain and irrigation water and reduced run off and erosion
- higher, more uniform yield.

Further information about controlled traffic farming can be accessed from www.dpiw.tas.gov.au.

Primary production in Tasmania provided significant income generation and employment opportunities, for example, in 2006-2007 the Tasmanian seafood industry alone generated $475.429 million in income and provided employment for over 7,000 Tasmanians.

Primary production standards for seafood were developed and implemented in 2006. This has enhanced the industry’s ability to demonstrate the production of safe food at the farm level and at harvest.

The Ministerial Organics Advisory Group was formed in 2003 and continues to assist the development of the organic industry in Tasmania.

The organic industry (through the Organic Coalition of Tasmania) and DPIPWW have been working collaboratively on skilling industry in supply chain issues. DPIPWE, DEDTA and the Organic Coalition of Tasmania are collectively encouraging large scale conventional farmers to investigate the option of organic conversion.

The Ministerial Organics Advisory Group was formed in 2003 and continues to assist the development of the organic industry in Tasmania.

The Tasmanian Government through DPIPWE has had a representative on the Standards Australia Committee currently drafting a domestic standard for organic production and processing, and there has been considerable consultation with industry during all phases of this process. A domestic standard (which will be voluntary) will provide a clearer pathway for all industry and farming sectors on what is required as a basis for their organic production needs.
Key challenges

- The broad challenges for primary production include ensuring sustainable water resources for food production, food branding, marketing, packaging and labelling as well as international competition including subsidised farming practices in the European Union and United States of America and promotion of primary production.
- Consumers are more influenced by price than the origin of food. There is a challenge to increase consumer loyalty to Tasmanian produce to support local industry.
- Ensuring outcomes from primary production research are disseminated in a practical and timely way to enable producers to integrate research findings into practice.
- Inconsistency in food technology standards internationally can limit market access. For example the European Union specifies a methodology for determining biotoxin in shellfish that is not utilised, or considered best practice, in Australia and New Zealand. This has necessitates Tasmanian making special arrangements for additional testing in order to access European markets.
- The organic food industry faces supply challenges as many enterprises are small and unable to meet the demands of large retailers. However, a few operations in Tasmania are now large enough to supply greater quantities of organic fruit and vegetables.
- The evidentiary base concerning the nutritional quality of organic food versus conventional produce requires further research.
- Minimising the carbon footprint associated with food production, transport and distribution presents a challenge. Within Tasmania there has been an upsurge in eat local campaigns. This creates a tension when food export markets are a major economic driver for the state.
- The challenges related to bio-security can impact on the local and export market. Tasmania will need to monitor bio-security issues.
- Tougher requirements and controls in relation to the development of the primary production standards have at times been met with resistance from some producers.
The business areas of distribution, retail and wholesale have made progress over the last few years in relation to food safety. There have been significant changes as a result of the food safety program rolled out during 2000.

At an individual level, organisations have reported changes in management, structure and logistics including:
- reduced reliance on pallets – now using roll cages for transportation of products from warehouses to stores which has improved efficiencies as it reduces product handling
- fresh produce and the use of returnable crates – growers pack directly into crates so that food can be shifted straight to the store. This reduces handling, increases quality, freshness and improves stock rotation

- increased number of stores and store expansion
- increased storage capacity
- improvements in refrigerated transport
- preservation of the cool chain (see Focus Area 2 – Food safety)
- broad improvements in design and layout of supermarkets (better storage and temperature control) to help prolong shelf life

Focus Area 7: Distribution, retail and wholesale
- introduction of quality assurance programs – while participation is voluntary, standards have been set which increases awareness
- quality assurance programs – in particular the generation of residue reports and product specification details
  • Retailers have provided support for, and promotion of, Tasmanian foods through events such as Agfest.
  • Media and marketing – a range of initiatives such as the Coles 7 a Day program. While the program may not have been as successful as first hoped, the partnership and between retail/industry and health was seen as successful.
  • Unit pricing – while this is still in the pilot phase and will help consumers, there are also challenges around the available space on shelves and the tendency for this process to conceal the value and quality aspects of different price points.
  • Increased commercial acceptance of Tasmanian product both domestically and internationally.
  • The influential role played by leading chefs who use Tasmanian produce and acceptance by local producers of the need to differentiate their product based on environmental credentials such as low pesticide and chemical use.
  • One major retail chain has introduced marketing measures to improve consumer satisfaction with quality and value for money in purchasing fresh, seasonal produce.

Changes in the use of plastic bags. This has presented huge challenges including getting customers to remember to bring their own bags, operational issues at point of sale, retaining costs, being competitive and serving customers.

  • Seasonal challenges in relation to fresh produce due to the level of quality, for example, problems with stone fruit and pears damaged by hail.
  • A standard challenge within distribution is trying to get the product to the store and the consumer as quickly as possible.
  • Other standard challenges include accountability, discipline, price competitiveness and the greater number of competitors within the niche area.
  • The development and management of distribution networks to assist with movement and storage of stock. This challenge is unique to Tasmania as there is no central market (as compared to Melbourne and Sydney) and the key growing areas within Tasmania are geographically separated.
  • A central point (for example a central market or co-op type arrangement) in Tasmania which acts to consolidate the production and distribution of fresh produce may help to overcome the challenges of fresh produce leaving the island and then returning.
  • The costs and efficiencies associated with transport and delivery of fresh food and the investment in infrastructure needed to do this in a timely way are challenges. Some distributors are looking at outsourcing this work to freight companies rather than investing in their own transport fleet. The challenges will be in maintaining the strong links between distribution centres and the outlets/stores and the efficiency of deliveries.

Key challenges

• Environmental challenges:
  - Banana shortage due to the natural disasters such as the cyclone in northern Queensland. This resulted in a significant price increase however stores still managed to obtain and supply bananas.
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• Unit pricing – while this is still in the pilot phase and will help consumers, there are also challenges around the available space on shelves and the tendency for this process to conceal the value and quality aspects of different price points.
• Increased commercial acceptance of Tasmanian product both domestically and internationally.

• The influential role played by leading chefs who use Tasmanian produce and acceptance by local producers of the need to differentiate their product based on environmental credentials such as low pesticide and chemical use.
• One major retail chain has introduced marketing measures to improve consumer satisfaction with quality and value for money in purchasing fresh, seasonal produce.

Key challenges

• Environmental challenges:
  - Banana shortage due to the natural disasters such as the cyclone in northern Queensland. This resulted in a significant price increase however stores still managed to obtain and supply bananas.
• Changes in the use of plastic bags. This has presented huge challenges including getting customers to remember to bring their own bags, operational issues at point of sale, retaining costs, being competitive and serving customers.
• Seasonal challenges in relation to fresh produce due to the level of quality, for example, problems with stone fruit and pears damaged by hail.
• A standard challenge within distribution is trying to get the product to the store and the consumer as quickly as possible.
• Other standard challenges include accountability, discipline, price competitiveness and the greater number of competitors within the niche area.
• The development and management of distribution networks to assist with movement and storage of stock. This challenge is unique to Tasmania as there is no central market (as compared to Melbourne and Sydney) and the key growing areas within Tasmania are geographically separated.
• A central point (for example a central market or co-op type arrangement) in Tasmania which acts to consolidate the production and distribution of fresh produce may help to overcome the challenges of fresh produce leaving the island and then returning.
• The costs and efficiencies associated with transport and delivery of fresh food and the investment in infrastructure needed to do this in a timely way are challenges. Some distributors are looking at outsourcing this work to freight companies rather than investing in their own transport fleet. The challenges will be in maintaining the strong links between distribution centres and the outlets/stores and the efficiency of deliveries.

Focus Area 8: Food service

The majority of food eaten in Tasmania is purchased from supermarkets and grocery stores (see Focus Area 7: Distribution, retail and wholesale). However, there is an increasing trend towards food being prepared outside the home environment. For the purposes of this policy, the food service sector includes those responsible for preparing and serving foods and beverages in restaurants, cafes and take-away outlets, school and worksite canteens, childcare services, sporting venues, community centres and other community-based services. The food service sector also includes those responsible for preparing and serving food and beverages in institutions such as hospitals, nursing homes, residential care services, correctional services and those responsible for delivered meals. Food prepared by the food service sector can form a significant part of an individual’s dietary intake. It is crucial, therefore, that food of high nutritional quality, and which is safe, is provided for consumption.

Goal
To ensure the Tasmanian food service sector is economically viable and provides healthy and safe food.

Sub-Goals
1. Increase the availability and promotion of safe and healthy food from the food service sector.
2. Promote practices consistent with food legislation and best practice in food safety among the food service sector.
3. Increase consumer demand for safe and healthy food from the food service sector.
4. Ensure food provided in institutions* and from delivered meals organisations is safe and meets the nutritional needs of the client group (*hospitals, nursing homes, residential care services and prisons).

