

# Medicines as Global Public Goods: The Governance of Technological Innovation in the New Era of Global Health

Suerie Moon

*One of the most significant changes in global health over the past decade has occurred in the framing, norms, and policy approaches to addressing the problem of globally inequitable access to drugs, diagnostics, vaccines or other health tools. This article traces the evolution over the past century of governance regimes for new product development (NPD) for health, using the case of anti-malaria tools as an illustration. There have been major shifts in conceptions about who should benefit from, and who should pay for NPD, with gradual movement away from a primarily national to an increasingly global approach. Innovative institutional arrangements, such as the “public-private product development partnerships (PDPs),” have begun to take into account the need to develop tools that are adapted for use in developing countries, and to incorporate considerations of affordability into the early stages of development. However, thus far such efforts have been limited to a small set of infectious diseases. The PDPs, as currently organized, are not likely to be the appropriate model for providing NPD to counter the rapidly rising burden in developing countries of chronic non-infectious conditions such as heart disease and mental illness. At the same time, the debate over access to HIV/AIDS drugs has contributed to global norms that frame health tools as global public goods; therefore, political mobilization to demand access to tools with significant therapeutic benefit is likely to rise. Today we are at the cusp of a new era of NPD governance: in order to meet the coming epidemiological and political challenges, innovation in the governance of NPD will be necessary, based on two key principles: 1) that tools should be adapted and accessible to a global population of end-users (as with the PDPs), and 2) that contributions to NPD, whether of human, scientific or financial capital, should be a globally-shared burden.*

## INTRODUCTION

Around the 4<sup>th</sup> century A.D. the Chinese physician Ge Hong recorded these instructions for curing intermittent fevers in his guidebook, *Emergency Prescriptions Kept Up One’s Sleeves*: “*Qinghao*: one bunch, take two *sheng* of water for soaking it, wring it out, take the juice, ingest it in its entirety.”<sup>1</sup> Sixteen centuries later during the Vietnam war, this simple text led Chinese government-sponsored researchers to identify artemisinin as a potent drug to treat malaria, which had become resistant in Southeast Asia to existing medicines.<sup>2</sup> Today, artemisinin-based combination therapies have become the gold-standard treatment and strongest line of defense against the malaria parasite’s uncanny ability to develop resistance to new drugs. Ge Hong’s knowledge – translated, transferred, and developed – has now become a global public good.

One of the most significant changes in global health over the past decade has occurred in the framing, norms, and policy approaches to addressing the problem of globally inequitable access to drugs, diagnostics, vaccines and other health technologies.<sup>3</sup> The shift was catalyzed by worldwide political mobilization regarding the rights of developing countries to access generic versions of costly, patented antiretroviral drugs to treat HIV/AIDS.<sup>4</sup> An important result of this mobilization has been a shift in the framing of health tools: whereas essential medicines had previously been understood as private goods or, at best, national public goods, today they are increasingly understood as global public goods to which all populations, rich or poor, should have access. Following this shift, a range of new approaches and policy proposals is currently under debate regarding how to stimulate innovation for health without relying on high end-product prices that compromise access.<sup>5</sup>

The need for a reformed global health innovation system is urgent: we still lack critical tools for preventing, diagnosing and treating many established infectious diseases, while new threats such as SARS and pandemic influenza put additional demands on the research community; while non-communicable diseases are putting a rising burden on the developing world, there is no global system to ensure that health technologies for such conditions are accessible or adapted for use in resource-poor settings; finally, globalization has tightened the links connecting all populations, creating both greater vulnerabilities to disease as well as increased political demands for access to health technologies. The economic crisis that began in late 2008 – which threatens anew the health of the world's poorest while simultaneously jeopardizing aid flows from the world's wealthy – has underlined the urgency of building economically and politically sustainable solutions to these challenges.

