

NHS National Institute for Health Research

Mee	ting title:	Cancer and Nutrition NIHR infrastructure collaboration Steering Committee	e
Date):	14 th December 2016 Time: 11am-1pn	า
Loca	ation:	WCRF, Bedford Place, London	
Present: Apologies:		Prof Alan Jackson (AAJ) – Chair, Millie Barrett (MB), Karen Brown (KB), J Cameron (JC), Bernard Corfe (BC), Ramsey Cutress (RIC), Amanda Cros Martin Wiseman (MJW), Steve Wootton (SAW), Lesley Turner (LT), Elio F Giulia Mangiameli (GM), Mark Samuels (MS) for agenda item 5 Kate Allen (KA), Carrie Bolt (CB), Helen Campbell (HC), Fiona Davey (FD Davies (LD), Richard Martin (RM), Fehmidah Munir (FM), Karla Duarte (K	ss (ÁC), Riboli (ER),
1.	Professor	and apologies Jackson welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked them for A list of apologies was given and new people introduced themselves.	Action
2.	These weile posted be posted Communit MB will for Committee BRC Direct AAJ report and NOCF future plan would not a) UI SAW report Collaborat	 If the last meeting and matters arising re agreed as an accurate record of the September meeting and will now onto the Collaboration website. cations Strategy: Illow this up with individual organisations represented on the Steering a. A meeting has been set up with Jane Heath at WCRF in January. ctors meeting: ted that he recently had a helpful meeting with the Department of Health RI, at which it was suggested there may be the opportunity to present hs to the meeting of BRC Directors scheduled for the New Year. This preclude meeting with the new BRC Directors at a future date. codated FY 2016-17 budget orted that this is an updated accurate budget of current support for the ion from Southampton BRC for the current financial year. Future budgets if April 2017 have not been produced yet. 	