Key achievements

• Note: see also Food safety section
• As part of the Australian Hotels Association awards there is an annual award to food outlets that offer healthy children’s menus – Cool Fuel for Kids.
• Tasmanian has attracted commercial acceptance of its food products both domestically and internationally. Leading chefs now use Tasmanian produce and local producers recognise the need to differentiate their product based on environmental credentials.
• Savour Tasmania, an initiative of the Department of Economic Development, Tourism and the Arts to showcase the highest quality Tasmanian products by engaging high-end international and national chefs.
• The Tasmanian Government has provided funding to Eat Well Tasmania Inc. under the healthy@work program to develop practical solutions for healthier vending machines in Tasmanian workplaces. The project, known as Healthy Options for Vending – Employer Resource or the
The HOVER project, will ensure that where workplaces have vending machines, a range of clearly identified healthy food and drink choices are provided and promoted. A training package will be developed on healthy vending machines that can be integrated into the ‘Network of Practice training’ provided by the healthy@work program for worksites.

- In 2008, a comprehensive assessment of food services in DHHS was undertaken in the context of consideration of a new Royal Hobart Hospital (RHH). This included a state-wide meeting that was attended by about 30 people from various disciplines including environmental health officers, food service managers, contract managers and dietitians. The purpose of the meeting was to better coordinate food services provided by DHHS. The meeting raised awareness of the importance of good nutrition in achieving quality patient outcomes and the pressures on food service managers to continually identify efficiencies in food service management. Subsequent to this meeting the RHH has invested in new food production and delivery equipment that should lift food quality produced for both use within the RHH and of bulk food produced for external users.

- Meeting the nutritional needs of client groups has been improved through developments in hospital menus including: daily healthy options on the menus (RHH and North West Regional Hospital [NWRH]) and in some cafeterias (Launceston General Hospital [LGH]); the introduction of low sodium diets (RHH); a finger food menu; and, special provisions for Cystic Fibrosis patients (RHH).

- Protected meal times commenced at the RHH and NWRH to improve the intake of patient meals by providing support to patients at meal times. This project is running on two wards at the RHH and one ward at the NWRH but could not be sustained hospital-wide.

- RHH and NWRH have introduced nutrition screening on admission resulting in earlier access to high-energy diets and supplements for patients who are not optimally nourished (through the dietetic assistant).

- Feel Better RHH is a health promotion initiative (lead by hospital management) has been implemented at the RHH which aims to improve access to healthy choices for staff.

- The introduction of a Food and Nutrition Policy at the RHH. This hospital also have standardised recipes and procedures since 2004.

- RHH plans to include nutrition requirements into food contracts.

- All major hospitals (LGH, NWRH, RHH) have undergone a third party Class I Audit for assessment of the suitability and implementation of their food safety programs. Regular food safety training for staff and compliance with food safety audits have been implemented at the LGH and RHH.

- Annual revenue from food service activities has increased at the LGH.

- Correctional services have made vast improvements to quality assurance and quality management with regard to food service and safety. A team of staff completed Hazard Analysis and Critical Control
• In 2008, a comprehensive assessment of food services in DHHS was undertaken in the context of consideration of a new Royal Hobart Hospital (RHH). This included a state-wide meeting that was attended by about 30 people from various disciplines including environmental health officers, food service managers, contract managers and dietitians. The purpose of the meeting was to better coordinate food services provided by DHHS.

• Meeting the nutritional needs of client groups has increased at the LGH and North West Regional Hospital (NWRH) have introduced nutrition screening on admission resulting in earlier access to high-energy diets and supplements for patients who are not optimally nourished (through the dietetic assistant).

• Feel Better RHH is a health promotion initiative (lead by hospital management) has been implemented at the RHH which aims to improve access to healthy choices for staff.

• The introduction of a Food and Nutrition Policy at the RHH. This hospital also have standardised recipes and procedures since 2004.

• RHH plans to include nutrition requirements into food contracts.

• All major hospitals (LGH, NWRH, RHH) have undergone a third party Class 1 Audit for assessment of the suitability and implementation of their food safety programs. Regular food safety training for staff and compliance with food safety audits have been implemented at the LGH and RHH.

• Annual revenue from food service activities has increased at the LGH.

• Correctional services have made vast improvements to quality assurance and quality management with regard to food service and safety. A team of staff completed Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points (HACCP) training, the implementation of ISO 9001:2000 (an international standard for food safety and quality management), and quality assurance systems.

• A requirement from the Tasmanian Government that food suppliers must start reaching levels to meet quality assurance systems has been achieved in correctional services.

• The Community Nutrition Unit in the Department of Health and Human Services has secured ongoing funding from the Home and Community Care program to provide a nutrition service to Home and Community Care service providers throughout Tasmania. This service includes working with providers to improve food services within their facilities to better meet the nutritional needs of clients.

Key challenges

• Finding ways to engage high-end chefs and the hospitality and tourism training sector to take a lead role in designing meals that not only look and taste good but are also healthy is an ongoing challenge.

• The Healthy Options Tasmania program was an attempt to advertise and promote food outlets with healthy and safe food practices, linked with Eat Well Tasmania and run through local governments. The program has been discontinued as despite the many partners involved, there were limited funds to support program implementation. In addition, the program was more readily adopted in higher socio-economic areas. A significant long-term financial commitment would be required to make a difference in this sector.

• Food service outlets, such as takeaway outlets, have no representative or peak body such as the Restaurant and Catering Association Tasmania, making it difficult to engage the sector. Interstate and overseas research suggest many food outlets feel that customers want less healthy options, therefore they saw no incentive to change their practice (some studies targeting consumers contradicts this perception with consumers wanting healthy options, some recent studies with workplaces supports this notion).

• If governments are to encourage food service outlets to offer healthier food choices it is important for those food service outlets managed or funded by governments to lead the way in role modelling this practice.

• A fragmentation of responsibility for food services and nutritional care within the hospital system has led to a number of tensions related to priorities highlighting the importance of an overarching policy or a higher level management structure to reach a shared vision for food services in the clinical setting. Examples include:
  - competing priorities between efficiencies in food production costs, food safety and meeting nutritional needs of patients
  - ensuring maximum variety within the food service setting
  - seeking the healthy option in the form of increased public nutrition awareness and promotion of healthy eating choices for the general population.
- The grocery contracts for food services within DHHS do not contain nutritional standards. While some stakeholders see this as a major challenge others are less convinced of the importance of the inclusion of nutritional standards.

- In 2008 there was an attempt to bring together key stakeholder to work towards developing a state-wide food service model for the hospital system in Tasmania. Due to changes in the health services structure, with the implementation of regional food service management, the capacity to develop a state-wide consistent model for food services within DHHS is now limited.

- Dietetic services in district hospitals are essentially unavailable meaning there is limited knowledge associated with the current status of the quality of food service and nutritional care in district hospitals.

- Fragmentation in the management and coordination of delivered meals services (such as Meals on Wheels) presents problems in food safety, quality management and meeting patient needs. For example, meals are produced by one organisation, delivered by another, and nutritional care, where available, is provided through a separate mechanism again. Clients also have involvement in the storage and reheating of the product and in some instances may have limited knowledge or awareness of safe food handling.

- There is a perception among food service managers in the hospital system that there is limited availability of fresh and quality fruit and vegetables. This may relate to pressures to provide food within a limited budget.

- Community services to support patients discharged from hospital on prescribed nutritional supplements are limited. This can lead to patients continuing on supplements beyond the time required or having difficulty accessing further supplements when they are required.

- There have been an increasing number of hospital patients requiring a special diet, for example due to allergies, which presents a challenge for food service managers who are under pressure to improve efficiencies in food service management.
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• Dietetic services in district hospitals are essentially unavailable meaning there is limited knowledge associated with the current status of the quality of food service and nutritional care in district hospitals.

• Fragmentation in the management and coordination of delivered meals services (such as Meals on Wheels) presents problems in food safety, quality management and meeting patient needs. For example, meals are produced by one organisation, delivered by another; and nutritional care, where available, is provided through a separate mechanism again. Clients also have involvement in the storage and reheating of the product and in some instances may have limited knowledge or awareness of safe food handling.

• There is a perception among food service managers in the hospital system that there is limited availability of fresh and quality fruit and vegetables. This may relate to pressures to provide food within a limited budget.

• Community services to support patients discharged from hospital on prescribed nutritional supplements are limited. This can lead to patients continuing on supplements beyond the time required or having difficulty accessing further supplements when they are required.

• There have been an increasing number of hospital patients requiring a special diet, for example due to allergies, which presents a challenge for food service managers who are under pressure to improve efficiencies in food service management.

• There is a perception among food service managers in the hospital system that there is limited availability of fresh and quality fruit and vegetables. This may relate to pressures to provide food within a limited budget.

