Discussion group agenda and question schedule.

9:00: Meet and introduction.

9:30: Top ten priorities discussion (reasons for choosing)

10:30: Break

10:45: Sticker activity (Ladder, Balanced Ladder) and discussion (reasons for choosing)

11:45: Intrusiveness and autonomy (discussion, important, relevance, definition, agree on one definition for each)

13:00: Lunch

13:45: Evidence for effectiveness- would it change their priorities of the top 10 provided.

14:30: Alternative options (not prioritised; reasons why, where do they fall on the ladders, influence of evidence).

15:45: Break

16:00: Final consensus: Top ten (summarise influence of autonomy, intrusiveness and evidence for effect on importance).

17:00: Finish

Question schedule:

9:30: Top ten priorities discussion (reasons for choosing)

- Why do you think these were most frequently prioritised?
- Can you all see at least a few that you chose? Why did you choose these?
- Prompts– are they most likely to work? Less expensive? Less intrusive? Affect us less?
- Would you personally want this as policy – what are your views? How would you feel?
- Are we all happy with these priorities and reasons for them? (make any changes).

10:30: Break

10:45: Sticker activity (Ladder, Balanced Ladder) and discussion (reasons for choosing)

- Stick the number for each of the options on each of the ladders according to how intrusive you believe the policy would be and how it would influence your autonomy.
- Use examples to question; 'Why did the majority of you put this one there?'
- Identify anomalies 'Why did you decide to place this one here?'

11:45: Intrusiveness and autonomy (discussion, important, relevance, definition, agree on one definition for each)

- How important do you think these concepts are when we are making decisions for obesity policy?
- Do you think they are relevant to obesity prevention policy?
- Are there more important things you can think of which are more important?

- In general, would you say this environment is enhancing or diminishing autonomy- where on the scale?
- In general, would you say this environment is intruding on our individual choice at the moment? To what extent – on the Ladder?
- In pairs just have a quick discussion and come up with two simple definitions for these yourselves (10mins).
- *Use their definitions to develop one or adopt on for each and all agree.*

13:00: Lunch

13:45: Evidence for effectiveness- would it change their priorities of the top 10 provided.

- What if we had evidence that this one worked well, would it affect your opinion?
- What if we had no evidence that this worked would it affect your opinion? (Exploring the value of evidence for effectiveness).
- *(Write on board headings: We would prioritise these if there was evidence for effectiveness; We would prioritise these if there was no evidence for effectiveness).*

14:30: Alternative options (not prioritised; reasons why, where do they fall on the ladders, influence of evidence).

- Why do you believe these weren't prioritised as frequently by the group?
- Prompt- how intrusive would you say they are? How would these influence autonomy? Would this affect your decision not to prioritise them? If we had evidence that this worked well would you prioritise it higher?

15:45: Break

16:00: Final consensus: Top ten (summarise influence of autonomy, intrusiveness and evidence for effect on importance).

- Here are the top ten; all in agreeance with these priorities?
- Here are the definitions we have developed for 'intrusiveness' and 'autonomy'; all in agreeance with these definitions?
- We have decided that the evidence for effectiveness does/does not influence our priorities, however where it is not available we would support those at X level of intrusion and those which enhance/diminish autonomy over those at X level of intrusion and those which enhance/diminish autonomy. Do we agree/disagree with this summary?
- Any changes?

17:00: Finish