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1. **General comments on the Draft of the Rome Declaration on Nutrition.**

While addressing some of the more salient issues relevant to protecting and promoting nutrition around the world, in general, the Draft Declaration falls well short of providing the powerful statement of political intent – the riveting call to action – that should guide nations in their efforts, acting singularly and in concert, to end hunger and all forms of malnutrition. The Declaration is underwhelming, at best; but at worst, by ignoring or misdirecting attention away from many of the real problems, threats, constraints and opportunities it could actually be detrimental to making real progress in reducing hunger and malnutrition throughout the world. For example, the omission or minimalizing of references to issues such as famine and food emergencies, gender equity and problems of social discrimination, civil disturbances, governance, education, the domains of “food, health and care” especially immunizations, child care and complementary feeding, among others, coupled with a somewhat narrow and often distorted view of food systems, all serve to detract attention from the basic and underlying problems of malnutrition. The Declaration as now written also removes nutrition from the mainstream of development efforts. Why is it not set within the framework of the Millennium Development Goals and, especially, within the follow-up plans. Where is the alignment with Secretary Ban Ki Moon’s Zero Hunger Challenge? Nutrition is relevant, fundamental actually, to each of the MDGs, and going forward nutrition must be seen as being central to whatever emerges. If the ICN2 does not place it there, it will again be marginalized.

As it now stands, the Declaration lacks substance and focus and thus its purpose is unclear. Where it does call for specific action, such actions are limited and often fail to address the fundamental issues needed. Many times the Declaration falls into muddled jargon and, even worse, makes inappropriate and often simplistic recommendations based on misguided notions of both diet-health relationships and of how food systems operate. And finally, it lacks passion – and any hint of poetry. I fail to see how it could serve as a forthright statement of commitment by our political leaders to improve nutrition, or as an inspiring catalyst for the generating the political will necessary to improve food and nutrition security. It most certainly will not serve to accelerate the widespread, multisectoral action necessary to do so.

The following comments further illustrate some of the above-mentioned short-comings.

a) Regarding the Declaration’s purpose and lack of focus: Para. 1 states that the purpose of the ICN2 is to “…address the multiple threats of malnutrition to sustainable development.” Think about that. All this is about threats to sustainable development? Where is the focus on people? Where is the concern with people’s suffering, with the growth, health and well-being of children, with the lost human potential? Instead we are told that the focus, the major concern of the ICN2, is on the threats posed by malnutrition to sustainable development, which may be a useful organizing principle, but in practice is somewhat nebulous and very difficult to apply in any real sense. Moreover, what about the impact of development – and natural disasters and civil disturbances – on nutrition? Focusing on sustainable development (as important as it is), instead of on people and their nutritional health and well-being, moves the ICN2 way off course, and into the realm of jargon, buzz words and fashionable concepts.

The bold-faced section heading after para 3 needs to go. It misses the point of what the Declaration should be about, and even at that it still does not relate to the following paragraphs.

b) Regarding the weak commitments and lack of passion: see para 2. Is reaffirming 22 year-old commitments that all too often were not seriously followed-up on the best we can do? Should not there be some soul searching as to why the commitments failed to materialize? The original ICN Declaration stated that “Hunger and malnutrition are unacceptable in a world that has both the knowledge and resources to put an end to this human catastrophe.” Shouldn’t we be asking why we continue to accept what is unacceptable? Reaffirming the previous commitments without anyone being held accountable for their actions - and inaction – is a meaningless gesture. However, even with the shortcomings, there has been considerable progress on many of goals of the original ICN. These too should be highlighted and analysed.

The same lack of passion, stemming from a lack of conviction and clarity, is also evident in the final section of the Declaration. The new commitments need considerable work. Where is the determination to refocus development efforts so that the poor and socially marginalized can realize their right to food in a dignified and sustainable manner? Where is the demonstration of the political will necessary to prevent famines and to deal effectively with food emergencies before they lead to widespread displacement and death. Where is the demonstration of the political will necessary to stop and better yet, prevent the suffering and often slow devastation of individuals – of all ages - caused by malnutrition? Where is evidence of the commitment to build the capacities, both in governments and local communities, necessary to design, implement and participate in initiatives and interventions aimed at helping people secure their food and improve their nutritional status? I could go on….

c) Regarding muddled jargon and simplistic wording: Para 3. refers to “sufficient, safe and nutritious food” but fails to define what is actually meant by that. Most notably, this becomes a problem in regard to nutritious food, which is a particularly relative concept that has little real meaning. Is the most nutritious food the one that has the most number of nutrients or the one that has the most of a given nutrient? Is spinach or meat more nutritious? Is sugar nutritious? Honey? If energy deficiency is a problem and adding sugar increases the energy density of a food, does that make the food more nutritious?

