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| **Communicating simple solutions for trade and investment treaties: Five ways to provide a health framing** |
| **Setting/problem**  Trade and investment treaties generally give enforceable rights to corporations, without requiring enforceable obligations from them. Such treaties tend to reinforce existing inequalities because of their strong emphasis on protecting the interests of investors. ‘Common good’ objectives, defined as benefits that can be shared by all such as the quality of air, tend to lose out.  The health promotion world has had difficulty engaging with policymakers on such treaties, and has lacked a simple framing of health solutions.  **Intervention**  We have devised five ways to frame the health solutions for such treaties.  **Outcomes**  The five framings are:  ***One***: Economic growth is the means, not the end.  Such growth should be recognised as a means to common good objectives, including health and environment, rather than an end in itself.  ***Two***: Common good interests must have priority over business interests.  International health, environmental protection, and human rights treaties must have enforceable priority over business interests in trade and investment treaties.  This means that trade and investment treaties should not only explicitly defer to international health, environmental protection, and human rights treaties, but also include their own enforceable health, social and environmental objectives.  ***Three***: Corporations must have legal responsibilities.  Trade and investment treaties must include enforceable corporate responsibilities for contributing to health, environmental, human rights and other common good objectives.  ***Four:*** Dispute processes must include common good perspectives.  New treaties need to remove the ability of investors to sue states through secret arbitration (investor-state dispute settlement). Governments should instead use their own courts for disputes arising under trade and investment agreements. If transnational dispute resolution systems are needed, decision makers and processes that represent wider objectives, including people with social, health or environmental perspectives, would be appropriate.  ***Five:*** The process for making treaties must be transparent.  The public needs to know what its government is signing up to, with independent assessments of treaty impacts, and independent avenues of citizen involvement.  Access to negotiations must be equal between citizens and business.  **Implications**  A framing approach that is based on commonly held societal values will assist people to advocate for fairer and healthier treaties  **Preferred presentation format**  Oral presentation |