Focus Area 9: Labelling

Appropriate labelling of foods provides consumers with the information they need to make informed decisions about the food they purchase and eat. With accurate labelling, consumer awareness should be increased in the areas of nutritional value of foods, technologies used for food production and preservation, and safety of food. Labelling may also assist in raising consumer awareness regarding country of origin of products, and may encourage Tasmanians to purchase more local produce. Labelling laws are revised constantly to improve information for consumers. Some recent changes include mandatory nutrition information panels (NIPs), improved date marking (including best before and use by information), improved declarations about a range of potential allergens such as nuts, and labelling relating to the use of gene technology and food irradiation.

Goal
To ensure food labelling in Tasmania complies with national requirements and assists consumers to make informed food choices.

Sub-Goals
1. Promote a consistent national approach to labelling for nutrient content claims.
2. Improve industry consistency and accuracy in provision of health and nutrient claims.
3. Enhance the ability of consumers to make informed food choices based on labelling information.

Key achievements
• Since the implementation of the Tasmanian Food and Nutrition Policy in 2004, labelling provisions have been improved in terms of providing more allergen information and country of origin information. This is useful for consumers to identify allergies in food, where food has come from, and potentially encourages consumption of local food. In addition, some retail outlets have implemented ‘free from’ labelling on private label products to assist consumers with specific dietary needs such as gluten-free.

• The 2008 Food Standards Australia New Zealand (FSANZ) consumer survey indicates that consumer use and understanding of labels has increased.

• A nationally consistent approach to front-of-pack labelling is progressing with states and territories working collaboratively. Formal mechanisms to progress this work have been developed and there are also informal networks promoting better communication between states and territories.

• There has been increasing recognition that food regulation and food labelling have a role to play in the broader public health arena. In the past,
interpretation of ‘public health’ has focused on immediate threats to public health such as food safety. With increasing rates of obesity, chronic disease and a national focus on preventative health it has been recognised that food regulation and labelling may also have a role to play supporting broader health strategies. The Australian New Zealand Food Regulation Ministerial Council Food Regulation Standing Committee has developed an overarching strategic statement which recognises public health nutrition, food safety and industry support.

• High-level recognition that nutrition needs consideration in developing food regulations has led to the formation of a position within DHHS to focus on nutrition related food regulation. This position has increased the capacity of Tasmania to contribute to national food labelling law and policy and keep abreast of national developments.

• The development of Ministerial Policy Guidelines related to nutrition such as fortification with vitamins and minerals, addition of substances other than vitamins and minerals and health claims indicates that nutrition issues are being considered in food labelling and consumers are more interested in this information on labels.

• Work is currently underway around policy for labelling of special purpose foods including infant formula.

Key challenges

• Food labelling has a complex range of reporting arrangements with different inter-governmental committees (Council of Australian Governments, Australian New Zealand Food Regulation Ministerial Council, Australian Health Ministers Conference, and their sub-committees and working groups) all have input into labelling.

• As part of the National Partnership Agreement to Deliver a Seamless National Economy, the Council of Australian Governments has agreed to reform food regulation legislation and governance arrangements and setting or modifying food standards to:

  - undertake a comprehensive review of food labelling law and policy to reduce regulatory burden while protecting public health and safety
  - improve national consistency in monitoring and enforcement of food standards.

The challenge of balancing the different needs of industry, regulators and consumers is increasing in the current economic climate. There is a national deregulation agenda and a focus on promoting preventative health. Some examples of such challenges include:

  - the complexity of nutrition information continues to increase
  - while reducing the red-tape associated with regulation, one of the challenges will be to ensure appropriate labelling to enable consumers to make informed food choices
Key challenges

- Food labelling has a complex range of reporting arrangements with different inter-governmental committees (Council of Australian Governments, Australian New Zealand Food Regulation Ministerial Council, Australian Health Ministers Conference, and their sub-committees and working groups) all have input into labelling.
- As part of the National Partnership Agreement to Deliver a Seamless National Economy, the Council of Australian Governments has agreed to reform food regulation legislation and governance arrangements and setting or modifying food standards to:
  - undertake a comprehensive review of food labelling law and policy to reduce regulatory burden while protecting public health and safety
  - improve national consistency in monitoring and enforcement of food standards.

The challenge of balancing the different needs of industry, regulators and consumers is increasing in the current economic climate. There is a national deregulation agenda and a focus on promoting preventative health. Some examples of such challenges include:

- the complexity of nutrition information continues to increase
- while reducing the red-tape associated with regulation, one of the challenges will be to ensure appropriate labelling to enable consumers to make informed food choices
- in conjunction with simplifying labelling of foods is the challenge for consumers to translate the understanding of labels into action and the potential to link into better health programs
- underlying tensions between public health initiatives and the need for industry to have sustainable and profitable business
- ensuring that labelling is not only technically correct but it is not misleading to consumers in terms of nutritional quality.

- There is a lack of enforcement capacity for labelling issues that do not have an immediate threat to public health and safety. This has been compounded by the limited consideration of enforcement in the development of new standards. (see also Focus Area 12: Workforce development)
- The food supply system is becoming more complex and manufacturers are focusing on value-added products which make labelling more complex.
- International development in labelling such information about agricultural systems, place of farming and sustainability ratings are likely to stimulate interest in Australia and if made law, will impact on food exporters. These labelling provisions are designed to provide greater consumer choice and confidence in food they purchase.

The European Union for example is considering place of farming legislation. However, additional food labelling requirements may also be ‘pushed back’ onto producers by major retailers in response to consumers demands.
- In recent times, food manufacturers and retailers have increased the level of front-of-pack labelling to assist consumers to make informed food choices. Recent evidence from the UK has revealed that co-existence of different front-of-pack label formats in the market place can cause consumer confusion. The challenge will be to gain agreement on a standard format for front-of-pack labelling whilst minimising the regulatory burden on industry.
Focus Area 10: Media, marketing and advertising

Industry, government and non-government sectors use media coverage, marketing and advertising to promote food products and to disseminate information about food and nutrition. Media coverage, marketing and advertising are among many factors that play an important role in influencing food consumption and purchasing patterns. Other important influences on food choice include family eating patterns, price and availability. Advertising of locally produced foods links closely with tourism in Tasmania as part of the clean environment marketing approach. Active promotion of affordable and accessible Tasmanian food, including fresh produce, has the potential to significantly influence the local market through increasing consumer demand. Fostering collaborative links between media, advertising, marketing, the food industry, health and consumer groups and tourism may create opportunities to increase promotion of healthy foods and healthy eating messages.

Goal
To promote media, marketing and advertising practices that promote healthy food choices, food safety and good nutrition and which promote locally produced foods.

Sub-Goals
1. Support and encourage increased media coverage, marketing and advertising of food safety, good nutrition and of healthy food choices, especially those of Tasmanian origin.
2. Increase community awareness of, and demand for, healthy food choices, especially those of Tasmanian origin.
3. Promote marketing and advertising practices consistent with the WHO International Code of the Marketing of Breast Milk Substitutes in Tasmania.
Focus Area 10: Media, marketing and advertising

Industry, government and non-government sectors use media coverage, marketing and advertising to promote food products and to disseminate information about food and nutrition. Media coverage, marketing and advertising are among many factors that play an important role in influencing food consumption and purchasing patterns. Other important influences on food choice include family eating patterns, price and availability. Advertising of locally produced foods links closely with tourism in Tasmania as part of the clean environment marketing approach. Active promotion of affordable and accessible Tasmanian food, including fresh produce, has the potential to significantly influence the local market through increasing consumer demand. Fostering collaborative links between media, advertising, marketing, the food industry, health and consumer groups and tourism may create opportunities to increase promotion of healthy foods and healthy eating messages.

Goal
To promote media, marketing and advertising practices that promote healthy food choices, food safety and good nutrition and which promote locally produced foods.

Sub-Goals
1. Support and encourage increased media coverage, marketing and advertising of food safety, good nutrition and of healthy food choices, especially those of Tasmanian origin.
2. Increase community awareness of, and demand for, healthy food choices, especially those of Tasmanian origin.
3. Promote marketing and advertising practices consistent with the WHO International Code of the Marketing of Breast Milk Substitutes in Tasmania.

