

International Research Group on Gender and Alcohol
13th Annual Workshop

GENACIS Seventh Semi-Annual Working Meeting

Riverside, California

May 27-28, 2005

Friday, May 27: Plenary

Welcome and Introductions (Chair: Sharon Wilsnack)

Sharon welcomed the IRGGA/GENACIS members to the workshop and asked each participant to introduce him/herself. Sharon noted that this was the 15th annual IRGGA/GENACIS workshop since IRGGA was founded at KBS in Krakow in 1993. She extended a special welcome to new GENACIS members from Latin America who are partners in the Multicentric Study on Gender, Alcohol, Culture and Harm, funded by the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO). Laura Krech of PAHO provided additional information about the Multicentric Study later in the workshop.

Sharon also thanked KBS organizer Robert Parker and his staff for their considerable assistance in making arrangements for the GENACIS workshop.

EU Update (Ulrike Grittner)

Ulrike reported that the three-year GENACIS EU funding cycle ended on December 31, 2004. The EU Project Final Report, "Gender, Culture and Alcohol Problems: A Multi-national Study," was released in January 2005. Kim Bloomfield has approached the editor of European Addiction Research about publishing some chapters from the EU report as a special section of the journal. There are no immediate plans to request further EU funding, although some unexpended overhead funds may be available to help support a GENACIS mid-year meeting. Sharon congratulated the EU partners on the impressive Final Report and urged all GENACIS members to request copies of the report from Kim.

WHO Update (Isidore Obot)

Isidore announced that in late May the World Health Assembly adopted a major resolution on alcohol that calls for the Director-General to strengthen WHO's capacity to support member states in monitoring and reducing alcohol-related harm. The resolution also calls for intensifying international cooperation in reducing alcohol-related public health problems, conducting further scientific studies on the public health impact of alcohol use, and developing recommendations for effective policies and interventions to reduce alcohol-related harms. Although it is not clear what the sources of funding for the new initiatives will be, Isidore is generally optimistic that the resolution will bring greater visibility and resources for international efforts to reduce alcohol-related harms.

Isidore reported that the WHO GENACIS book is progressing well. The book will include chapters from each of the WHO-funded countries (Argentina, Costa Rica, India, Nigeria, Uganda, and Uruguay) plus Brazil and Mexico. Each chapter will emphasize a different theme, although all will also present basic GENACIS drinking variables. Isidore anticipates that the WHO alcohol resolution will make funding for the book a bit more secure, and he hopes that the book will be published by the end of 2005.

UND/NIAAA Update (Sharon Wilsnack)

Sharon reported the good news that all four papers from the KBS 2003 plenary session in honor of Ludek Kubicka have now been accepted for publication in Addiction. Papers are authored by GENACIS members Marja Holmila, Kim Bloomfield, Jacek Moskalewicz, Myriam Munné, and their co-authors. The four papers, together with an introduction by Sharon and discussant comments by Robin Room, will appear in a fall or winter issue of Addiction.

Unfortunately the R01 application to NIAAA to conduct secondary analyses of the GENACIS data base was not approved for funding at its review in February. Reviewers were favorably impressed with the research team, the uniqueness of the data set, and the methodological detail provided but seemed to need to be more convinced of the overall public health significance of the proposed secondary analyses. The R01 planning group will revise the application in light of the reviewers' comments and will resubmit it by November 1. The current NIAAA funding to UND will end July 31, but some carryover funds will be available after that.

Robin thanked the UND group for their work on the quarterly newsletter, and Sharon thanked Gerhard Gmel and his musical colleagues for creating the "GENACIS song," which was rehearsed during the workshop and sung at the Thursday night KBS banquet.

SIPA Update (Gerhard Gmel)

Robin, Sharon, and others commended the SIPA team for their latest contribution: the GENACIS CD Version 3, containing almost all variables from the expanded core questionnaire, in nine questionnaire domains. The Kazakhstan data are still missing, but efforts are being made to recover them. France is now included in the data base, thanks to the efforts of Francois Beck. The Swiss and Finnish national data must be obtained separately because access requires special permission. SIPA will run requested tables with the Swiss data, and members should contact Pia Mäkelä about the Finnish data. The Canadian national data will be available soon. Members applauded the SIPA team for the clarity and detail of the codebooks and country tables and the rapidity with which questions are answered. Sharon noted that the high quality of the SIPA database demonstrates the value of centralized data management.

