Statement

MMI appreciates the opportunity to address the EB. This statement is supported by PHM. We appreciate efforts made to address conflicts of interests arising from WHO's engagement with private sector entities. However, we have concerns regarding the effectiveness of existing approaches to WHO-NSA engagement. We offer the following suggestions:

Key principles of good governance are transparency and accountability. We urge MS to ensure that FENSA is implemented and monitored in accordance with these principles so that conflicts of interest can be effectively avoided.

Good progress has been made in developing the register of NSA. However, the register should also provide details on the nature and type of interactions between NSA and WHO, for example information on the provision of technical advice and/or financial resources.

The current reporting on WHO’s due diligence assessments lacks transparency and adequate detail to facilitate an informed assessment about the FENSA implementation. In the interest of transparency, we urge WHO to publish: the outcomes of WHO’s 1500 “due diligence discussions” discussed in para 17; the content of the “simplified assessment procedure for new engagements” discussed in para 18; and the outcomes of WHO discussions with NSA to “reinforce WHO’s normative mandate” discussed in para 7.

We are concerned about the proposal in para 10 for “nil-remuneration contracts.” It appears that this provides the opportunity to bypass the restrictions placed on secondments for private sector entities. We strongly urge WHO to do away with nil-remuneration contracts.

Lastly, in the implementation of FENSA, we urge MS and WHO to revisit the definition of conflicts of interest to make important distinctions between civil society, for whom health is a right and public good, versus private sector actors for whom health is a commercial good.