Key achievements

- Eat Well Tasmania engage a range of players (paddock to plate) at a local level to promote fruit and vegetables. Some of the promotion that has occurred includes local level distribution of pamphlets about healthy eating for children, building partnerships across sectors, shifting unhealthy fundraising to healthy fundraising, supporting the Wicked Vegies program and building positive relationships with the media.
- There is heightened awareness in the media of the links between healthy eating and improved health. The media is accessing more credible sources for food and nutrition stories.
- The focus on obesity and weight loss increased support for action from a range of sources but has also shifted the focus from healthy eating, physical activity and other underlying determinants of health and there is an increased risk of disordered eating in the community.
- The vegetable marketing campaign is a positive step forward in starting to try to brand vegetables as being Tasmanian (although a lot of fruit and vegetables that Tasmania produces has not been branded as being Tasmanian so people are not aware of its origin).
- There has been an increase in media promotion opportunities with the Eat Well Tasmania award at the Taste of Tasmania for the stall with healthiest menu.
- In general, the reputation of the quality of Tasmanian food is increasing locally, interstate and overseas in certain markets. That reputation for quality is linked to an underlying belief that the food is safe, produced in a sustainable way and there are good environmental practices with production of the food within state.
- The profile of the Parents Jury (advocating for parents and grandparents to improve the nutrition and physical activity environments of their children) has increased through promotion at various conferences and seminars around the state. Media training has been received by some members.
- The Cancer Council Tasmania’s profile has strengthened with more media coverage. This non-government organisation is also using other events like Relay for Life to promote the healthy eating message by offering locally grown fruit for examples to participants.
- Increasing awareness of the food industry in promoting healthy food messages and actually offering healthy foods. For example, at the Taste of Tasmania festival caterers are competitive about offering healthy option meals at a good cost using local produce.
- Major retailers have become increasingly active in marketing healthy food choices which provides opportunities for collaborative partnerships.
Key challenges

• Television advertising and marketing practices, (including sponsorship of sporting events) for unhealthy food and drink products directed at children compete with attempts to promote healthy food choices. The budget for promoting healthy food choices is unlikely to ever reach the level of funding directed at advertising and marketing of unhealthy food choices. Consideration of legislative restrictions on marketing and advertising of unhealthy food and drink products to children needs to be considered seriously.

• Advertising that promotes a desire for women to be slim conflicts with a healthy body image. This is an area that needs to be addressed. Significant funding at national level for social marketing campaigns such as Measure Up is simplistic in nature and does not help people address underlying determinants of their health.

• There are many breaches of the World Health Organization International Code of the Marketing of Breast Milk Substitutes which fall outside of the Marketing in Australia of Infant Formulas agreement (see focus area 4 – Breastfeeding).

• Inadequate investment in large social marketing campaigns without the supporting community based interventions has been shown to be ineffective at changing behaviour. It is expected there will be more social marketing campaigns at national level that do not have community based interventions attached.

• There is increasing consumer interest in the environmental cost of food production. The challenge for the food industry is to provide consumers with information on the environmental cost of food production in a form that is understandable and comparable.

• There are limited numbers of Tasmanian food processors (companies that have managers and decisions makers who are Tasmanian as opposed to national) and this makes it more challenging to get national companies to think about developing a Tasmanian brand.

• There is a challenge balancing nutrition, health and related claims which are used by food industry to market products and which consumers want to use to assess the relative benefits of the food. There are tensions between consumer understanding of these claims and marketing of these claims out of context which can conflict with healthy eating messages. This is confusing for the public.
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Focus Area 11: Technology

The increasing need to meet market demand in terms of availability, quality, safety and nutritional value has seen the application of many forms of food technology. This includes (but is not limited to):

- gene technology
- reformulation of foods (fortification)
- reconstituted foods or food type dietary supplements
- processing technologies – irradiation, dehydration, cook/chill

Regulation of food technology is undertaken at a national level through Food Standards Australia New Zealand. However, use of food technologies in Tasmania requires a comprehensive assessment of the subsequent risks and benefits.

Goal

To monitor and, where appropriate, adopt evidence-based developments in food technology.

Sub-Goals

1. Ensure food type dietary supplements (FTDS) meet appropriate safety and nutrition outcomes.
2. Position Tasmania to take advantage of beneficial applications of gene technology in food production.
3. Enhance Tasmania’s capacity to benefit from new and emerging food technologies.

Key achievements

- The Tasmanian Government has continued its moratoria on genetically modified food production. This process has involved good communication with stakeholders and sound management of the impacts to business and industry.
- CSIRO Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) Centre was established in 2006. The CSIRO ICT Centre is working closely with the Tasmanian Institute of Agricultural Research and businesses to develop sensor network technologies for the agriculture sector.

- The Tasmanian Institute of Agricultural Research has been responsible for a number of developments in food technology in Tasmania including:
  - a program looking at bacteriophages as a biological control mechanism for food safety (bacteriophages are viruses that attack bacteria).
  - this work has been extended to include investigation of methods to control Salmonella by using bacteriophages.
  - investing in value chain research. Value chain research aims to assist local agribusiness to increase their competitiveness in international markets.
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- The Tasmanian Government has continued its moratoria on genetically modified food production. This process has involved good communication with stakeholders and sound management of the impacts to business and industry.
- CSIRO Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) Centre was established in 2006. The CSIRO ICT Centre is working closely with the Tasmanian Institute of Agricultural Research and businesses to develop sensor network technologies for the agriculture sector.

- The Tasmanian Institute of Agricultural Research has been responsible for a number of developments in food technology in Tasmania including:
  - a program looking at bacteriophages as a biological control mechanism for food safety (bacteriophages are viruses that attack bacteria).
  - this work has been extended to include investigation of methods to control Salmonella by using bacteriophages.
  - investing in value chain research. Value chain research aims to assist local agribusiness to increase their competitiveness in international markets.
- facilitating effective communication between businesses and industry and the science and research sector.

- Development of the National Functional Food Centre at Wollongong University has provided support for food industry development.

- In response to growing awareness of increasing iodine deficiency in Tasmania, other parts of South Eastern Australia and in New Zealand, DHH, with support from the Tasmanian Ministerial Thyroid Advisory Committee has to promote the need for mandatory fortification of the food supply with iodine at a bi-national level. Mandatory fortification of bread with iodine using iodised salt to replace regular salt was agreed to by the Australia New Zealand Food Ministerial Council in October 2008 and will be required in Australia from October 2009.

Key challenges

- Some sectors of the food industry are resistant to technological change. The ongoing challenge is to translate the results of research findings in food production technology into practical application for the end user.

- Tasmania has a number of premium product producers. Demand for their product in national and international markets presents challenges in terms of technological support to supply a safe, high quality product that has a reasonable shelf life.

- There is a challenge for the research sector to maintain the balance between the demand for a particular form of technology, and, researcher’s areas of interest.

- Genetically modified foods still appear in the Tasmanian food supply. This can be challenging from a labelling perspective particularly given some consumers are seeking food free from genetically modified organisms.

- It is a common belief that products free from genetic modification are best for the environment. However, in some instances genetically modified products can deliver environmental benefits such as genetically modified cotton which uses fewer pesticides and can grow in dry climates. The challenge is to maintain an even balance between use of genetically modified organisms and environmental sustainability.

- Greater understanding of the origins of all carbon emissions due to food production (for example transport, fertiliser and power) is required in order to stimulate innovation to minimise carbon emissions.

- The need to contain food prices may impact on food safety and the uptake on new technologies.
Key challenges

- Development of the National Functional Food Centre at Wollongong University has provided support for food industry development.

- In response to growing awareness of increasing iodine deficiency in Tasmania, other parts of South Eastern Australia and in New Zealand, DHHS, with support from the Tasmanian Ministerial Thyroid Advisory Committee has to promote the need for mandatory fortification of the food supply with iodine at a bi-national level. Mandatory fortification of bread with iodine using iodised salt to replace regular salt was agreed to by the Australia New Zealand Food Ministerial Council in October 2008 and will be required in Australia from October 2009.

- Development of the National Functional Food Centre at Wollongong University has provided support for food industry development.

- In response to growing awareness of increasing iodine deficiency in Tasmania, other parts of South Eastern Australia and in New Zealand, DHHS, with support from the Tasmanian Ministerial Thyroid Advisory Committee has to promote the need for mandatory fortification of the food supply with iodine at a bi-national level. Mandatory fortification of bread with iodine using iodised salt to replace regular salt was agreed to by the Australia New Zealand Food Ministerial Council in October 2008 and will be required in Australia from October 2009.

Case Study
CSIRO ICT Centre and water sensor technology

The Tasmanian Information and Communication Technologies Centre was established in September 2006 and is jointly funded by the Australian Federal Government through the Intelligent Island Program (administered by the Tasmanian Department of Economic Development, Tourism and the Arts) and the CSIRO. The centre aims to promote employment growth and wealth creation throughout the Tasmanian economy and it conducts innovative applied research in the areas of sensor networks and data management.

An example of this research is the water sensor web project (part of the Water for a Healthy Country Flagship, CSIRO) which is combining the latest information and communication technologies to improve on farm water use efficiencies and the sustainable management of Australia’s water resources. The technology is being tested for irrigation of dairy pastures in Northern Tasmania but it will also have potential applications for dry land farmers and water management authorities.

The CSIRO water sensor web project aims to improve ‘near real-time situation awareness’ of water resources by getting adaptive sensor systems and predictive models to work together. This involves observing the current state of the water resources using sensors, interpreting the information obtained from the sensors, and then using the information to model and predict future outcomes and make strategic decisions relating to the water resources.

At a glance, the water sensor web project –

- Is based on real-time situation awareness as used in the military, where access to more accurate and detailed sensor data usually leads to better tactical decisions.
- Will provide a cheap, flexible and easily deployable platform that can relay data wirelessly to a computer network or base station.
- Will provide information on the soil properties of different areas of a paddock and hence allow for more precise irrigation (for example, areas with drier, better draining soils would receive more water and areas with wetter soils, less).

