

## **Summary of CSM Interventions to the OEWG on Nutrition 25 of February**

During the meeting the Nutrition WG of the CSM made four interventions on the proposal. The first and second interventions related to the need for the proposal to take a human rights approach in reflection of CFS's mandate and as outlined in the CFS Reform document (see here: [http://www.csm4cfs.org/resources-7/cfs\\_reform-16/](http://www.csm4cfs.org/resources-7/cfs_reform-16/)). It was argued that policies and recommendations on nutrition must be coherent with a human rights approach. Furthermore, it was argued that a holistic approach to nutrition needs to be utilized such that the focus of the CFS's work on nutrition is not limited to exploring how food systems shape nutrition but also how nutrition is shaped by other key determinants and due to failures to uphold human rights. The essential need for a holistic approach to nutrition and one that ensure's women's rights and the right to food, health, water, land and seeds was stressed. The second intervention alerted to the fact that the CFS should not add to the already fragmented approach to nutrition, by establishing a niche in the area of food systems alone, but build on its unique mandate to coordinate, and promote policy convergence and coherence with human rights. The CFS should map duplications, gaps and incoherence with human rights and facilitate policies to overcome these.

The third intervention explored the three primary functions that the Proposal outlines for the CFS in advancing nutrition and argued for the need for these functions to be changed such that they reflect the key functions of the CFS outlined in the Reform document. Furthermore, it mentioned the need for monitoring practices that are human-centered and that reporting should emphasize whether policies and actions have been carried out towards the realization of the right to food. The fourth intervention discussed the need for conflict of interest policies within the CFS and stressed that the document acknowledge fully that nutritional health goals are in conflict with the profit motives of the Big Food, Beverage and Agro industries, and this fact must not be obscured.

Importantly, many of our points were supported by, or convergent with the views of some member states, such as Brazil, Ecuador and Switzerland as well as the FAO and the UN Standing Committee on Nutrition supported the need to improve and strengthen the human rights approach in the document and to generally improve the vision aspect of the document.