PAHO Multicentric Study (Laura Krech)

Laura presented the background and design of the Multicentric Study of Gender, Alcohol, Culture and Harm, funded by the Pan American Health Organization. The study is using most of the GENACIS expanded core questionnaire -- plus additional questions on health, conflict and

violence, influence of family and friends, and socioeconomic circumstances – in new surveys in Belize, Nicaragua, and Peru. Data from these three countries will be combined with data from previous GENACIS surveys in Argentina, Brazil, Costa Rica, Mexico, and Uruguay and compared with findings from the U.S. (ARG's N10 national survey) and Canada (2004 GENACIS national survey). The study will produce the most extensive data yet available on associations between gender, alcohol, and culture in Latin America.

Three of the existing GENACIS surveys in Latin America were described briefly by Myriam Munné (Argentina), Florence Kerr-Correa (Brazil), and Raquel Magri (Uruguay). Progress on the new Multicentric Study surveys was discussed by Claudina Elington Cayetano (Belize), Marcos Zaleski (Brazil), and Ines Bustamante (Peru). Other GENACIS members participating in the Multicentric Study are Kate Graham (Canada) and Tom Greenfield and Sharon Wilsnack (USA). The study partners will meet in Nicaragua in October to review data sets, coordinate data cleaning, and plan data analyses and dissemination of findings. Preliminary findings from the study will be presented at the first Pan American Conference on Alcohol Policy in Brasilia in December.

Paper Group Meetings

GENACIS paper groups met Friday, 11:00 – Saturday, 15:30. Members of each work area determined which paper groups would meet during that work area's three-hour meeting time. Work areas are: (1) drinking patterns; (2) drinking problems; (3) alcohol and violence; (4) social roles and social inequalities; (5) intimacy and sexuality; (6) health and lifestyle; and (7) societal-level predictors.

Saturday, May 28: Plenary 1 (Methods and Measures)

A plenary discussion of GENACIS drinking variables was held from 9:00 to 10:30, chaired by Sharon Wilsnack and Kate Graham. The drinking variables used in the Wilsnack drinking patterns overview paper were reviewed and discussed. Members agreed that a shared perspective is needed about which drinking-related measures should be used and what the benefits and costs are for different measures. The goal of the discussion was to try to understand the options and implications of various choices of measures, and to keep a record of the discussion so that it would not have to be repeated at each meeting. Major issues concerning definitions of drinking variables and methods for creating these variables are summarized below.

Abstinence: SIPA recommends that 12-month abstinence should be used as the criterion for classifying current abstainers vs. current drinkers. For each paper a decision will need to be made whether the analyses should be based on the total population or on drinkers only. Using the total population as the denominator provides important information (e.g., for public health policy) about distributions of drinking patterns and drinking-related problems in the total population, whereas using drinkers as the denominator is useful for identifying risk factors for heavy drinking or drinking-related problems among those people who drink.

Former drinkers: The question was raised whether former drinkers should be included in some analyses such as health effects. Should three categories (lifetime abstainers/former drinkers/current drinkers) or two (abstainers/drinkers) be analyzed? Members noted that while most drinking consequence questions are asked for the last 12 months, and not asked of 12-month abstainers, past year health consequences are asked of all respondents.

Frequency: In the UND prevalence paper, the frequency variables recommended by SIPA were used for the frequency tables. Frequency categories were those in the GENACIS questionnaire. For the population-based frequency tables, current abstainers were given a frequency of zero.

Several members emphasized the value of being able to measure and describe different drinking patterns, e.g., routine daily drinking, weekday abstention/weekend drinking, and special occasion drinkers. Much of the research literature, which has emphasized averaging frequencies, obscures how frequently people are drinking different amounts. We need to be aware of the detail that is sacrificed when frequencies are reduced to a small number of averaged categories.

Members discussed which data are best used when there are beverage-specific and generic frequency measures based on both Q-F and GF. Should the maximum of generic and beverage-specific frequencies be used? SIPA recommends using generic frequency data when these are available.

Total volume: SIPA's recommendation is that it is best to rely on generic measures for total volume. If a generic measure of volume is not available, the beverage-specific volume measure is recommended, but this is problematic for mean volume per drinking day. Gerhard cautioned that SIPA's recommendations are not "best" in some absolute sense; they are simply SIPA's recommendations based on their best judgment and their observations of the various country data sets.