Other applications –

- Entire catchment monitoring, for example South Esk River Catchment.
- More accurate forecast of stream flows, mitigated flood risk and sustainable allocation of water resources by water management authorities.
- Dry land farming, where a dense sensor web combined with other information sources could help identify optimum times to sow crops.

The openness and flexibility of the technology involved will allow farmers to use the same technology for different purposes e.g. the sensors could be used for dry land farming one year and for irrigated cropping the following year.
Focus Area 12: Workforce development

To ensure that effective food and nutrition strategies are implemented in Tasmania, it is important to have a skilled and knowledgeable workforce across many sectors including education and training, health, research, regulatory bodies and the food industry sector.

Goal
To strengthen the capacity, knowledge and skills of the Tasmanian food and nutrition workforce.

Sub-goals
1. Strengthen the food and nutrition workforce (both specialist and generalist) within the health sector.
2. Increase the capacity of the food service sector to contribute to food and nutrition promotion.
3. Increase opportunities for food and nutrition education and training in Tasmania.

Key achievements

• Since 2004 the nutrition/dietetics workforce has strengthened in government and non-government organisations:
  - the increased workforce capacity and expansion state-wide of the Community Nutrition Unit in the DHHS is an important progression that has allowed more efficient use of staff time and the ability to reach a wider cross-section of the community
  - within the public hospital system, clinical dietitians now have the capacity to focus on acute-type cases as the diet-aid is responsible for screening new admissions and working closely with patients deemed at risk of malnutrition
  - increased recognition of the importance of nutrition in the Oral Health Services sector has also been an achievement as dental therapists now receive nutrition training and a position for an Oral Health Promotion Coordinator has been established
  - the establishment of dietetics positions in the chronic disease sector (for example Diabetes Tasmania and GP North) has been a significant achievement with the recognition of the role nutrition plays in its contribution to chronic diseases
  - health promotion positions have increased in the DHHS and non-government organisation sector since 2004.

• The food safety workforce has also received increased training and opportunities:
  - DPIPWE has been involved in a successful skills development program for sectors of the meat industry through TAFE Tasmania
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- Since 2004 the nutrition/dietetics workforce has strengthened in government and non-government organisations:
  - the increased workforce capacity and expansion state-wide of the Community Nutrition Unit in the DHHS is an important progression that has allowed more efficient use of staff time and the ability to reach a wider cross-section of the community.
  - within the public hospital system, clinical dietitians now have the capacity to focus on acute-type cases as the diet-aid is responsible for screening new admissions and working closely with patients deemed at risk of malnutrition.
  - increased recognition of the importance of nutrition in the Oral Health Services sector has also been an achievement as dental therapists now receive nutrition training and a position for an Oral Health Promotion Coordinator has been established.
  - the establishment of dietetics positions in the chronic disease sector (for example Diabetes Tasmania and GP North) has been a significant achievement with the recognition of the role nutrition plays in its contribution to chronic diseases.
  - health promotion positions have increased in the DHHS and non-government organisation sector since 2004.
- The food safety workforce has also received increased training and opportunities:
  - the DHHS developed the Food Unit Newsletter in 2008 for the Local Government Association of Tasmania (LGAT) to keep them informed of food safety regulation, policy updates and general important information on food safety.
  - formal food safety audit courses for Environmental Health Officers and LGAT have been conducted.
  - the DHHS also provided informal training courses/seminars for LGAT.
- The increase in the number and type of courses available for study in the food and nutrition stream in the Tasmanian education sector:
  - in 2006, Environmental Health Officers and industry personnel attended workshops conducted by DPIPWE and Meat and Livestock Australia to reinforce Meat and Livestock Australia’s guidelines with a focus on the risk and controls of Listeria monocytogenes.
  - the University of Tasmania made a commitment to increase opportunities for students to study food related topics. In 2004, a first year food studies unit was offered which has been taken by a broad range of students and a second year unit on food sciences and practices was created and is now being taken by a cohort in alternative years. There has also been an increase in students undertaking the Health Promotion unit and the follow-on unit Public, Community and Environmental Health. These units would be available for appropriate health professionals for individual enrolment. An increase in research skills as a result of students graduating with honours or Masters with a nutrition emphasis is another achievement since 2004.
  - the Horticulture Division of the Southern Polytechnic campus has implemented Certificate I and Certificate IV courses in Organic Production. An Organic Learning Group chaired by Polytechnic staff and comprising industry, government and private groups in the organic sector has been developed to investigate innovative delivery of organic information to all stakeholders.
  - the Tasmanian Government identified the need for the development of a top flight farm management course through the University of Tasmania in the Premier’s State of the State Address 2009.

- in 2008, the University of Tasmania introduced a Bachelor of Health Science (Environmental Health) degree that provides tertiary qualifications for Environmental Health Officers. Qualifications were previously obtained through an advanced diploma at TAFE, however this had a high attrition rate. It is now hoped that students are better matched with the course due to the science pre-requisites.
Key challenges

- The workforce capacity of local government and the shortage of Environmental Health Officers and other workers in the area of food safety is a big challenge. The ability to attract and retain qualified Environmental Health Officers extends beyond Tasmania and is a nationwide issue. In 2005, a survey was conducted which showed 40 per cent of all Environmental Health Officers were over 50 years of age.

- Subsequent to this is the challenge of Environmental Health Officers working in the area of labelling enforcement as it is not seen as a priority.

- Despite the increased role of the diet-aid in the hospital systems, a lack of dedicated staff to work with food service people to allow clinical dietitians to focus on clinical loads is another workforce challenge.

- Whilst there has been an increase in position for dietitians/nutritionists this increase has been piecemeal and opportunist rather than planned. Given the increasing importance being placed on nutrition in the prevention of overweight and obesity it is likely that further expertise will be required. As the increase in demand for a skilled workforce in nutrition will be national it is likely it will become increasingly difficult to attract skilled staff to Tasmania unless salaries are competitive.

- Rural areas including the north-west of Tasmania have a shortage of dietitians. A challenges lies in ensuring there are sufficiently well trained health practitioners who can actively promote nutrition in the health care setting.

- Sourcing additional courses for the implementation of Organic Production courses through the Horticulture Division in the Northern Tasmanian Polytechnic campus using current resourcing available is a challenge.

- In support of continuing fresh food production there exists a need for polytechnic level farm manager training that includes business management, land management and sustainability in addition to technical skills machinery maintenance, crop production and animal husbandry to attract and retain people in food production, particularly given the ageing population and global food security issues.

- Communication and relationships between the education sector and workplace institutions is another challenge and the time taken to make progress/changes within courses or creating new courses is an issue.

- Limited job opportunities for graduates from health based university degrees such as Bachelor of Health Science is a big challenge for the health workforce in Tasmania. This results in students moving interstate to work and to expand their qualifications. A career pathway for people graduating with a Bachelor of Health Science is needed. The education sector is willing to incorporate specific units and be flexible with the course design to meet the requirements of the health system, for example, training people for working with chronic disease. This relates back to the need for improved communication and collaboration between the education sector and health system to modify the skills of health graduates for workforce requirements and create appropriate job opportunities for these graduates.
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Case Study

Bachelor of Health Science (Environmental Health)

The Bachelor of Health Science (Environmental Health) was introduced by the University of Tasmania in 2008 with support and input from the Department of Health and Human Services.

The Bachelor of Health Science (Environmental Health) is a professionally accredited 3.5 year program that is designed to produce graduates who will work as Environmental Health Officers (EHOs) in State and Local Government. Graduates will be eligible for membership to Environmental Health Australia and be recognised as Environmental Health Officers, employable by all levels of government and in the defence forces. In Tasmania the qualification will be recognised by the Director of Public Health as sufficient to become an ‘Authorised Officer’ under the Public Health Act 1997 and Food Act 2003.

EHOs are responsible for implementing public health legislation, monitoring and maintaining many environmental health standards and dealing with a broad range of issues including food safety, air and water quality, water and solid waste management, health promotion, epidemiology, communicable diseases prevention and control, noise pollution and the use of hazardous substances. Graduates will also be involved in environmental health risk assessment and risk management, local government health planning and advising state and local governments on legislative policy.
Conclusions and recommendations

Conclusions

- A policy that spans the whole food system, from production to consumption including food safety and nutrition, is highly valued by key players in the food and nutrition sector providing the policy is appropriately supported and leads to positive action.
- The vision of the Tasmanian Food and Nutrition Policy is for Tasmania to be:

  a state which produces quality, healthy, safe and affordable food, while sustaining the natural environment and strengthening the local economy;
  a community empowered to make food choices that enhance health and wellbeing.