3.			
	NIHR Off	ice for Nutrition Research	
	AAJ repo	rted on three main ongoing activities related to his role as NIHR Director	
		on Research:	
	i)	A national review of nutrition-related research as requested by the	
		OSCHR committee (Office for Strategic Collaboration in Health Research). A report will be made to OSCHR early in 2017. The panel	
		for the review is organised by MRC and chaired by Professor Chris	
		Day.	
	ii)	A review of nutrition-related research supported by NIHR during 2016-	
		2017, which includes activity through the Central Commissioning	
		Facility (CCF) infrastructure and programme sections, Trainees	
		Coordinating Centre (TCC), NIHR Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre (NETSCC), and the Clinical Research Network	
		(CRN). A report has been presented to DH and NIHR. There is	
		ongoing support for a wide range of nutrition-related research, much	
		of which is in the area of cancer and nutrition.	
		It was noted that much of the nutrition-related research was being	
	iii)	conducted outwith the BRCs. The Cancer and Nutrition NIHR infrastructure collaboration provides a	
		worked example of the nature of nutrition-related research. The	
		lessons learnt within the Collaboration have resonance for other areas	
		of clinical research, indicating possible opportunities to better structure	
		activities to enable sharing of experience and greater efficiencies	
		within the process. This suggests opportunities for improved support for patients and patient services in areas of complex disease. There is	
		recognition at senior level within DH and NIHR of what the	
		Collaboration has achieved and encouragement to continue the	
		activities.	
	the Colla	A formal request to be submitted to The National Office on behalf of aboration, to produce a summary statement of the review into NIHR -related research at the next Steering Committee meeting in March.	Secretariat
4.	Phase 2 a		
		activities:	
	a) <u>C</u>	activities: Iinicians' Survey report	
	BC prese	Elinicians' Survey report ented the Executive Summary (Attachment 8) of the preliminary findings	
	BC prese from the	Elinicians' Survey report ented the Executive Summary (Attachment 8) of the preliminary findings Clinicians' survey, a joint effort between the Toolkit and Professionals	
	BC prese from the work stre	Elinicians' Survey report ented the Executive Summary (Attachment 8) of the preliminary findings Clinicians' survey, a joint effort between the Toolkit and Professionals eams. In total 490 responses were received, with nurses and dietitians	
	BC prese from the work stre being the	Elinicians' Survey report ented the Executive Summary (Attachment 8) of the preliminary findings Clinicians' survey, a joint effort between the Toolkit and Professionals	
	BC prese from the work stre being the therapists including	Elinicians' Survey report ented the Executive Summary (Attachment 8) of the preliminary findings Clinicians' survey, a joint effort between the Toolkit and Professionals earns. In total 490 responses were received, with nurses and dietitians a highest contributors, with doctors, surgeons and speech and language is in smaller numbers. Key findings from the survey were discussed, data on nutritional screening and assessment of cancer patients (both	
	BC prese from the work stre being the therapists including inpatients	Elinicians' Survey report ented the Executive Summary (Attachment 8) of the preliminary findings Clinicians' survey, a joint effort between the Toolkit and Professionals eams. In total 490 responses were received, with nurses and dietitians highest contributors, with doctors, surgeons and speech and language is in smaller numbers. Key findings from the survey were discussed, data on nutritional screening and assessment of cancer patients (both and outpatients); collection and storage of nutritional data; most	
	BC prese from the work stre being the therapists including inpatients common	Elinicians' Survey report ented the Executive Summary (Attachment 8) of the preliminary findings Clinicians' survey, a joint effort between the Toolkit and Professionals eams. In total 490 responses were received, with nurses and dietitians a highest contributors, with doctors, surgeons and speech and language is in smaller numbers. Key findings from the survey were discussed, data on nutritional screening and assessment of cancer patients (both and outpatients); collection and storage of nutritional data; most measurements and tools used; most common nutritional concerns raised	
	BC prese from the work stre being the therapists including inpatients common by patien	Elinicians' Survey report ented the Executive Summary (Attachment 8) of the preliminary findings Clinicians' survey, a joint effort between the Toolkit and Professionals eams. In total 490 responses were received, with nurses and dietitians highest contributors, with doctors, surgeons and speech and language is in smaller numbers. Key findings from the survey were discussed, data on nutritional screening and assessment of cancer patients (both and outpatients); collection and storage of nutritional data; most	
	BC prese from the work stre being the therapists including inpatients common by patien clinicians the lack	Elinicians' Survey report ented the Executive Summary (Attachment 8) of the preliminary findings Clinicians' survey, a joint effort between the Toolkit and Professionals eams. In total 490 responses were received, with nurses and dietitians a highest contributors, with doctors, surgeons and speech and language is in smaller numbers. Key findings from the survey were discussed, data on nutritional screening and assessment of cancer patients (both a and outpatients); collection and storage of nutritional data; most measurements and tools used; most common nutritional concerns raised ts; provision of information about diet and nutrition to cancer patients by	
	BC prese from the work stre being the therapists including inpatients common by patien clinicians	Elinicians' Survey report ented the Executive Summary (Attachment 8) of the preliminary findings Clinicians' survey, a joint effort between the Toolkit and Professionals eams. In total 490 responses were received, with nurses and dietitians a highest contributors, with doctors, surgeons and speech and language is in smaller numbers. Key findings from the survey were discussed, data on nutritional screening and assessment of cancer patients (both is and outpatients); collection and storage of nutritional data; most measurements and tools used; most common nutritional concerns raised ts; provision of information about diet and nutrition to cancer patients by ; the lack of training in nutritional care for cancer patients; and similarly	
	BC prese from the work stre being the therapists including inpatients common by patien clinicians; the lack overall.	Elinicians' Survey report ented the Executive Summary (Attachment 8) of the preliminary findings Clinicians' survey, a joint effort between the Toolkit and Professionals eams. In total 490 responses were received, with nurses and dietitians a highest contributors, with doctors, surgeons and speech and language is in smaller numbers. Key findings from the survey were discussed, data on nutritional screening and assessment of cancer patients (both a and outpatients); collection and storage of nutritional data; most measurements and tools used; most common nutritional concerns raised ts; provision of information about diet and nutrition to cancer patients by ; the lack of training in nutritional care for cancer patients; and similarly of awareness of nutritional guidelines for patients amongst clinicians	
	BC prese from the work stre being the therapists including inpatients common by patien clinicians; the lack overall. BC comm	Elinicians' Survey report ented the Executive Summary (Attachment 8) of the preliminary findings Clinicians' survey, a joint effort between the Toolkit and Professionals eams. In total 490 responses were received, with nurses and dietitians a highest contributors, with doctors, surgeons and speech and language is in smaller numbers. Key findings from the survey were discussed, data on nutritional screening and assessment of cancer patients (both is and outpatients); collection and storage of nutritional data; most measurements and tools used; most common nutritional concerns raised ts; provision of information about diet and nutrition to cancer patients by ; the lack of training in nutritional care for cancer patients; and similarly	
	BC prese from the work stre being the therapists including inpatients common by patien clinicians; the lack overall. BC common nutritional with the	Elinicians' Survey report ented the Executive Summary (Attachment 8) of the preliminary findings Clinicians' survey, a joint effort between the Toolkit and Professionals eams. In total 490 responses were received, with nurses and dietitians a highest contributors, with doctors, surgeons and speech and language is in smaller numbers. Key findings from the survey were discussed, data on nutritional screening and assessment of cancer patients (both a and outpatients); collection and storage of nutritional data; most measurements and tools used; most common nutritional concerns raised ts; provision of information about diet and nutrition to cancer patients by ; the lack of training in nutritional care for cancer patients; and similarly of awareness of nutritional guidelines for patients amongst clinicians	
	BC prese from the work stree being the therapists including inpatients common by patien clinicians; the lack overall. BC common nutritional with the screening	Elinicians' Survey report ented the Executive Summary (Attachment 8) of the preliminary findings Clinicians' survey, a joint effort between the Toolkit and Professionals eams. In total 490 responses were received, with nurses and dietitians a highest contributors, with doctors, surgeons and speech and language is in smaller numbers. Key findings from the survey were discussed, data on nutritional screening and assessment of cancer patients (both a and outpatients); collection and storage of nutritional data; most measurements and tools used; most common nutritional concerns raised ts; provision of information about diet and nutrition to cancer patients by ; the lack of training in nutritional care for cancer patients; and similarly of awareness of nutritional guidelines for patients amongst clinicians mented that the results suggest that many patients may be lost to I assessment if they not identified as being malnourished when screened MUST tool. There is scope for improvement the uptake of different g measures to make sure patients are being picked up and supported. It	
	BC prese from the work stre being the therapists including inpatients common by patien clinicians; the lack overall. BC common nutritional with the screening was common	Elinicians' Survey report ented the Executive Summary (Attachment 8) of the preliminary findings Clinicians' survey, a joint effort between the Toolkit and Professionals eams. In total 490 responses were received, with nurses and dietitians a highest contributors, with doctors, surgeons and speech and language is in smaller numbers. Key findings from the survey were discussed, data on nutritional screening and assessment of cancer patients (both a and outpatients); collection and storage of nutritional data; most measurements and tools used; most common nutritional concerns raised ts; provision of information about diet and nutrition to cancer patients by ; the lack of training in nutritional care for cancer patients; and similarly of awareness of nutritional guidelines for patients may be lost to I assessment if they not identified as being malnourished when screened MUST tool. There is scope for improvement the uptake of different g measures to make sure patients are being picked up and supported. It mented that the most common nutritional concerns raised by patients are	
	BC prese from the work stree being the therapists including inpatients common by patien clinicians; the lack overall. BC common nutritional with the screening was common entirely commonstant	Elinicians' Survey report ented the Executive Summary (Attachment 8) of the preliminary findings Clinicians' survey, a joint effort between the Toolkit and Professionals eams. In total 490 responses were received, with nurses and dietitians a highest contributors, with doctors, surgeons and speech and language is in smaller numbers. Key findings from the survey were discussed, data on nutritional screening and assessment of cancer patients (both a and outpatients); collection and storage of nutritional data; most measurements and tools used; most common nutritional concerns raised ts; provision of information about diet and nutrition to cancer patients by ; the lack of training in nutritional care for cancer patients; and similarly of awareness of nutritional guidelines for patients amongst clinicians mented that the results suggest that many patients may be lost to I assessment if they not identified as being malnourished when screened MUST tool. There is scope for improvement the uptake of different g measures to make sure patients are being picked up and supported. It	