The incipient era of US President Barack Obama offers both new challenges and opportunities for progress. Major reform of the US healthcare system is high on the new administration's agenda, and is likely to affect not only Americans but all populations touched by a global research system that relies on major push funding from the US National Institutes for Health (NIH) and pull funding from the US patent system. In particular, a medical research & development (R&D) system that continues to rely on high drug prices in the US appears politically untenable. Furthermore, US approaches to trade and health can either accelerate or retard progress towards improved international arrangements for sharing the costs and benefits of health R&D. President Obama's multilateral approach to global governance, which contrasts sharply with his immediate predecessor's unilateral bent, has engendered optimism regarding the possibility of constructing a more equitable global health innovation system. However, early mixed signals from his Administration suggest this optimism may be misplaced. For example, the 2009 US Trade Representative's Special 301 report on intellectual property protection warned developing countries such as Thailand and Brazil that their efforts to access lower-cost generic medicines to address public health crises could lead to trade retaliation.<sup>6</sup> Just a week later, Obama asked Congress for \$63 billion over six years for global health spending,<sup>7</sup> appearing to offer with one hand what the other threatened to take away. The US can ill-afford to take such inconsistent

policies towards trade and global health<sup>8</sup> – as the recent swine flu pandemic amply illustrated, the health of all nations is intimately interconnected and depends in part on the health of each nation.<sup>9</sup>

At this juncture of crisis and opportunity, it is worthwhile to look back at the historical processes that have led to the current health innovation system, as well as to consider the principles that ought to guide future efforts. This article traces the evolution over the past century of governance arrangements for new product development (NPD), using the case of anti-malaria tools such as drugs, vaccines, bednets, and insecticides, as an illustration. For the sake of brevity, I refer to these products generally as “health tools” for the remainder of this article.

There have been major shifts in conceptions about who should benefit from and who should pay for the development of new tools, with gradual movement away from a primarily narrow national approach that focused primarily on the industrialized countries, to an increasingly inclusive global approach that includes the needs of developing countries. This shift has had important implications and broadened our shared understandings about both the kinds of tools that get developed and who gets access to them.

The R&D process for new products can stretch across a long chain, especially in the case of medicines, from basic research to screening of potentially useful tools, to proof of concept, to clinical testing for safety and efficacy, to field application and dissemination. For the sake of analytical tractability, this article focuses on the latter part of this chain, which I label “new product development” or NPD, and excludes from consideration the stage of basic research.

This article offers a framework and narrative account of the conceptual evolution that has occurred concerning NPD for the needs of developing countries, using malaria as a microcosm of the broader system. It then ties this evolution to ongoing debates regarding proposed systemic changes to the way NPD is currently organized and governed. Finally, the article concludes with recommendations for the Obama Administration on the core governance principles that it should adopt in ongoing and future efforts to spur technological innovation that meets human health needs globally.

## **FRAMEWORK**

The development of health tools to combat disease has a long and storied history that reaches back thousands of years from the development of traditional medicines, and continues forward through the germ theory of disease, the emergence of a modern pharmaceutical industry, up through today’s myriad products of advanced science and technology. Within the era of modern medicines and health technologies, four separate phases are discernible, which I label: National, International, Global/Neglected Diseases, and Global Health (summarized in Table 1). The following sections discuss and illustrate each of these in turn.

### *Phase I: National: Late 19<sup>th</sup> century-1950s*

From about the late 19<sup>th</sup> century through the 1950s, NPD efforts were organized along national lines and were situated predominantly in the more-industrialized countries. On the public side, governments would invest taxpayer money through institutions such as the US NIH or military research organizations, with the understanding that in the long run the national public would benefit from the discoveries that would result. On the private side, firms would invest in developing new products, with the expectation that profits made through government-granted, time-limited patent monopolies would provide a sufficient return to re-invest in the development of new products. While patients outside of national borders would also benefit from the development of new health tools, the policy frameworks that guided such investments were primarily national rather than international.