- This vision is actively supported by key players and much work across government, the community and private sector is currently being done to achieve this vision.
- Awareness and recognition of the Tasmanian Food and Nutrition Policy is varied among sectors, with some key informants indicating it was a major driver for their work whilst others were unaware of the policy. There was a tendency for awareness of the policy to be higher in the health sector. This is not surprising as DHHS currently has the lead role in coordinating policy implementation.
- The issues contained within the policy are broad and span many government portfolios. Informants felt that heightened awareness of the policy and greater engagement with policy implementation could be achieved with a clear coordination mechanism across government. Key informants expressed some reluctance at this taking the form of a government committee. There was greater support for of innovative approaches that inspire innovation and promote creative partnerships such as a ‘think-tank’.
- Five key emerging issues were identified that impact on policy implementation including:
  - The global financial crisis
  - Climate change
  - Sustainable water resource management
  - Globalisation of food supply and implications for food safety
  - Rising prevalence of lifestyle-related chronic disease and the ageing population.
- Key achievements since the adoption of the policy in 2004 include:
  - increased commitment and action across government, community and private sectors to promote food production practices consistent with environmental sustainability
  - agreement to establish a Tasmanian Food Security Council with $1 million to be held in trust to support initiatives to improve food security
  - achievement of legislative frameworks for food safety programs
  - increased awareness and recognition of the importance of healthy eating and the burden of chronic lifestyle-related disease to the Tasmanian economy
  - development of the food industry Score Card to provide industry and government reliable
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  - Rising prevalence of lifestyle-related chronic disease and the ageing population.
- Key achievements since the adoption of the policy in 2004 include:
  - increased commitment and action across government, community and private sectors to promote food production practices consistent with environmental sustainability
  - agreement to establish a Tasmanian Food Security Council with $1 million to be held in trust to support initiatives to improve food security
  - achievement of legislative frameworks for food safety programs
  - increased awareness and recognition of the importance of healthy eating and the burden of chronic lifestyle-related disease to the Tasmanian economy
  - development of the food industry Score Card to provide industry and government reliable information about the value of primary industries from production to consumption.
- Key challenges include:
  - the ongoing need to balance food productivity with environmental sustainability while managing the impact of climate change and distribution of water resources
  - building the capacity of the food safety workforce to:
    - assist Tasmanian businesses in complying with food safety legislation
    - identify creative solutions to reducing food waste
    - maintain preparedness to respond to food-borne illness events.
  - enhancing efforts to prevent chronic lifestyle-related disease by creating a community in which healthy food choices are easy choices
  - Strengthening the capacity for effective monitoring and surveillance to inform action particularly in relation to:
    - impacts of food production practices on environmental sustainability
    - nutritional status and food intake, including breastfeeding and food security
- The following opportunities were identified that would benefit from increased communication, collaboration and policy integration:
  - increased consideration of food safety in food production to ensure economic pressure does not compromise food quality
  - consideration of nutritional goals as a driver in the primary production and food distribution sectors to ensure minimally processed, nutritious foods are readily available and affordable locally
  - increased support for food service outlets to move towards offering an increased range of healthy food choices – focusing initially on food service outlets within government institutions to reinforce the Tasmanian Government’s commitment to promoting healthy eating
  - reduced impact of mixed messages to the community through the development of formal mechanisms to restrict advertising and marketing of unhealthy food products
  - improved industrial relations policy and workplace practice reforms to support working mothers with babies to continue breastfeeding
  - consideration of food access and availability, particularly in lower income areas in transport and urban design policy.

Recommendations

I. Policy coordination and awareness

I.1 Commit to ongoing implementation of the policy as the majority of goals and sub-goals remain relevant.
I.2 Increase promotion of the policy across government, the community and private sector to increase awareness of, and commitment to, policy implementation.
I.3 Consider creative approaches to policy coordination such as the establishment of a food and nutrition
1. Commit to a full review of the policy in 2014.

2. **Food productivity, climate change and water resource management**

   2.1 Increase the information and evidence base to support decision making about the impact of food production on the environment and water resource usage to ensure the long term sustainability of the food production environment.

   2.2 Undertake an analysis of the whole food production chain including food transport, distribution, packaging and retail systems to look for opportunities for increased productivity.

   2.3 Increase public awareness that certified organic labelling provides a quality assurance that goods are produced in accordance with organic standards.

3. **Food safety and a global food supply**

   3.1 Build on the opportunities created by the *Civil Liability Amendment Act 2008* to identify creative solutions to reducing food waste and improving food security.

   3.2 Provide advice, and where required assistance, to food businesses to enable them to comply with food safety regulations.

4. **Rising prevalence of lifestyle-related chronic disease and the ageing population**

4.1 Reinforce nutrition related health education messages in the community by:

   • considering the potential to restrict advertising and marketing of unhealthy foods, developing guidelines for food-related sponsorship and improving food labelling for consumers

   • creating incentives for food services outlets, particularly those within government and government-funded institutions (school canteens, child-care centres, nursing homes, hospitals, prisons, workplace cafeterias and catering facilities) to increase their focus on providing healthy food choices

   • encouraging the catering and hospitality sector to incorporate a greater emphasis on population nutrition into the training of chefs and caterers and into the design of high profile events involving high-end chefs.

4.2 Strengthen the community sector’s capacity to effectively manage nutrition education programs through funding security and improved governance.

4.3 Explore the potential for a vibrant partnership to increase consumption of vegetables in Tasmania between vegetable growers, those involved in vegetable marketing and promotion, those working in the hospitality and food service sector and those involved in promotion of healthy eating.

4.4 Develop a comprehensive breastfeeding strategy. Such a strategy should include: increasing the profile of the importance of breastfeeding through,
‘virtual think tank’ across government, academic, private, non-government and community sectors. The purpose of such a ‘virtual think tank’ would be to share information across sectors and to explore creative partnerships with the aim of developing win-win situations, minimising conflicting policies and maximising use of resources.

1.4 Commit to a full review of the policy in 2014.

2. Food productivity, climate change and water resource management

2.1 Increase the information and evidence base to support decision making about the impact of food production on the environment and water resource usage to ensure the long term sustainability of the food production environment.

2.2 Undertake an analysis of the whole food production chain including food transport, distribution, packaging and retail systems to look for opportunities for increased productivity.

2.3 Increase public awareness that certified organic labelling provides a quality assurance that goods are produced in accordance with organic standards.

3. Food safety and a global food supply

3.1 Build on the opportunities created by the Civil Liability Amendment Act 2008 to identify creative solutions to reducing food waste and improving food security.

3.2 Provide advice, and where required assistance, to food businesses to enable them to comply with food safety regulations.

4. Rising prevalence of lifestyle-related chronic disease and the ageing population

4.1 Reinforce nutrition related health education messages in the community by:

• considering the potential to restrict advertising and marketing of unhealthy foods, developing guidelines for food-related sponsorship and improving food labelling for consumers

• creating incentives for food services outlets, particularly those within government and government-funded institutions (school canteens, child-care centres, nursing homes, hospitals, prisons, workplace cafeterias and catering facilities) to increase their focus on providing healthy food choices

• encouraging the catering and hospitality sector to incorporate a greater emphasis on population nutrition into the training of chefs and caterers and into the design of high profile events involving high-end chefs.

4.2 Strengthen the community sector’s capacity to effectively manage nutrition education programs through funding security and improved governance.

4.3 Explore the potential for a vibrant partnership to increase consumption of vegetables in Tasmania between vegetable growers, those involved in vegetable marketing and promotion, those working in the hospitality and food service sector and those involved in promotion of healthy eating.

4.4 Develop a comprehensive breastfeeding strategy. Such a strategy should include: increasing the profile of the importance of breastfeeding through, strengthening the Marketing in Australia of Infant Formula Agreement, highlighting the cost-benefits (including the environmental and long term health benefits) of breastfeeding, developing strategies to reach high risk groups, incorporating breastfeeding into the school curriculum as a natural and normal way to feed an infant, and, developing a monitoring and surveillance system for breastfeeding initiation and duration rates. Consideration should be given to the inclusion of breastfeeding as a state priority through Tasmanian Together.

