



INTERNATIONAL UNION OF NUTRITIONAL SCIENCES

Prof. Dr. Helmut Heseker
(IUNS council member)
c/o University Paderborn
D-33095 Paderborn
Email: helmut.heseker@upb.de

IUNS office: *kenes associations worldwide*
De Ruyterkade 7 /12th floor)
NL-1013 AA, Amsterdam

August 17th, 2014

Document on “ Second International Conference on Nutrition (ICN2)” Framework for Action (FFA)

Comments of the International Union of Nutritional Sciences (IUNS)

This review of the document has been done on behalf of the International Union of Nutritional Sciences (see: www.IUNS.org).

In the FFA the background-part is presented precisely and clearly, considering a wide range of significant nutrition-related health problems from malnutrition to overnutrition. The FFA addresses ambitious but achievable goals and focusses on main nutrition related health problems taking also environmental factors – such as climate change and climate variability – into account. In the paragraph of the institutional mechanisms the requirements to improve nutrition are openly addressed, also reflecting actual developments.

In various parts of the document the development of “evidence-based strategies” and the control of measures are mentioned. However the urgent need of supporting the obligatory research in this field is yet not sufficiently addressed in all parts of the FFA: e.g. the introducing paragraph “Better results for the investments” of chapter 2.3 „Financing for improved nutrition outcomes” (pp 6) should be expanded: “This needs to be accompanied by investment in relevant sectors (e.g., agriculture, education, **research**, health, water, sanitation, hygiene [WASH], etc.)”.

The prioritization of actions of improving nutrition on the different levels is one of the strengths of this document. This is accompanied by a detailed description of potential measures to improve nutrition quality and safety along the food-chain. From the perspective of nutritional sciences these measures are comprehensive, relevant and meaningful. The addressed specific changes in the diet (pp 11) refer to evidence-based nutrition research and are widely supported by the community of nutritional sciences.

However there are some points of critics we want to mention:

Paragraph 3.3.3 Breastfeeding: There is the need to resuscitate the Baby Friendly Hospital Initiative. The document is silent on this.

Paragraph 3.3.4: Section on nutrition education is too long. This can be shortened to quarter of a page without losing content. This long narrative is not really needed. It is not focused and has no priority actions.

4. Accountability: Biannual means every 6 months. Is this what the document implied here? Every 6 month can the responsible organizations handle this?

How will ICN2 link up with other global initiatives in monitoring progress? The UK's Global Nutrition Report will be monitoring progress on a yearly basis. How is ICN2 linking up to ensure that is done in a coherent manner; this saves time, money and efforts.

5. Recommendations: The formation of an IPN is not needed. There is no need to establish new structures. There are enough of such; however there is a strong need to link up with existing structures.

The document should clearly show how ICNs can facilitate commitment and action by countries.

Overall: The document is too long. It should be made sharper by reducing repetitions and redundant sections. The final document should be subjected to language editing to make it clearer and consistently bring the main messages to the point. A much shorter and crispier document will be more likely to be read and acted upon.

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to the effort.

Kind regards

Prof. Dr. Helmut Heseke
(IUNS council)