Certainly some foods contain more nutrients than do other foods, but what we need to be concerned about is how well total diets meet the nutritional and other food needs of people. We need to be concerned with nutritious diets, not with seemingly nutritious foods. Individual food items contain widely divergent amounts of different nutrients, and what is important – all that is important – is how they all fit together to meet a given individual’s needs. Is a potato a nutritious food? Is a fried potato nutritious? Are highly polyunsaturated vegetable oils nutritious? Should any high-fat, high sugar food be considered nutritious? What about breastmilk and Plumpy-Nut?

The point is that notions of whether or not a given food is nutritious are very inexact and highly pliable, with the possible exceptions of contaminated foods or those containing anti-nutrient properties such as the goitregenic types of cassava. In fact, the concept actually refers to food quality not to the relative contributions a specific food may make to nutrient intake. In practical terms Codex defines a nutritious food as one that contains whatever nutrients one would expect to find in it. For example, an overly-heated canned fruit that has lost an excessive amount of vitamin C might be considered non-nutritious, while a properly processed can of the same fruit would be considered as being nutritious. Similarly, a chocolate bar made with high amounts of sugar and full-fat milk would be considered nutritious since it contains the nutrients expected in a chocolate bar. Again, the document needs to refer to nutritious diets, not foods.

d) paras. 7. And 12 f) refer pejoratively to processed foods, which is particularly unfortunate in a document that aims to stimulate and guide efforts to improve dietary intakes. These may or may not be oblique, negative references to the food industry, but they certainly are based on other equally pejorative, misguided and generally discredited concepts concerning diet and health relationships, involving dietary fat, saturated fat, salt and sugar. In any event such sweeping, unsubstantiated statements have no place in a document intended to highlight global problems and guide global solutions.

The swipe at processed foods, overall, is truly unfortunate, and it appears to be based on a serious misunderstanding as to why and how foods are processed. While there will certainly be changes in nutrient composition arising from the processing of food, I do not believe there is any argument that the benefits far outweigh any negative impacts. In general, processing preserves food and the nutrients it contains. It slows spoilage, and prevents or reduces contamination. Processing makes seasonal foods available for a much longer period of time. Processing can enhance the nutritional and organoleptic qualities of food, and in the case of fortification can add significant qualities of nutrients. Processing facilitates food storage and preparation, and it expands and diversifies the food supply. It makes more foods more widely available at lower costs. Processing adds value to foods and provides wide-ranging opportunities for stimulating economic activity all along the food chain. This is all good, and I could go on, but will stop here with a simple plea that you not allow the Declaration to condemn food processing in general, or suggest that consumption of processed foods, *per se,* including those containing saturated fats, salt or sugar lead to obesity and noncommunicable diseases. There is no compelling scientific evidence to support such claims.

The ICN2 represents the best chance that national governments, intergovernmental organizations, and all aspects of civil society will have, at least in the foreseeable future, to come together to renew their commitments and reinvigorate their efforts, acting singly or in concert with one another, to reduce the scourge of hunger and malnutrition found throughout the world. If the Plan of Action and the Declaration do not get it right, the opportunity to do so will have squandered.

1. **Specific comments on the paragraphs related to the multiple threats that malnutrition poses to sustainable development (paragraphs 4-10).**

See comments above on the misguided emphasis on sustainable development as the primary object of concern of the ICN2. Please emphasize people and their ability or inability to acquire and utilize the amount and variety of food they need to be well nourished, healthy and active. Overall, I find that this section fails to make a compelling case for placing nutrition appropriately in the context of social and economic development ( that is, as it being both an outcome of social and economic development and an input into the process). As such, it does not lead to the realization that broad-based, multisectoral action is needed to address nutritional problems.

**Para. 4**: ”Acknowledge” is a pretty feeble response to widespread hunger and malnutrition. Why are we not outraged, frustrated, dismayed, etc. that they continue? In general the paragraph lacks passion; the almost clinical listing of woes fails to convey the reality of suffering and loss associated with hunger and malnutrition. The reference to “overweight” is inappropriate and irrelevant, given there is no evidence that it presents any health risk and may be seen as beneficial. The phrase “…noncommunicable diseases caused by unbalanced diet” should be stricken, or you are left with the logic that noncommunicable disease increases susceptibility to noncommunicable disease.