For example, in the field of malaria, many of the tools used today to prevent or treat the disease emerged from the efforts of national military research institutions. Militaries were often the lead investors in developing new anti-malarial tools because of the crippling effect the disease had on fighting capacity.<sup>10</sup> Of the main malaria medicines developed in the twentieth century, none emerged without significant military contribution to the R&D effort. Most often, the targeted end-user was a soldier from an industrialized country. For example, the medicine that was for many years the mainstay of malaria treatment, chloroquine, emerged from US military efforts to find viable synthetic alternatives to quinine during World War II.<sup>11</sup> The US military research program also developed amodiaquine, primaquine, halofantrine, and mefloquine,<sup>12</sup> while the British military developed proguanil and pyrimethamine.<sup>13</sup> The development of artemisinin emerged from the Chinese government's efforts to develop a better drug for its soldiers and allies in Vietnam in the 1970s.<sup>14</sup>

The initial development of insecticide-treated bednets (ITN) was also pioneered by military efforts. While evidence of using netting to protect humans from insect bites dates as far back as the 6<sup>th</sup> century in the Middle East,<sup>15</sup> the innovative step of treating bednets with insecticides emerged from military efforts. During World War II, US, German and Russian troops used insect repellent-treated uniforms and bednets to protect soldiers from vector-borne illnesses.<sup>16</sup> (The further development of insecticide-treated bednets is discussed below.)

The military also played a key role in applying DDT as an anti-malarial measure. The Swiss scientist Paul Muller first developed DDT as an insecticide in 1939, and was later awarded the Nobel Prize in Medicine for his discovery. However, it was only after the British and US militaries carried out field trials in southern Italy in WWII that DDT's potency against malarial mosquitoes was realized.<sup>17</sup> As a result of this demonstrated success, DDT became a mainstay of the global malaria eradication campaigns in the 1950s. Only later would DDT be heavily used in agriculture, leading to the discovery of its long-term environmental impacts and its ban in many markets in the 1970s. Other pesticides have since replaced DDT in the US and Europe, but there is not yet a chemical that matches DDT for its low-cost, effectiveness, and long-lasting properties for malaria control. Thus, with some controversy, DDT is now slowly being re-introduced in some endemic countries for indoor residual spraying. The

DDT example illustrates how the early nationally-driven NPD system generated tools that were useful for the industrialized countries and could then be applied in developing countries.

Under the “national” framework, innovation followed a distinct trickle-down pattern: products were invented in the public and/or private sectors, national research organizations (e.g. militaries) then played a critical role in applying or discovering their utility against malaria; later, other organizations such as developing country governments, WHO, donors, or public health researchers, picked up these innovations and adapted or applied them for use in developing countries.

However, for the purposes of addressing malaria in endemic developing countries, there were important drawbacks to this nation-based NPD system. Namely, tools developed for the purposes of Northern militaries were often ill-suited for the needs of civilians in the South. Since the tools that emerged from this system were not specifically designed for use in developing countries, they were not always well-adapted or affordable.

For example, when drugs were developed for military use, the target end-user was an adult, and there was almost no need to test the drugs in children or to produce pediatric formulations; however, the majority of deaths from malaria today occur in children under 5 in sub-Saharan Africa, and lack of sufficient research into pediatric drugs is problematic. Similarly, clinical trials have tested the safety and efficacy of using chemoprophylaxis for a duration of 3 months, which would serve the needs of many military operations and the travelers’ market. However, such studies do little to help prevent malaria in populations living in endemic regions.<sup>18</sup> Furthermore, while ITNs were important preventive tools, they retained their potency for a maximum of 6 months, but then had to be re-treated – this problem created logistical nightmares for population-wide use in endemic countries.<sup>19</sup> In addition, while Northern militaries (and farmers) now have alternatives to DDT, the NPD system has failed to produce a viable replacement for the environmentally-harmful chemical for malaria control. In the area of vaccines, military research efforts have focused on identifying a vaccine that would provide 12 months of immunity to an adult with no prior exposure to malaria (no natural immunity), an extremely useful tool for military deployments but of limited utility in endemic areas where adults usually have some immunity and much longer-term protection would be required. As the US Military Infectious Diseases Research Program (MIDRP) points out, “Preventing death in children and keeping soldiers healthy and effective are distinct goals requiring different research strategies.”<sup>20</sup> Finally, though the world has benefited immensely from affordable and effective drugs like chloroquine and sulfadoxine-pyrimethamine, when resistance to these medicines was spreading quickly in the 1980s and 1990s, there was no system in place to make newer medicines available or affordable in most endemic countries. At that time, the relatively more profitable market for anti-malarials remained Northern militaries and travelers. Thus, in 1999, a drug pricing study found that the average retail price of mefloquine in Tanzania was 80 percent higher than the maximum allowable retail price for the travelers’ market in Norway, where medicines prices are about average for the European Union.<sup>21</sup> The high prices of newer malaria drugs

reflected the problem that new health tools were not being specifically developed or priced for the developing world. Some of these problems began to be addressed during the second phase of the NPD system.