nutrition with their patients.	
The ambition is to provide a manuscript for a suitable peer-reviewed journal and other articles for discipline specific journals such as <i>Complete Nutrition</i> , <i>Nursing Times</i> , and <i>Dietetics Today</i> , the official magazine of the BDA.	
RIC then reported on behalf of the Professionals work stream that they intend to adapt the survey and circulate it to GPs as a modified version, so that the results and write-up can be more complete. It was agreed that in order not to delay writing up of the results so far, primary care and secondary care would be approached as separate surveys with separate write-ups. It was agreed that a patient representative should be on the drafting and writing-up group.	
Action: A patient representative to be identified to join the analysis sub- group as soon as possible, to ensure PPI input at all stages.	BC and LT
It was agreed that the recommendations we make as a result of the survey findings will be key, and should focus on what needs to be done to rectify the problem we have identified. It may be for others, outside of the Collaboration, to decide what action needs to take place.	
The Steering Committee thanked and encouraged BC in this endeavour. The importance of this piece of work was formally recognised as an important step in delivering the Collaboration's ambitions to improve the nutritional care given to cancer patients at all stages of the cancer process.	
Action: The analysis sub-group to move forward with a publication at the earliest opportunity, focusing on secondary care only at this stage.	BC
b) Toolkit work stream	
The Joint Meeting in October was very useful and allowed the work stream to start developing a framework for the nutritional toolkit. The toolkit has been divided into seven domains (appetite and symptom management; diet; physical activity; nutrient status; body composition; functional performance and fitness; psychosocial), with different members of the work stream working on each domain. BC reported that he would like to co-opt members of the Professionals work stream to help create the Toolkit, if resources allow.	
Phase 2 will see development of a top level framework and a road map. Phase 3 will focus on education and implementation.	
c) <u>Professionals work stream</u>	
RIC and MJW reported back on updates relating to this work stream. Membership is now complete with primary care representatives included. The Catalogue of Advice is an ongoing activity, and has now been mapped according to different stages of the cancer process. It became clear at the Joint Meeting in October that there are different opinions of what is meant by 'evidence-based' information, and therefore a clear framework for judging the evidence included in the catalogue is critical. This piece of work will be part of discussions to be held on 7 th February with cancer charities attending the second workshop on setting up a charity consortium.	
Action: Professionals work stream to produce a short document about the Catalogue of Advice that can be circulated to charities before the February workshop.	RIC and MJW
The NOCRI template has been updated with new timeframes to more accurately reflect planned work stream activities.	