**Para. 5**: given the complex and multidimensional nature of the causes of malnutrition, why not build on the widely recognised framework of malnutrition that addresses the immediate, underlying and basic causes of malnutrition? This would facilitate efforts to direct action appropriately and to emphasise the interconnected nature of the causes.

 First bullet: It should read: “The lack of year- round access….” Also, I do not believe there is any evidence of widespread public health problems arising from chemically contaminated food supplies. Isolated instances of adulteration have occurred, but the real threat to health comes from microbial contamination. If anything needs to be highlighted apart from referencing the need for safe food, that should get the attention, not chemical hazards.

 Second bullet: The inverse is also true: malnutrition is a major contributor to low productivity and poverty and this, too, should be highlighted. In fact that is a major thrust of this entire section and making the point more explicitly would help give an economic reason, as well as a moral imperative, for addressing nutritional problems. I also suggest emphasising some of the non-income related factors – gender bias, social and/or political discrimination, etc.- that also affect food and nutrition security.

**Para. 6:** a very confusing, poorly constructedparagraph that needs to be rewritten. What does the term “dietary risk” mean? Unequal nutritional status is a strange concept; change “inequalities” to “differences.”

**Para. 7:** very one-sided and misleading. In fact, many of the dietary changes associated with social and economic development have led to greatly improved nutritional status. Moreover, many of those improvements have come about through the greater consumption of processed foods. It is highly inaccurate and totally inappropriate to disparage processed foods and to suggest that the “greater consumption of processed food…” has generally been nutritionally detrimental. Such a perspective illustrates a profound ignorance of what food processing is, why it is important, the nutritional and health benefits associated with food processing, and, just as significantly, the social and economic benefits arising from it. If people are living in urban and peri-urban areas, processed foods are essential. So too, are they in rural areas, be they commercially or home processed. In addition, the emphasis on foods high in fat, saturated fats, sugar and salt is misplaced. Recent (and some not so recent) evidence clearly shows how misguided such global pronouncements are, and these should be eliminated from this document. Saturated fat, salt and sugar are not the dietary demons many would have us believe.

**Para 8:** Climate change is not/will not have a negative impact on food production everywhere. Some regions will prosper greatly from having a warmer, wetter climate.

**Para 9:** this presents a strange and distorted image of food systems. Also, what is the evidence that “…current food systems and being increasingly challenged to provide sate and nutritious food for all…”? That isn’t true. We have more people in the world today with greater access to a nutritionally adequate amount and variety of safe foods than at any time in history. This is not to minimize the importance of strengthening and improving local food systems, including better integrating them with other food and social and economic systems, but it should emphasize that efforts to improve diets and nutritional status need to involve much more than what is referred to, somewhat cavalierly, as a food system.

Part of the problem with this paragraph is there is no common understanding as to what constitutes a food system, how various food systems may interact, the environments in which food systems operate, how other social and economic systems (especially those most closely associated with consumers) intersect with a given food system, and arguably, what may be most important, how food systems can become more nutrition sensitive. Instead, we are given an incomplete listing of selected issues that may or may not be particularly relevant to conditions in a real food system, and which do not provide a guide to any particular policy action. A more thorough, cogent discussion of food systems and their importance to nutrition would be more beneficial. Within that discussion, it would be important to stress that food systems do not exist in isolation, but are features of various environments (including physical, soci-economic, political, health, etc), and that they produce more than just food products. Food systems produce livelihoods and a variety of outputs and by-products that can be both very positive (fuel, fibre, etc) and negative (pollution).

This paragraph also seems to miss the point that food systems are a balance of many factors related to both the supply of and demand for food, and that, ultimately, food systems are driven by consumer choices. If consumers will not consume certain items, they will not be produced. Over time, farmers and food processors will simply not produce what they cannot eat, barter or sell. Governments can intervene in food systems in various ways, including providing support for either/both producers and consumers, but unless those interventions lead to improvements (hopefully, sustainable) in the conditions and welfare of the producers, they will fail. The challenge then is how to make food systems more profitable for producers – and more beneficial to consumers. Another challenge is how to integrate more people efficiently, effectively and equitably into existing food systems.