*Phase II: International: 1960s-1970s*

In the 1960s and '70s, public health entered a phase of internationalization, in parallel with similar developments in other fields, as actors came to see the world as increasingly interdependent.<sup>22</sup> For example, in the US, the 1960s saw increased attention to the health problems of the developing world with the establishment of the Fogarty International Center at NIH in 1968, and the joint USAID-Department of Defense launch of a multi-million dollar malaria vaccine research initiative.<sup>23</sup> Of particular importance during this period was the establishment in 1975 of the Special Programme for Research and Training in Tropical Diseases (TDR), a joint initiative of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), UN Development Programme (UNDP), the World Bank and WHO, and alongside it the Rockefeller Foundation's Great Neglected Diseases of Mankind international research network in 1977. These initiatives marshaled donor resources to build research capacity in, and fund research on, diseases disproportionately affecting the developing countries.

TDR-supported research contributed to the development of a number of important new products, including demonstrating the effectiveness in humans of Merck's veterinary drug ivermectin for the treatment of onchocerciasis (river blindness).<sup>24</sup> WHO and TDR also played the role of cultural broker when news of a Chinese-developed anti-malarial wonder drug, artemisinin, first emerged in the West during the Cold War in 1979.<sup>25</sup>

The development of insecticide-treated bednets (ITNs) also owes a debt to the support of TDR. In the 1960s-70s, soldiers wearing insecticide-treated uniforms often failed to properly use these tools because the chemicals available at the time caused skin rashes and other side-effects; furthermore, the insect repellants usually wore off after one or two washings. In 1977, the US Departments of Defense and Agriculture began studying ways to treat textiles with permethrin, a synthetic version of the plant-based insecticide pyrethrum; permethrin offered important advances over previously used chemicals, because it was biodegradable, non-irritating, long-lasting, and had low toxicity in mammals.<sup>26</sup> By 1983, researchers had developed technologies for treating textiles so that permethrin would retain its potency after multiple washings and users could go several months without re-treating their clothes and bednets. The same year, WHO convened an expert meeting to study the potential of ITNs for malaria control. TDR-supported researchers performed the important function throughout the 1980s of developing ways to apply permethrin to mosquito-nets used in sub-Saharan Africa (separate efforts were also underway in China) and documented their efficacy in reducing child morbidity and mortality from malaria.<sup>27</sup> As a result of this work, ITNs came to be understood as an important additional tool in the fight against malaria.

Finally, some of TDR's practices established a model that the PDPs would later emulate; for example, TDR set up an international network of academic

centers to screen compounds from pharmaceutical companies for usefulness against its target tropical diseases.<sup>28</sup>

Compared to the earlier “national” period, the type of innovation that occurred during this “international” period was broader in scope, combining knowledge from both high- and lower-income countries to develop new products for developing country health needs. However, by the late 1980s the Great Neglected Diseases initiative was winding down and TDR was seriously underfunded for its broad mandate. While TDR was charged to work on seven tropical diseases, among other activities, its annual budget was only about \$30 million;<sup>29</sup> at the same time, a 1991 study found that the average cost of developing a new medicine was \$114 million (1987 dollars) out-of-pocket.<sup>30</sup> Though these new governance arrangements for NPD had yielded important advances, overall they could not sufficiently meet the vast health needs of the developing world. At the close of the 1980s, drug-resistant malaria was spreading across the globe, the AIDS epidemic had gained momentum, and there were no new tools to detect or treat tuberculosis: the NPD system had not kept up with global health needs.