ESPEN Guidance and a Collaboration response:	
SAW spoke about the recently published <u>guidance</u> which has been circulated to all work streams and comments sought. The focus of attention in the guidance is on cachectic/wasting cancers, and does not cover nutritional issues relating to non-wasting cancers. This is an omission given the rise of e.g. pre-menopausal breast cancer patients with a high BMI whose weight may remain stable or rise during treatment, possibly leading to poorer outcomes.	
AAJ commented that the guidance also contains recommendations for research, so the research (and other) work streams may also wish to consider its contents in relation to planning activities for Phase 3.	
Action: SAW to discuss the ESPEN guidance with BAPEN (British Association for Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition) and incorporate comments into an NIHR response.	SAW
d) <u>PPI work stream</u>	
LT reported that all activities set out in the template have been completed, and PPI is embedded across all work streams with two representatives each. Awareness-raising within the NCRI is complete with many presentations made to different CSGs. LT is also helping on the PANACHE bid (Physical Activity and Nutrition during Adjuvent Chemotherapy) being led by Diana Eccles at Southampton. LT presented the PANACHE study to the Dragon's Den at the NCRI Conference in November.	
AAJ congratulated LT on setting the pace for activity within her work stream and emphasised the importance of maintaining a strong separate PPI group, in order to allow patients to share their unique experiences and contribute centrally to Collaboration activities in the future. It is critical to the success of what we are trying to achieve, as well as setting the agenda for NIHR activities more widely.	
The conversation with NCRI is ongoing, a positive response has been received to the recent proforma filled in, and PPI participation is needed to take this conversation forward into Phase 3.	
e) <u>Research work stream</u>	
This work stream has been split into three sub-groups in order to work more efficiently and facilitate development of grant applications. The group with a focus on epidemiology and public health research held its first TC meeting on 13.12.16 and ER summarised the conversation. A face to face meeting has been proposed for February or March next year, to bring together the relevant people working in this area of cancer research, to include nutrition, diet, physical activity work in the primary or secondary prevention arena.	