Three basic point emerge here: 1) except where environmental, political, social and economic constraints limit producer’s abilities to produce and trade the commodities and food items consumers want and can pay for, food systems have no difficulty in providing adequate amounts of nutritionally adequate and safe foods; 2) where insufficient supply or demand are large enough problems to lead to malnutrition, lasting solutions should begin with trying to identify and address the specific constraints involved; and 3) poor diets and malnutrition are not all the result of inadequate food systems.

**Para 10:** a glaring omission are the deaths and poor health related to food emergencies and famine. This is particularly egregious since putting an end to famine deaths was one of the most hopeful goals of the original ICN. Why is there not mention of linkages with the Millennium Development Goals? I think there is considerable benefit in placing nutrition within the framework of the MDGs and especially the post-2015 framework that is emerging.

 Bullet d) remove overweight – the cut-offs determining overweight status are arbitrary and there is no consistent risk associated with someone being above 25 BMI. When playing his best basketball, Micheal Jordan would have been considered over-weight.

 Bullet e) what is a “dietary risk factor?” Perhaps a reference to “poor diets…”

1. **Specific comments on the vision for global action to end all forms of malnutrition (paragraphs 11-12).**

This is where the Declaration’s (and one assumes the ICN2’s ) lack of attention to people and their aspirations for food, health and care is again, disturbingly, very noticeable. The “vision” being laid out here is a vision for governmental action, specifically: better coordination, coherent policies, managing food prices, and improved regulatory frameworks. All these are good and necessary, but is that really the “vision” of the ICN2 and this Declaration? Where is the vision of healthy active people, growing children, productive adults, vibrant communities, thriving markets, and abundant and safe food supplies? Where is the vision of social and economic equity, fair trade, environmental and intergenerational sustainability, and consumer choice and protection? Where is the vision of a world free from hunger? The vision is very limited, and I again, stress, there no passion and no poetry. My fear is that it will lead to no action.

**The section title and Para 11 a) –** The aspiration is laudable, but the impracticality of “eliminating all forms of malnutrition” makes it hard to take the vision seriously. Hold out the wish, but focus on what is possible. Stressing the multiple “imperatives” is good.

**11b)** How would you propose to “coordinate” the actors and “support “ their actions through the “cross-cutting policies, programmes and initiatives” in the areas noted (which is simply a list of someone’s favourite sectors, issues or current topics). This does not seem like a viable vision. Again, this is not to denigrate the need for multisectoral and multi-level action, but this sort of wording does nothing to make a serious case for fostering such action.

**11c)** This is another trite, virtually meaningless paragraph. Better targeted, more comprehensive, efficient and cost-effective policies and programmes that help to improve nutrition are always needed, and very welcome. However, to call for “global and national policy coherence…” without even specifying to what purpose, is an example of policy jargon that reveals nothing and leads nowhere. What policies, in what relevant sectors need to cohere? Is this call, in fact, but the latest ploy by the health sector in its quest to direct what the food and agriculture sectors produce, process and market? One hopes not. If, however, it is a call for governments to develop greater common understanding and appreciation across sectors, and in particular situations, as to how various national and sectoral policies and programmes can impact nutrition, and to then encourage those sectors to find ways to cooperate in achieving common nutrition-related objectives, then it is welcome. And if that is what is being called for, say so.

**11d)** This seems like another well-meant, but poorly though-out statement. Who, exactly, should manage the risks linked to high food prices, and how? If these are risks faced by consumers, what about managing the risks to producers of low food prices? Should the benefits of high food prices, of which there can be many for producers, also be managed? I suggest that the “vision” here should not be so much one of managing the risks linked to higher food prices, but rather one of ensuring that the poor can maintain adequate levels of food consumption, even in the midst of high and volatile food prices.

**11e)** I suggest envisioning a world where good quality and safe food is the norm; where good agricultural, manufacturing and marketing practices are followed; and consumers can protect themselves against contaminants. Achieving such a vision would include a strengthened Codex Alimentarius Commission, but it is much more than that. As written, this point is very overly specific and very limited in scope.

**Para 12 -**

Most of what is in this section needs to be “recognized,” but often not in the way it is, or given the prominence it is given. The basic question here is: are these 10 points the most significant ones that should be “recognized” for setting the stage for the following commitments? I am not sure they are.

**12a)** – This is generally ok - if taken in the narrow sense of international nutrition assistance supporting local nutrition initiatives. However, it might not be ok, if we would like other types of international non-nutrition-specific assistance (i.e. health and/or agriculture related assistance) to be nutrition sensitive or have a specific nutritional impact even in the absence of a comparable local initiative. Perhaps it would be better to recognize here that nutrition is the outcome of many factors and is associated with various sectors, all of whom should strive to incorporate nutrition objectives and considerations into their policies, programmes and activities whenever possible.