### *Phase III: Global/Neglected Disease: 1990s-2000s*

The 1990s launched the third phase of NPD governance arrangements, which I label “global/neglected disease” because the new system took into account the health needs of populations around the globe, but mainly for the so-called “neglected diseases” that predominantly affected poor populations.

The question of how to channel health research for developing country needs was revived during these years, particularly due to an increased understanding of health research as global. In distinguishing between the older term, “international health” and the now widely used “global health” Brown et al. argue that the former emphasizes “a focus on the control of epidemics across the boundaries between nations” whereas the latter “implies consideration of the health needs of the people of the whole planet above the concerns of particular nations.”<sup>31</sup> This characterization fits well NPD governance arrangements in the “global/neglected disease” era, in which governments partnered widely with corporations and non-governmental organizations to develop new tools for health needs specific to the developing world. This period witnessed a growing appreciation for the importance of health research for development, coupled with increasing dissatisfaction with the existing institutions for NPD, highlighted most dramatically by the AIDS drug crisis.

A resurgence of interest in the role of research was reflected at the start of the decade in the Commission on Health Research for Development’s 1990 report *Health Research-Essential Link to Equity in Development*. This report argued that research had long been “under-recognized and neglected” as a tool for addressing growing global inequities in the health of populations, and urged greater investment in health research at national level in developing countries, to be supported internationally with increased funding, technical support, and partnerships.<sup>32</sup> Not long after, the 1993 World Bank report, *Investing in Health*, put health squarely back on the international development agenda, making the case that good health was critical to economic development.<sup>33</sup> Closely following

on its heels was the 1996 report, *Investing in Health Research and Development*, which focused more specifically on the questions of R&D and NPD.<sup>34</sup> Finally, the 1999 publication of the Global Forum for Health Research, *10/90 Report on Health Research* added an overtly normative dimension to the debates by arguing that spending only 10 percent of the world's R&D dollars on health conditions primarily affecting 90 percent of the population was an unethical imbalance that needed to be corrected. The products of R&D were no longer framed as private goods but as potential public goods that ought to produce global benefits.

The demand for change in the NPD system had come from many quarters, but was most vividly highlighted by the AIDS crisis. By the late 1990s, antiretroviral therapy was reducing morbidity and extending life in the industrialized countries, translating a lethal diagnosis into a chronic one. However, at over \$10,000 per patient/year, the therapy was beyond the reach of most people living with HIV, about 95 percent of whom were in the developing world. At the same time, developing countries were just beginning to implement the 1994 World Trade Organization's Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), a treaty that mandated a minimum level of patent protection and dismantled longstanding national exceptions in patent law for medicines and food. As a result, developing countries were granting patent monopolies on AIDS drugs that made it illegal to import generic medicines, even when they cost 98 percent less than the patented price. In response to vocal and politically savvy AIDS activists around the globe, a public outcry emerged over a system that developed new medicines but denied access to them for the majority of patients in need.<sup>35</sup>

The debate over access to AIDS drugs was highly contentious. While the major patent-owning pharmaceutical companies initially responded to public pressure by offering voluntary price discounts and donations, these were insufficient in scope to meet the vast scale of the needs. Advocates pushed for the widespread use of lower-cost generic medicines, which would require overcoming patent barriers at country level. WTO rules allowed countries to override patents for the public interest using a measure called "compulsory licensing," but due to heavy political pressure from the industrialized countries, no developing country used this flexibility until after 2001. That year, the drug industry suffered a major public-relations debacle when it sued the South African government for attempting to access lower-cost medicines; by April 2001 the industry had dropped the case "exhausted by the vitriol that has been heaped upon it."<sup>36</sup> Later that year, in the wake of the anthrax scare, US health secretary Tommy Thompson was facing the possibility of shortages and high prices for the only effective drug, ciprofloxacin. Thompson publicly threatened the patent holder, Bayer, with a compulsory license on the medicine, as did Canada. While he never issued the compulsory license, the episode changed the tenor of the debates around AIDS drugs. Two months later, at the WTO conference of trade ministers in Doha, Qatar, the US found its opposition to the use of compulsory licensing untenable. In December 2001, the WTO issued a unanimous declaration confirming the right of all member countries to use compulsory licensing and to decide the grounds upon which to use them.<sup>37</sup>



The Doha Declaration provided the political support for developing countries to access generic versions of patented medicines either through compulsory licensing or other legal means.