Failed (and successful) measures: Members agreed that a GENACIS website bulletin board would be a good place to discuss measures that do not work as they were expected to work. If a measure has failed (i.e., has created problems of analysis or interpretation), members should be informed so that that measure can be avoided and alternatives found. The bulletin board could be used for topics such as GF: where GF worked and where it did not (or perhaps the maximum level for GF worked but the lower levels did not). A bulletin board would also be useful for posting "successful" measures, and measures (such as Ulrike's education measure) that are recommended based on extensive psychometric analysis.

Countries with multiple surveys: Several countries (mostly ECAS countries) have multiple surveys in the GENACIS database and so have more than one estimate of the drinking variables. Some of the estimates vary greatly within one country. Rather than using both surveys, most members agreed that the poorer of the multiple surveys should be dropped (e.g., if one survey had a substantially lower response rate than the other). Deciding between surveys may be difficult, so it was suggested that representatives from multiple-survey countries be asked to provide guidance regarding the relative quality of the different surveys.

Drink size variation: The question of using coverage rates to adjust drink size estimates was raised. Total volume is generally not used in Europe as a measure of drinking behavior, instead mean consumption per drinking day or per occasion. U.S. studies more often use volume measures. Members agreed that early in each paper the meaning of each of the drinking measures should be clearly defined.

Quantity per drinking day or per occasion: It was suggested that for GENACIS papers quantity per drinking day should be used rather than quantity per drinking occasion. Both were calculated for the EU report. “Occasion” may be defined differently in different surveys and by different respondents. For this reason it was suggested that for GENACIS papers it may be better to use drinking day and not try to separate out multiple occasions within a day.

Gerhard summarized SIPA’s recommendations for the quantity/drinking-day measure. He said that it is simplest to use non-beverage-specific Q-F for a measure of quantity. Combining data from beverage-specific questions produces a questionable measure of quantity, because the degree of overlap among beverages consumed within a drinking day is unknown. He recommended that total volume be calculated first and then the maximum of generic and beverage-specific frequencies be used to obtain quantity per drinking day. Gerhard also suggested that the GENACIS response categories should be coded as follows: less than once a month = 6 per year, and once a week = 52 per year.

There may be a problem with frequency when the only available measure of frequency is from beverage-specific data. Strategies for combining beverage-specific frequencies may work only on a country by country basis, based on knowledge of beverage-specific consumption patterns in each country. If beverage-specific data are the only data available, it was recommended that the maximum of the beverage-specific frequencies be used. Again, the paper should state clearly that frequency was defined in this way.

Graduated Frequency: It was recommended that GF data not be used for estimating frequencies if generic frequency data are available. The reported frequencies for the different GF drinking levels should be mutually exclusive. However, if respondents fail to make mutually exclusive responses to the different drinking levels, the overall frequency that is calculated based on these questions results in an estimate greater than 365 drinking days for the last 12 months.

Heavy Episodic Drinking: Several issues were discussed concerning HED/risky single-occasion drinking. Variation exists across countries in how HED is defined (most use ≥ 5 drinks/day as the standard), but the definitions generally reflect what is viewed as high volume drinking in a particular country. Generic Q-F measures fail to detect exceptionally high (e.g., weekend) drinking occasions. Beverage-specific measures may detect these occasions better, especially if the binges involve a different beverage from routine drinking patterns. The AUDIT is a third option for estimating HED. GF may be used to derive frequency of 5+ drinks, but it may involve over-counting of frequencies (when respondents do not give mutually exclusive responses to drinking levels). Maximum level works well as a predictor of other drinking consequences, so perhaps more use should be made of this variable instead of, or in addition to, the standard HED measure.

Concluding comments were that caution needs to be used in comparing drinking rates across countries, especially where drinking measures vary. We need to emphasize that comparable measures are available for many measures and many countries, while also recognizing the limitations of some measures and describing explicitly the measures we are using for each country.

Saturday, May 28: Plenary 2

From 16:00 to 17:30 a wrap-up session was held during which work area leaders reported on the progress of papers in their areas. Their reports are summarized briefly here. An updated list of papers planned and in progress, including co-authors of each paper, will be included in the next GENACIS newsletter.