**12b)** – Fine, but it also requires many other things, including: jobs; education; clean environments; social equity and protection; economic opportunities; political stability; fair trade; good governance; and more. Why the limited focus on certain aspects of food systems?

**12c)** – This sounds like another a jargon-laden catch phrase, the meaning of which is very unclear. What does it mean to address food and agriculture systems “holistically by public policies…?” This is especially troubling since it appears these public policies are to address the resources and investment, among other things, going into food systems, but without indicating what any of it means – other than it will be holistic. What is particularly alarming about this is the apparent lack of understanding that it is private resources and investment (especially that of local farmers and producers) and consumer spending that drive food systems. Governments have important roles to play in food systems, but to wish/hope/ expect governments to address, holistically, all aspects of food and agriculture systems in which food is produced, processed, stored, distribute, prepared and consumed is not a recipe for greater food security or better nutrition.

**12d)** – this makes sense!

**12e)** – nutritional well-being depends on the consumption of adequate diets sufficient to meet one’s nutritional requirements, not the provision of them.

Also, the notion that saturated fat, salt and sugar in the food supply is to blame for increasing levels of noncommunicable disease is outdated and generally discredited, except to those whose reputations and professional status requires them to hang on. There is certainly no scientific consensus around the need to single out saturated fat, sugars and salt/sodium as items to be avoided to promote good nutrition and health. In fact, excessive intake of anything is to be avoided, including so called “heart-healthy” fats. This is particularly important in regard to most of the polyunsaturated fatty acids (i.e. those referred to a omega-6 fatty acids) which have clearly been shown to raise the risk of cardiovascular disease.

**12f) –** This is the most egregious example of the lack of understanding about food systems and their relation to nutrition in the entire document. It is true that if we all are to be well nourished, then our food systems will have to supply us with the amount and variety of good quality and safe foods that we need and want, when and where we want it and at a price we can afford. However, this includes such “nutritious” foods as meat, milk products and eggs, which were dismissed by the “animal-source” reference in the paragraph. It also includes processed foods which were deemed to negatively affect nutrition and health! The sheer stupidity of such a statement is mind-boggling. Large losses of food are recognized as a serious threat to food security and nutrition around the world, and yet this Declaration wants its signers to try to limit “… the consumption of processed foods.” Can anyone imagine a world without canned foods, bottled foods, dried foods, frozen foods, ready to eat foods, bread, pickled foods, processed cereals, fermented foods, vegetable oils, fortified foods, wines and beers, extracts, flavourings, cured meats, cheeses, yoghurts, condiments, spices, pepper sauces, whiskey, and the list goes on and on.

Pointedly, the paragraph in question does not suggest limiting the intake of non-processed foods. Is that because there is no risk to nutrition and health from unlimited unprocessed foods? Hardly, but the intention is to disparage processed foods, not to look honestly at diet and health relationships. It is my suggestion that instead of trying to limit food processing, the Declaration should seek to expand and improve food processing to both reduce waste and improve the nutrition and organoleptic qualities of foods.

Another major misunderstanding about food systems that keeps surfacing is that food is only one of the outcomes of food systems, and surprisingly, the actual food itself may not be the most important factor that contributes to good nutrition. Food systems also produce livelihoods. They are sources of income and wealth all along the various food or value chains. The food and nutrition security of countless billions of people around the world depends on them maintaining their job in some aspect of the food system, be it as a farmer, labourer, extension agent, fertilizer salesman, food processor, equipment saleslady, secretary, agronomist, food technician, etc., etc., etc…. This is one of the reasons that misguided nutrition and health policies can be so detrimental. Think of the destruction that could be caused by a totally unnecessary health policy that aimed to reduce consumption of chocolate bars due to a fear of fat and sugar. Cocao farmers – small and large – in for example, Ghana and Ivory Coast could suffer, as would their laborers and the cocao buyers, processors, shippers, exporters and importers. It doesn’t stop there: think of the sugar producers and their laborers and factory workers, the shippers and traders, and distributors. If milk chocolate is a particular target, then dairies and the rest of the milk industry could be affected. Any almonds or peanuts in the chocolate? Count those farmers and their workers in, too, along with all those working in the factories, distribution and marketing of the chocolate. Suffice it to say that turning food systems over to the health sector is a bad idea, especially if improved food and nutrition security is the goal.