4.5 Develop improved monitoring systems to track trends over time of population eating patterns and nutritional status (including, but not limited to, healthy weight, fruit and vegetable consumption and breastfeeding) enabling Tasmanian to report on indicators as specified in National Partnership Agreements.
## Appendix 1: Outcome indicator tables

### Focus Area 1: Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Outcome Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline data</th>
<th>Most recent data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced incidence of food-borne contaminants (pests and chemical).</td>
<td>Extent of use of commercial food and non-food GM crops in the open environment. (DPWE)–also TT indicator</td>
<td>Existing moratorium</td>
<td>NIL (DPW cited in 2008 TT Progress Report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced chemical and pesticide residues in the environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced impact of waste and pollution on the environment.</td>
<td>Extent of organic agricultural production in Tasmania. (DPWE)–also TT indicator</td>
<td>Organic index 109.67–2000-2001</td>
<td>No updated data supplied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced soil erosion of agricultural land.</td>
<td>Quarantine confiscations by State Quarantine Services (DPWE)–also TT indicator</td>
<td>1673 kg; 2001</td>
<td>1652kg; 2008 (DPW cited in TT Progress report 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International opinion of image</td>
<td>To be established</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Levels of exposure of non-target organisms and areas to environmentally toxic chemicals. (DPWE)–also TT indicator</td>
<td>To be established</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concentrations of pollutants into waterways. (DPWE)</td>
<td>To be established</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 1: Outcome indicator tables

#### Focus Area 1: Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Outcome Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline data</th>
<th>Most recent data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced incidence of food-borne contaminants (pests and chemical).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced chemical and pesticide residues in the environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced impact of waste and pollution on the environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced soil erosion of agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintained clean-green image in the international community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Outcome Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline data</th>
<th>Most recent data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extent of use of commercial food and non-food GM crops in the open environment.</td>
<td>Existing moratorium</td>
<td>NIL (DPIW cited in 2008 TT Progress Report)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarantine confiscations by State Quarantine Services.</td>
<td>1673 kg 2001</td>
<td>1652kg 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of new pests established</td>
<td>Week 758 approx Invertebrate pests: 450 approx Plant pathogen: 100 approx 2001</td>
<td>Weeds: 4 Invertebrate pests: 1 Plant pathogen: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International opinion of image</td>
<td>To be established</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels of exposure of non-target organisms and areas to environmentally toxic chemicals. (DPIW)</td>
<td>To be established</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentrations of pollutants into waterways. (DPIW)</td>
<td>To be established</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Focus Area 2: Food Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Outcome Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline data</th>
<th>Most recent data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced incidence of food-borne illnesses in the Tasmanian community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved consumer knowledge, skills and practice of food safety.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved food safety practices in industry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved compliance with food standards by those who prepare food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates of Campylobacter infection.</td>
<td>134.2 per 100 000 population per year 2001</td>
<td>146 cases per 100 000 persons 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates of Salmonella. (DHHS)</td>
<td>Around 30 per 100 000 population per year: 2001</td>
<td>46 cases per 100 000 persons 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates of Hepatitis A. (DHHS)</td>
<td>Below 10 per 100 000 population per year: 1990</td>
<td>0.6 cases per 100 000 persons 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates of Listeria monocytogenes.</td>
<td>Below 1 per 100 000 population per year</td>
<td>0.4 cases per 100 000 persons 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates of shellfish biotoxin illnesses. (DHHS)</td>
<td>Below 1 per 100 000 population per year</td>
<td>Nil cases per 100 000 population 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of population receiving drinking water which does not meet bacteriological compliance.</td>
<td>No data available</td>
<td>2.7% 2006 (Source: ABS Census)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of physical contaminants in foods and drinking water. (DHHS)</td>
<td>Below 10 per 100 000 population per year</td>
<td>No data available as at 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Focus Area 3: Promoting Healthy Eating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Outcome Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline data</th>
<th>Most recent data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced rates of diet-related diseases (including cardiovascular disease, type 2 diabetes, impaired glucose tolerance, colorectal, bowel, breast and lung cancer)</td>
<td><strong>Age standardised mortality rates from ischaemic heart disease.</strong> <em>(DHHS)</em></td>
<td>Per 100 000 population:</td>
<td>Per 100 000 population:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M: 217.6</td>
<td>M: 152.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F: 120.0</td>
<td>F: 86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced rates of obesity and overweight.</td>
<td><strong>Age standardised incidence rates from lung, colorectal, prostate and breast cancer in males and females.</strong> <em>(DHHS)</em></td>
<td>Per 100 000 population:</td>
<td>Per 100 000 population:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Colorectal: M: 65.1</td>
<td>Colorectal: M: 75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F: 51.3</td>
<td>F: 56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lung: M: 68.0</td>
<td>Lung: M: 57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F: 25.8</td>
<td>F: 27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prostate: M: 147.5</td>
<td>Prostate: M: 1479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased proportion of population within the healthy weight range.</td>
<td><strong>Type 2 diabetes in over 25 year olds.</strong> <em>(DHHS)</em> also TT indicator</td>
<td>2.3%: 2001 <em>(National Health Survey – self reported)</em></td>
<td>2.8%: 2004/05 <em>(National Health Survey – self reported)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.7%: 2000 <em>(AusDiab – objectively measured)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased breastfeeding initiation and duration rates.</td>
<td><strong>Rates of overweight and obesity.</strong> <em>(DHHS)</em></td>
<td>67% of males 19+</td>
<td>48.9% adults 18+ 2004/05 <em>(National Health Survey – self reported)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54% of females 19+ 1995 <em>(National Nutrition Survey – objective measures)</em> Note: objective measure data should not be compared to self-report data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.1% adults 18+ 2001 <em>(National Health Survey - self reported)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proportion of adult Tasmanians (25 years and over) with blood cholesterol levels greater than or equal to 5.5 mmol/L. <em>(DHHS)</em></td>
<td>6.2% adults 18+: 2001 <em>(National Health Survey – self report)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53%: 2000 <em>(AusDiab objective measures)</em></td>
<td>6.6% adults 18+ 2004 <em>(National Health Survey – self report)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Focus Area 3: Promoting Healthy Eating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Outcome Indicators (lead agency responsible for reporting)</th>
<th>Baseline data</th>
<th>Most recent data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced rates of diet-related diseases (including cardiovascular disease, type 2 diabetes, impaired glucose tolerance, colorectal, bowel, breast and lung cancer)</td>
<td>Per 100 000 population: Medical Indicator (DHHS)</td>
<td>Per 100 000 population: Medical Indicator (DHHS)</td>
<td>12.6% 2001 (National Health Survey – self report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced rates of obesity and overweight</td>
<td>67% of males 19+ 54% of females 19+ (1999)</td>
<td>48.9% adults 18+ (2004) (National Health Survey – self report)</td>
<td>42% of people aged 19 and over consuming 2 serves of fruit or more per day: 1995 NNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased proportion of population within the healthy weight range</td>
<td>Baseline data</td>
<td>Most recent data</td>
<td>Percentage of adults who achieve the NHMRC recommended guidelines for vegetable consumption. (DHHS) also TT indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased breastfeeding initiation and duration rates.</td>
<td>Baseline data</td>
<td>Most recent data</td>
<td>Mean percentage contribution of saturated fat to energy intake. (DHHS) also TT indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced incidence of dental caries.</td>
<td>Per 100 000 population: Medical Indicator (DHHS)</td>
<td>Per 100 000 population: Medical Indicator (DHHS)</td>
<td>Proportion of Tasmanians who achieve the NHMRC recommended guidelines for fruit consumption. (DHHS) also TT indicator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standards and Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Outcome Indicators (lead agency responsible for reporting)</th>
<th>Baseline data</th>
<th>Most recent data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced rates of diet-related diseases (including cardiovascular disease, type 2 diabetes, impaired glucose tolerance, colorectal, bowel, breast and lung cancer)</td>
<td>Per 100 000 population: Medical Indicator (DHHS)</td>
<td>Per 100 000 population: Medical Indicator (DHHS)</td>
<td>12.6% 2001 (National Health Survey – self report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced rates of obesity and overweight</td>
<td>67% of males 19+ 54% of females 19+ (1999)</td>
<td>48.9% adults 18+ (2004) (National Health Survey – self report)</td>
<td>42% of people aged 19 and over consuming 2 serves of fruit or more per day: 1995 NNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased proportion of population within the healthy weight range</td>
<td>Baseline data</td>
<td>Most recent data</td>
<td>Percentage of adults who achieve the NHMRC recommended guidelines for vegetable consumption. (DHHS) also TT indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased breastfeeding initiation and duration rates.</td>
<td>Baseline data</td>
<td>Most recent data</td>
<td>Mean percentage contribution of saturated fat to energy intake. (DHHS) also TT indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced incidence of dental caries.</td>
<td>Per 100 000 population: Medical Indicator (DHHS)</td>
<td>Per 100 000 population: Medical Indicator (DHHS)</td>
<td>Proportion of Tasmanians who achieve the NHMRC recommended guidelines for fruit consumption. (DHHS) also TT indicator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standards and Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Outcome Indicators (lead agency responsible for reporting)</th>
<th>Baseline data</th>
<th>Most recent data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced rates of diet-related diseases (including cardiovascular disease, type 2 diabetes, impaired glucose tolerance, colorectal, bowel, breast and lung cancer)</td>
<td>Per 100 000 population: Medical Indicator (DHHS)</td>
<td>Per 100 000 population: Medical Indicator (DHHS)</td>
<td>12.6% 2001 (National Health Survey – self report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced rates of obesity and overweight</td>
<td>67% of males 19+ 54% of females 19+ (1999)</td>
<td>48.9% adults 18+ (2004) (National Health Survey – self report)</td>
<td>42% of people aged 19 and over consuming 2 serves of fruit or more per day: 1995 NNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased proportion of population within the healthy weight range</td>
<td>Baseline data</td>
<td>Most recent data</td>
<td>Percentage of adults who achieve the NHMRC recommended guidelines for vegetable consumption. (DHHS) also TT indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased breastfeeding initiation and duration rates.</td>
<td>Baseline data</td>
<td>Most recent data</td>
<td>Mean percentage contribution of saturated fat to energy intake. (DHHS) also TT indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced incidence of dental caries.</td>
<td>Per 100 000 population: Medical Indicator (DHHS)</td>
<td>Per 100 000 population: Medical Indicator (DHHS)</td>
<td>Proportion of Tasmanians who achieve the NHMRC recommended guidelines for fruit consumption. (DHHS) also TT indicator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Focus Area 4: Breast Feeding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Outcome Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline data</th>
<th>Most recent data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Increased community support for; and acceptance of, breastfeeding. | **Rates of breastfeeding at discharge from hospital (DHHS)**  
Note data limitations: Prior to 2005 collected as, breastfeeding yes/no; and 2005+ collected as intending to breastfeed yes/no/unsure  
1995: 78% of infants breastfed at discharge from hospital  
2005: 81.0% of infants breastfed at discharge from hospital  
(Council of Obstetric & Paediatric Mortality and Morbidity data) | **Rates of breastfeeding (full or partial) at 6 months of age. (DHHS)**  
Note data limitations:  
- The results are potentially biased as only two thirds to three quarters of babies attend a six month visit with CHAPS; non-breastfeeding mothers may be less likely to attend routine checks.  
- Breastfeeding status is recorded at the time of visit which may not exactly coincide with six months of age. Therefore variation exists in the age at which breastfeeding status is recorded.  
- Data collection is paper based with the potential for transcription errors and record loss.  
- Methodology to obtain data was different in 1995 and 2006.  
1995: 43.9% of infants fully or partially breastfed at 6 months of age  
2006: 52.0% of infants fully or partially breastfed at 6 months of age  
(National Health Survey data) | **Proportion of maternity services accredited with the Baby Friendly Hospital Initiative (DHHS)**  
Data not available  
(Child Health and Parenting Service, DHHS cited on Tasmanian Breastfeeding coalition website) |
| Increased percentage of infants breastfed at discharge from hospital. | **Proportion of maternity services accredited with the Baby Friendly Hospital Initiative (DHHS)**  
Data not available  
(Child Health and Parenting Service, DHHS cited on Tasmanian Breastfeeding coalition website) | **Proportion of maternity services accredited with the Baby Friendly Hospital Initiative**  
Data not available  
(Child Health and Parenting Service, DHHS cited on Tasmanian Breastfeeding coalition website) |
### Focus Area 4: Breast Feeding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Outcome Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline data</th>
<th>Most recent data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased community support for, and acceptance of, breastfeeding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased percentage of infants breastfed at discharge from hospital.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased percentage of infants exclusively and partially breastfed at six months of age.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rates of breastfeeding at discharge from hospital (DHHS)**
- Note data limitations: Prior to 2005 collected as breastfeeding yes/no, and 2006–2009 oscillated as intending to breastfeed/yes/no.