Drinking Patterns (Tom Greenfield and Pia Mäkelä)

Tom and Pia reported that the following papers are in progress: (1) the Wilsnack group presented a nearly complete draft of the first overview paper on drinking patterns across all GENACIS countries, by age and gender; (2) Kate Graham is leading a paper on reasons for abstaining; (3) Myriam Munné is planning a paper on situational drinking norms (for various drinking settings, for women vs. men); (4) Gerhard Gmel has a fairly well-developed paper on drinking at meals and in bars, examining the potential protective effects of the former and the hazards of the latter; (5) Karin Bergmark is interested in a paper on positive effects of drinking; and (6) Zofia Mielecka-Kubien will present a paper on distribution of alcohol consumption across GENACIS countries as part of the KBS symposium. Other papers planned in this work area are (7) patterns and correlates of intoxication; and (8) a multi-level paper analyzing the effects of individual drinking style vs. context choice effects.

Drinking Problems (Ronald Knibbe and Isidore Obot)

Isidore reported that five papers are in draft stage: (1) Jan Joosten's paper on informal pressures to drink less; (2) Marja Holmila's paper on country variations in overall pressuring; (3) Hildigunnur Olafsdottir's paper on informal control and formal treatment; (4) Sylvia Kairouz's paper on psychometrics of GENACIS alcohol-related problems; and (5) Gerhard Gmel's paper on the Hazardous Drinking Score (from WHO's CRA/GBD) in GENACIS countries.

Alcohol and Violence (Karin Bergmark and Kate Graham)

Kate and Karin reported that the violence chapter for the EU Final Report is finished and published; an extension of these analyses (of fights after drinking and aggression when drinking) with additional countries is underway. Kate's papers on partner aggression are awaiting addition of the Canadian national data to the GENACIS data base. Sharon Wilsnack is leading a paper on childhood sexual abuse and alcohol consumption; and Akan Ibanga is leading a paper on adult sexual assault and drinking. The Latin American countries in the Multicentric Study will all have data on partner aggression. Members of the alcohol and violence work group expressed interest in using these data to produce a book on alcohol and partner violence in Latin America.

Further planning for this book will take place at the October Multicentric Study meeting in Nicaragua.

Sexuality and Intimacy (Marja Holmila and Louise Nadeau)

Louise is analyzing data on social support, loneliness, and drinking in nine countries. Women report more loneliness than men despite having greater social support. Louise has obtained input from study directors in each of the nine countries regarding cultural issues in defining and measuring social support and loneliness. Other papers in progress in this work area include (1) sexuality-related alcohol expectancies and drinking (headed by Jillian Fleming and Alexandra Bogren); (2) relationship quality and drinking (planned by Louise and Sharon); (3) cross-cultural variations in alcohol problems in primary networks (Martin Plant and Moira Plant); and (4) correlates of convergence vs. divergence in partners' drinking patterns.

Social Roles and Social Inequalities (Kim Bloomfield, Andrée Demers, and Gerhard Gmel)

Kim reported that the EU chapters on social inequalities and social roles are complete; there are plans to publish these chapters in European Addiction Research. Other papers underway are: (1) Martha Romero's paper on marital status and drinking in middle age; (2) Ulrike Grittner and Sandra Kuntsche's paper on within- vs. between-country variation in social inequalities (extending the EU chapter to as many additional countries as possible); (3) Ulrike's analyses of components of social status in relation to drinking patterns (ready for submission); and (4) Andrée's paper on social inequality, gender, and health.

Health and Lifestyle (Moira Plant and Nancy Vogeltanz-Holm)

Moira and Nancy are working on an overview paper on the prevalence and associations with drinking of various lifestyle factors (e.g., smoking, exercise, other drug use). Other papers include (1) Jillian Fleming's paper on "excessive behaviors" (gambling, eating, and others) as related to drinking behavior; (2) Isidore and Florence Kerr-Correa's paper on alcohol use and use of other substances (tobacco, illicit drugs); and (3) Antonio Vidal's paper on drinking, emotional health, and help-seeking.

Societal-Level Variables (Giora Rahav and Richard Wilsnack)

Giora reported that the EU Final Report chapter on aggregate-level variables is finished; he is working on a publishable extension of the analyses of gender inequality and drinking. Zofia Mielecka-Kubien is planning a paper on economic development and gender differences in drinking. Tom Greenfield and Robin Room are interested in writing a paper on social control patterns (official vs. unofficial) and drinking patterns and problems, although the quality of the available societal data is uncertain at this point.