**12g)** while the overuse of antibioticsin animal production systems is a problem, the broader issue of tackling emerging anti-microbial resistance in human populations is more of a health sector responsibility. Inter-sectoral cooperation is needed, but stopping the overprescribing of antibiotics by the medical profession is of paramount importance. Also, food systems cannot prevent infections. More sloppy thinking and writing.

**12h)** Another feel-good call for an ill-defined outcome. Again, a laudable, aspirational concept, but one lacking a way to apply it in practice.

**12i) –** ok.

**12j) –** if only they would!

1. **Specific comments in the appropriate fields relating to these commitments (paragraph 13):**

Taken together, these commitments do not point to a bold set of initiatives and actions emerging from the ICN2. They are uneven in terms of goals, processes and aspirations and need considerable thought and massaging. Also, SMART objectives are meant to be specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time-bound. Given those criteria, this group could use some shaping up. If, in fact, they are not intended to be commitments for which governments are to held accountable, (i.e. they are “aspirationable”) then this needs to be made clear.

These commitments do not seem to warrant the time and effort of an ICN2. They lack strength, purpose, passiokn, conviction, and (a favorite word of the day) coherence.

**Commitment a):** eradicate hunger and all forms of malnutrition, particularly to eliminate stunting, wasting and overweight in children under 5 and anemia in women; eliminating undernourishment and reversing rising trends in obesity;

A strange mix of hoped for outcomes, with no chance of being realized. Can stunting be eliminated since stunted children tend to stay stunted. Better to prevent it. Why <5s?

Why anaemia in women? Why not other micronutrient deficiencies, too?

Eliminate the reference to overweight children as it is meaningless.

**Commitment b):** reshape food systems through coherent implementation of public policies and investment plans throughout food value chains to serve the health and nutrition needs of the growing world population by providing access to safe, nutritious and healthy foods in a sustainable and resilient way;

See earlier comments on food systems. Expecting the “coherent implementation of public policies and investment plans” to reshape value chains and food systems into anything that could contribute to sustained improvements in nutrition and health is far-fetched, at best.

If better, more vibrant food systems, value chains, and income earning opportunities are what governments want to see, then say so. Then have them make a serious effort to work in partnership with the private sector, committing to create the supportive education, infrastructure and legislative and regulatory frameworks needed, and then turn them loose.

**Commitment c):** take leadership to shape and manage food systems and improve nutrition by strengthening institutional capacity, ensuring adequate resourcing and coordinating effectively across sectors;

Combine with B above.

**Commitment d):** encourage and facilitate contributions by all stakeholders in society and promote collaboration within and across countries, including North-South, South-South and triangular cooperation;

Nothing of particular significance to improving nutrition.

**Commitment e):** enhance people’s nutrition, including people with special needs, through policies and initiatives for healthy diets throughout the life course, starting from the early stages of life, before and during pregnancy, promoting and supporting adequate breast feeding and appropriate complementary feeding, healthy eating by families, and at school during childhood;

What is left to say??! This is bland and lifeless: Enhance people’s nutrition through policy and initiatives for healthy diets???

**Commitment f):** adopt and implement a Framework for Action that should be used to monitor progress in achieving targets and fulfilling commitments;

This means that targets and timelines need to be set

**Commitment g):** integrate the objectives of the Framework for Action into the post-2015 development agenda including a possible global goal on food security and nutrition.

 Finally, a link to the world outside of nutrition…

1. **We would also appreciate your vision on policies, programmes and investment that might help translate such commitments into action.**

Mainstream nutrition! Nutrition-specific objectives could/should be part of many/most national and sectoral development policies, plans and programmes. Take nutrition out of the realm of nutrients and individual foods and place it meaningfully into the development process. Focus on food and nutrition security in meaningful ways – for example, focus on such things as: poverty, including the amounts and control of income; gender bias; social discrimination; people’s participation; managing environmental risks; food emergencies; promoting the expansion and diversification of food supplies; promoting better health care and practices; promoting better maternal and child care; meaningful nutrition education and consumer awareness; and protecting the quality and safety of foods all along the food chain. Perhaps one of the most important steps to promote is working to develop locally agreed upon assessments and analyses of nutritional problems and their causes among various high-risk social and economic groups. Such analyse could then inform and guide the development and implementation of appropriate interventions aimed at strengthening the capacity of local populations to participate more fully in the development process and to secure own right to food.

Do not let the 2nd International Conference on Nutrition sink into a Conference on Nutrients!