**Rates of breastfeeding (full or partial) at 6 months of age (DHHS)**
- The results are potentially biased as only two-thirds to three-quarters of babies attend six month visits with CHAPS; non-breastfeeding mothers may be less likely to attend routine checks.
- Breastfeeding status is recorded at the time of visit which may not exactly coincide with six months of age. Therefore variation exists in the age at which breastfeeding status is recorded.
- Data collection is paper based with the potential for transcription errors and record loss.
- Methodology to obtain data was different in 1995 and 2006.

**Proportion of maternity services accredited with the Baby Friendly Hospital Initiative (DHHS)**
- Data not available

**Increased availability and accessibility to healthy and quality Tasmanian food.**
- Improved service delivery to those people experiencing physiological, cultural, social, geographical and economic barriers to accessing healthy and safe food.

**Reduced incidence of diet-related disease.**

**Proportion of adults who report that they frequently worry about whether the food they can afford to buy for their household will be enough.**

**Proportion of adults who report that they have run out of food in the past 12 months and couldn’t afford to buy more.**

### Focus Area 5: Food Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Outcome Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline data</th>
<th>Most recent data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased availability and accessibility to healthy and quality Tasmanian food.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved service delivery to those people experiencing physiological, cultural, social, geographical and economic barriers to accessing healthy and safe food.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced incidence of diet-related disease.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proportion of adults who report that they frequently worry about whether the food they can afford to buy for their household will be enough.**

**Proportion of adults who report that they have run out of food in the past 12 months and couldn’t afford to buy more.**

### Focus Area 6: Primary Production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Outcome Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline data</th>
<th>Most recent data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased contribution of primary produce to the Tasmanian economy and employment through the export market.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased availability of local foods within Tasmania. Sustainable and profitable agricultural, aquaculture and fishing industries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased quality and safety of Tasmanian foods.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Primary production (farm gate or beach) value.**

**Employment in the primary production sector.**

**Output of the value-adding sector.**

**Increased contribution of primary produce to the Tasmanian economy and employment through the export market.**

**Increased availability of local foods within Tasmania. Sustainable and profitable agricultural, aquaculture and fishing industries.**

**Increased quality and safety of Tasmanian foods.**

**Accurate data difficult to access. Some data suggests that overall employment in the primary production sector has decreased.**

**Output of the value-adding sector.**

- $1.2 billion per year – total
- $983.6 million per year – food
- $204 million – (Tasmanian Food Industry Scorecard)

**Employment in the primary production sector.**

**Output of the value-adding sector.**

- Increase by 1000 jobs and a further 1000 jobs in the value adding sector
- Increase by $250 million

**Increased contribution of primary produce to the Tasmanian economy and employment through the export market.**

**Increased availability of local foods within Tasmania. Sustainable and profitable agricultural, aquaculture and fishing industries.**

**Increased quality and safety of Tasmanian foods.**
**Focus Area 12: Workforce Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Outcome Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline data</th>
<th>Most recent data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased number of dietitians and the number of professionals with</td>
<td>Increased rates of full-time equivalent dietitians in the workforce (DHHS)</td>
<td>3.6 per 100 000 population in 2000; national average 6.8 per 100 000 pop in 2000 (By FTE - Dietitians Association of Australia membership data)</td>
<td>6.5 per 100 000 in Tasmania; 11 per 100 000 population in Australia; 2006 (By head count - Dietitians Association of Australia membership data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skills in food safety in Tasmania.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased nutrition knowledge of health and community workers including</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.6 per 100 000 population in Tasmania; 12.9 per 100 000 population in Australia; 2009 (By head count - Dietitians Association of Australia membership data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased number of food service and food industry workers with skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in nutrition and food safety.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased opportunities for food and nutrition training in Tasmania.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other indicators to be developed.
Appendix 2: Acronyms

ABA Australian Breastfeeding Association
ABHI Australian Better Health Initiative
ABS Australian Bureau of Statistics
AHA Australian Hotels Association
AHMAC Australian Health Ministers’ Advisory Council
AHMC Australian Health Ministers’ Conference
AHPA Australian Health Promotion Association
AIEH Australian Institute of Environmental Health
AIHW Australian Institute of Health and Welfare
APD Accredited Practising Dietitian
APMAf Advisory Panel on the Marketing in Australia of Infant Formula
AQIS Australian Quarantine and Inspection Services
ARA Australian Retailers Association
ARH Australian Retailers’ Health
BFHI Baby Friendly Hospital Initiative
CHAPS Child Health and Parenting Service
CNJ Community Nutrition Unit
COAG Council of Australian Governments
CSIRO Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation
CTF Contested Traffic Farming
DAA Dietitians Association of Australia
DEDT Department of Economic Development and Tourism
DEDTA Department of Economic Development and Tourism and the Arts
DEPHE Department of Primary Industries and Water
DEPPPE Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and the Environment
DHHS Department of Health and Human Services
DIER Department of Infrastructure, Energy and Resources
DoJ Department of Justice
DoE Department of Education
DoHA Department of Health and Ageing
DPAC Department of Premier and Cabinet
DPH Department of Primary Industries and Water
DHPPWE Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and the Environment
EHO Environmental Health Officer
ELs Essential Learnings
EWA Eat Well Australia
EWT Eat Well Tasmania
EWF Eating With Friends

Other indicators to be developed.

Increased number of dietitians and the number of professionals with skills in food safety in Tasmania.

Increased nutrition knowledge of health and community workers including teachers.

Increased number of food service and food industry workers with skills in nutrition and food safety.

Increased opportunities for food and nutrition training in Tasmania.

Increased rates of full-time equivalent dietitians in the workforce (FTE)

3.6 per 100 000 population in 2000; national average 6.8 per 100 000 pop in 2000

6.5 per 100 000 in Tasmania, 11 per 100 000 population in Australia 2006

9.6 per 100 000 population in Tasmania, 12.9 per 100 000 population in Australia 2009

Baseline data

Most recent data