It was noted that in terms of achievements of the Collaboration, funded research studies are the ideal end point, but earlier stages are also important including collaborative working to discuss ideas, put bids together, and submit applications. It was recognised that the recent CRUK Catalyst and ongoing PANACHE bids were both born out of the Cancer and Nutrition Collaboration, it is important to learn lessons from these experiences and strengthen future applications. It was also agreed that face to face meetings are crucial to the development of strong bids, as well as rehearsals for panel interviews.

Action: The intention is to hold a half day workshop before the March Steering Committee, to start development of a scientific research programme

	in cancer and nutrition.	
	f) Engagement with the Commercial Sector	
	SAW reported that this work stream is live but not fully initiated yet, partly due to restructuring at NOCRI and internal processes taking place there, with Karla Duarte now responsible for this area. Development of this work stream will be a priority for Phase 3 of the Collaboration's activities.	
	AAJ also reported that as part of the OSCHR review process, a meeting may take place involving representatives of the food sector and people from the field of nutrition science to explore ways of working together constructively.	
5.	Phase 3 Strategy (Mark Samuels joined the meeting by telephone)	
	a) Operational planning	
	AAJ summarised discussions that have taken place so far for the benefit of MS. A report will be written to capture all the achievements of Phase 2, and start to look forward to identifiable outputs for Phase 3. The biggest challenge for the Collaboration is to find a way to structure itself within the NIHR infrastructure, not restricting itself to BRCs only, and also to take into account people and activities that sit outside the NIHR infrastructure.	
	MS commented that in order to secure future funding for the Collaboration we need to define sharp targets we are aiming for, that are well-defined and measureable. Good communication is key, in terms of what has been achieved so far, and what we set out to achieve in the next phase. Communication to BRC Directors (or others) should be brief, concise and clear.	
	Action: Phase 3 plans to be set within a context of defined outputs achieved to date, and deliverable outputs for the future.	Secretariat
	b) Funding plans	
	Currently the Collaboration is very dependent upon BRC support, but as the activites in cancer and nutrition are wider that the remit of the BRCs there is the need to broaden the base of the Collaboration's support so that it adequately reflects the areas of greatest priority.	
	In future budget planning, protected support for the real costs of PPI activities should be included. This should not be just for travel and phone costs, but also for attending meetings, along the lines of a day rate such as that recommended by the organisation <u>INVOLVE</u> .	
	Action: Future budget planning to include more formal recognition of PPI contributions, and this money should be ring-fenced.	Secretariat
6.	Charity Consortium	
	A second workshop is being planned for Tuesday 7 th February, led by Jenny Cameron at NOCRI. A save the date email has gone out to around 20 charities, most of whom attended the first workshop in September. The second workshop will focus on developing the Catalogue of Advice activity, and also identifying areas	

	where there are gaps in the research and charities could potentially be asked to fund specific research to fill those gaps.
7.	Date and host of next meeting: The next meetings will be held on Wednesday 22nd March at NOCRI, and Thursday 15 th June at CRUK.
8.	 AOB BC reported back on an event he recently attended at BBSRC (Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council) at which higher protein foods for ageing was discussed and could potentially provide a model for funding that the Collaboration could learn from. It was reported that the Nutrition Society's winter conference in 2017 will be on diet and nutrition in the cancer process. BC also asked if the Collaboration has a media policy as he had been asked to do an interview for a national TV chat show. BC raised the point about development of courses in the UK to support health professionals who want to learn more about how best to nutritionally support cancer patients, along the lines of the <u>forthcoming course run by the National Cancer Institute</u> in the US in March next year. It was agreed that this should form part of the Collaboration's Phase 3 activities.