Other Issues

Funding

With EU funding ending December 31, 2004, and the UND NIAAA grant ending July 31, 2005, the next six to twelve months will be a “lean period” for GENACIS. Members discussed several potential sources of funds during this period, including (1) some carryover funds from the UND NIAAA grant; (2) possible supplemental or “bridge funding” from NIAAA; and (3) the possible return of overhead costs on the EU project to Kim, who could then contribute these as continuity funding for GENACIS. Members who request funding for GENACIS research in their home countries were encouraged to request funds for their travel to GENACIS meetings.

As an alternative to the relatively expensive mid-year meeting held in Berlin for the past three years, we may need to think of smaller, more topic-focused meetings during the coming year (i.e., prior to the June 2006 GENACIS and KBS meetings in Maastricht). One such meeting may be the planning session for the proposed alcohol and partner violence book, to be held during the meeting of Multicentric Study partners in Nicaragua in October. We should also take advantage of our attendance at other professional meetings (e.g., ICAA in Budapest in October) to further our collaborative GENACIS activities.

Encouraging Continued Productivity

Members discussed ways of encouraging continued productivity of the GENACIS work areas and paper groups, especially if it is not possible to have a mid-year meeting before Maastricht. One suggestion was the publication of a group of related papers as a special issue or special section of a journal. Several GENACIS papers on informal social control of drinking are nearing completion, and these might be appropriate for a special section of a journal such as Contemporary Drug Problems. Hildigunnur agreed to work with Robin to explore the possibilities of publishing the informal control papers as a group. Isidore noted that the African Journal of Drug Studies is another possible venue for publishing a group of GENACIS papers. Several multinational analyses of sexual behavior and drinking are currently underway that include Nigeria, Uganda, and other countries, and these might be appropriate for the African Journal.

Other suggestions for maintaining productivity included developing a password-protected sharepoint site as part of the UND IRGGA/GENACIS website, where authors can post drafts of their papers and obtain comments from other GENACIS members. Sharon agreed to explore this possibility with the UND staff person responsible for the IRGGA/GENACIS website.

Knowledge Transfer and Capacity Building

Claudina Cayetano suggested that, in addition to disseminating GENACIS findings to other researchers, we need to look at the implications of our findings for local and national alcohol policies. This stimulated considerable discussion of how knowledge transfer and capacity building can be incorporated as features of GENACIS. How can we go beyond the reporting of facts and findings to addressing the implications and uses of those facts for developing alcohol policies and interventions? Members agreed that it will be important that WHO know that the rich and wide-ranging GENACIS data set is available for use in furthering the goals of the new WHO alcohol resolution. Press conferences and news articles about GENACIS findings, both on

an international level and in members' home countries, are always useful for raising awareness of the GENACIS project and disseminating its findings.

The group decided to form a committee to develop ways of more effectively disseminating GENACIS findings and their implications for policy and intervention. Isidore and Louise agreed to co-chair this "knowledge transfer and capacity building committee." Other committee members are Claudina, Tom Greenfield, Martin Plant, and Nancy Vogeltanz-Holm. Maristela Monteiro was suggested as an additional member. Other GENACIS members who would like to serve on this committee should contact Isidore and Louise.

Before the workshop adjourned, Sharon reminded the group about the Sunday workshop on "publishing addiction science," presented by the International Society of Addiction Journal Editors, and about the IRGGA meeting on Tuesday, May 31, 16:00 – 17:30. Isidore announced that the knowledge transfer/capacity building committee will meet and report to the group at the Tuesday afternoon IRGGA meeting.

Tuesday, May 31

Sharon welcomed the group and briefly summarized the Friday/Saturday GENACIS workshop for IRGGA members who did not attend. The Tuesday session gives us a chance to discuss and wrap up issues not totally resolved at the workshop. Arlinda reminded members that CDs of the GENACIS data set, Version 3, can be burned during the meeting in Riverside; all work area leaders and first authors of papers are eligible to receive a CD.

Knowledge Transfer and Capacity Building

Isidore and Louise reported on a meeting yesterday of the knowledge transfer/capacity building committee. The committee agreed that we need to go beyond our GENACIS research and paper-writing, to translate what we are doing for public access and use. They suggested examples of how we might do this:

- (1) Disseminate your own interesting findings within your own country, via press conferences, press releases, and news articles.
- (2) Seek ways (e.g., talking with practitioners and professional organizations) to use your findings to help develop more effective interventions (prevention and treatment).
- (3) Seek ways to get your findings into the hands of those who make or influence public policy relating to alcohol use/abuse.
- (4) Position your research findings where they are most likely to get noticed, e.g., in those journals covered most closely by the press and those journals that create their own press releases for the media.
- (5) Consider partnering with advocacy groups that can help get your research findings out beyond the covers of a book or journal.

