

## **How the Framework Convention on Global Health (FCGH) should address conflict situations**

*Submitted November 29, 2013, by Professor Brigit Toebes, University of Groningen*

Brigit Toebes, PhD  
Senior Lecturer – Rosalind Franklin Fellow  
Faculty of Law  
Department of International and Constitutional Law  
University of Groningen  
Oude Kijk in 't Jatstraat 26, 9700 AS, PoBox 716, Groningen, the Netherlands  
0031(0)503635676  
[B.C.A.Toebes@rug.nl](mailto:B.C.A.Toebes@rug.nl)  
[www.rug.nl](http://www.rug.nl)

*States in conflict: Should an FCGH address directly situations where governments do not have full control over all of their territory? If so, how should the FCGH address these situations? What are obligations of governments, non-state actors controlling territory not controlled by the government, and international actors?*

I think that obligations similar to the ones mentioned above for natural and humanitarian crises could be defined for States in conflict (e.g., also on the basis of obligations to respect, to protect and to fulfill/ core obligations). I think that both situations could be dealt with in an integrated fashion, be it that in international armed conflicts international humanitarian law can play a larger role in defining and underlining 'medical neutrality', which implies both negative and positive obligations for all (or many) parties in the conflict (I argue).