

*Statement by civil society organization to the OEWG
Rome, 11 October 2014*

We thank Brazil for and other governments for supporting CSOs request to speak and thank the chair for giving us the floor. We had hoped to have an opportunity to address the distinguished delegates at the beginning of today's session. We wanted to share our observations on the political declaration and yesterday's proceedings. We will circulate these in writing. Thank you for giving us the floor to provide feedback on the draft Framework For Action.

In our intervention on the Framework we make reference to the Recommendation number 3. It calls for strengthening and establishment of multistakeholder governance mechanisms and states that *'such platforms may be needed at various levels, with robust safeguards against abuse and conflicts of interest'*. This language is vague, rather a lip service. What are examples of such robust CoI safeguards? As we all know adequate CoI safeguards do not exist even at the UN level, in particular with regard to institutional CoI. Multistakeholder platforms, which involve corporate sector, are intrinsically increasing the risks of CoI for the public sector partners. Therefore, they increase risks that the mission and integrity of government agencies and intergovernmental organizations become undermined. The commercial interests of multinational companies inevitably diverge in fundamental ways from those of the public sector, as states in the October comment to BMJ professor Marks. Recognizing this divergence does not mean demonizing the industry. Disregarding or downplaying it can be detrimental, as it can jeopardize public mission and integrity of institutions, ultimately undermining trust and confidence in the public sector.

The FFA currently downplays this divergence. As a result, to give an example, its focus on the food systems does not address the issue of **agricultural models** that are supported, and it does not recognize that all agricultural models do not have the same impacts on nutrition. Therefore the FFA must set out a vision on how to maximize the contribution of small scale producers and the traditional food systems and ensure better access to the proceeds of a diversified food systems for the most affected population.

Governance is key. It is therefore fundamental that Member States commit to develop a legitimate, coherent, accountable and participatory governance mechanism. In this context, the implementation of the FFA must be led by Member States and facilitated by FAO and WHO under the overall umbrella of the UNGA. In this manner, coherence, coordination and integration with the broader development agenda can be ensured. Member States should therefore request the CFS -led global platform on food security and nutrition with a specific mandate to establish coherence and coordination among all concerned actors - to prominently address nutrition in all its discussions and build the necessary capacity to perform this enhanced role. This might include, among others, the stronger direct engagement of WHO as a norms and standards- setting agency. At the same time, it is fundamental that the ICN2 outcomes be coherent with the CFS Global Strategic Framework and other relevant CFS policy documents.

Finally, it is equally essential that Member States establish a clear accountability framework – one based on principles of human rights, transparency, and democracy - that includes mechanisms for citizens' participation and the direct engagement of the

populations and communities which are most affected by different forms of malnutrition. This accountability framework must also ensure that transnational corporations and other powerful economic actors act in accordance with the public good and follow human rights-based frameworks and norms.