(6) Perhaps GENACIS could develop a “tool kit” for how to get research findings publicized and used. Members could let others know what they did that worked in getting media and policy-makers interested in their findings.

(7) The committee may send members an email inquiring about the impact of GENACIS findings in their countries. That information can be useful for other countries and for fund-raising.

With regard to capacity building, members suggested that GENACIS could serve as an umbrella that connects members who have conducted gender and alcohol research with people in other countries who are dealing with similar problems and research issues. We could compile grant applications, questionnaires, and other research materials and share these both within our group and with researchers in other locations. Other capacity-building activities include our offering assistance with interviewer training in other countries and providing funding for travel to international meetings.

The PAHO Multicentric Study has an explicit goal of using survey findings to inform policy decisions in Latin America, for example, with regard to gendered drinking patterns, links between drinking and economic development, and what are the most supportable/justifiable interventions for alcohol-related problems. The PAHO experience translating research findings into policy can inform other GENACIS partners about what can/should be done with our research findings elsewhere.

Overall, there was a strong consensus that GENACIS should become more concerned with knowledge transfer and capacity building efforts. We will look to Isidore, Louise, and their committee for leadership in this important area.

Alcohol and Pregnancy Research: A Role for GENACIS?

On Saturday, May 28, the U.S. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) sponsored a workshop on Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder as a KBS-affiliated activity. The FASD workshop had not been publicized among GENACIS members and conflicted with the second day of the GENACIS workshop. Raquel Magri and Moira Plant attended portions of the FASD workshop and gave a brief report to GENACIS members. The workshop was designed to introduce information about FASD, information that would already be familiar to many GENACIS members. It included a description of several multinational studies, including a study of pregnant women in Moscow in which Sharon and Arlinda had been involved.

The report of the SAMHSA workshop led to a general discussion about the level of interest in alcohol and pregnancy research among GENACIS members. Isidore indicated that WHO is interested in drinking in pregnancy issues and will likely fund three small studies of alcohol screening among pregnant women. Raquel is currently conducting a study of pregnant women in Uruguay that includes questions to the mothers about their drinking, information from their physicians, examination of the baby, and analysis of meconium samples. Other GENACIS

members with experience conducting alcohol and pregnancy research include Moira in the UK, Sharon and Arlinda in St. Petersburg and Moscow, Fredrik Spak in Sweden, Ann Hope in Ireland, Maria Dinis in the U.S., and Anne George, a new member from Vancouver who conducts alcohol and pregnancy research in British Columbia, including studies of indigenous First Nations women. Madhabika Nayak has co-authored an article on drinking among U.S. women of childbearing age.

Several members observed that there seems to be a resurgence of interest in research and prevention efforts related to drinking in pregnancy, perhaps in part because the first wave of research findings and prevention efforts has not had a significant and lasting effect, especially among heavier drinking or alcohol dependent women. Moira noted that there is a significant gap between U.S. and European research and policy, e.g., with regard to dose-related risks, and Sharon commented that there is still a lack of communication and collaboration between researchers who primarily study women and those who primarily study children. Several members underscored the importance of the prenatal and postnatal physical and social environment, including drinking and other behavior of the father, which is often neglected in studies of drinking and pregnancy outcome.

Raquel, Moira, and Anne George agreed to co-chair a GENACIS interest group on alcohol use among women of childbearing age; other members are Ann Hope, Arlinda, Fredrik, Madhabika, Maria, and Sharon. Initial activities of the group could include assessing current research on drinking and pregnancy, including research on sensible limits and on prevention; identifying other researchers and other countries that might be interested in collaboration; considering what GENACIS could contribute from existing data, e.g., with regard to cross-national variations in drinking among women of childbearing age; and identifying high-priority research questions that could be addressed with new coordinated data collection.

2006 KBS Symposium

Sharon thanked the GENACIS members for their commitment to the GENACIS project and for their hard work before and during the Riverside workshop. She announced that the 2006 KBS symposium will be held in Maastricht, the Netherlands, May 29 – June 2, 2006. The pre-KBS GENACIS workshop will be held May 26-28. All members will receive further information about the Maastricht workshop as plans are developed.