By 2008, generic competition had dropped the best international price for a year's worth of AIDS drugs to less than \$100, or about 1 percent of its price in 2000.<sup>38</sup> Major donors such as the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria and the US President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) both currently purchase large quantities of generic drugs to supply national treatment programs. Arguably, there is an emerging global norm that, in some circumstances, governments are allowed to put public health concerns before patent protection.

The AIDS drug debate has resulted in three outcomes that are important for ongoing discussions on NPD for developing country needs. First, it has re-framed medicines from being understood as private goods to global public goods. Second (and relatedly), it has legitimized the idea that public health concerns may trump intellectual property protection. Third, it has set the precedent of civil society mobilization for access to new health tools. I discuss the implications of these developments for future NPD governance in the next section.

While much of the public attention centered on HIV/AIDS, the broader debate on access to medicines called into question the dominant institutional arrangements for NPD, in which the size of the market fixed research priorities, and monopolies allowed health tools to be sold at unaffordable prices.

The public-private product development partnerships (PDPs) emerged in the late 1990s against a complex backdrop of scientific, medical, ideational, political and economic factors, including: increasing attention paid to health and the critical role played by research, the growing commercial potential of emerging markets in the developing world, the criticism of the negative impacts of the globalization of patents, the idea that NPD investment was not globally equitable ("10/90 gap") and that patents would not remedy this imbalance, and the tattered image of the pharmaceutical industry due to its reaction to the AIDS crisis.<sup>39</sup> The new PDPs were designed to respond to the key shortcomings of the existing NPD system.<sup>40</sup> One major problem was that in a market-driven system there would be insufficient investment into diseases primarily affecting poor populations; of 1393 new medicines developed from 1975-1999, only 16 – or about 1 percent -- were for tropical diseases and tuberculosis.<sup>41</sup>

Three key principles of the PDPs that differentiated them from older institutional models were that: 1) tools should be affordable, 2) tools should be adapted for use in resource-poor settings and 3) complementary public- and private-sector expertise should be mobilized.

Important PDPs include: the International AIDS Vaccine Initiative (IAVI, founded 1996), Medicines for Malaria Venture (MMV, 1999), Malaria Vaccine Initiative (MVI, 1999), Global Alliance for TB Drug Development (2000), Institute for OneWorld Health (IOWH, 2001), the Drugs for Neglected Diseases Initiative (DNDi, 2001), the Foundation for Innovative Diagnostics (FIND, 2003), and the long-lasting insecticide-treated (LLIN) bednets partnership between WHO and three firms (detailed below).

One example of the new thinking is represented by MVI, which describes its ideal malaria vaccine as: “easy to manufacture, easy to administer, and when administered in infancy, confer life-long immunity.” Furthermore, MVI commits to ensuring “that successful, appropriate vaccines will be sold at affordable prices in the public sector.”<sup>42</sup> These criteria differ significantly from those of the US Department of Defense, which is trying to develop a vaccine primarily intended for adults that would confer short-term immunity (1 year minimum, 2 years desired), with no explicit mention of cost constraints.<sup>43</sup> Finally, within the scope of MVI’s seven ongoing projects are 51 “partners,” of whom 35 percent are private firms and 65 percent public or publicly-oriented organizations (e.g. government research institutes, universities, foundations).<sup>44</sup> This globally-networked partnership structure contrasts with the more centralized DoD program, which is largely carried out in-house (though DoD cooperates with MVI).

The rapid evolution of institutional arrangements in recent years is well illustrated by the example of the development of artemisinin-combination therapy for malaria. Coartem (artemether and lumefantrine) is a fixed-dose combination of two malaria drugs that was developed by the pharmaceutical company Novartis in partnership with a Chinese firm. When Novartis first launched Coartem in 1998 it was targeted at the European market. The drug was neither widely available nor affordable in developing countries until 2001, when Novartis and WHO announced an agreement to market the drug at a reduced price in low-income countries. At the time, Novartis only produced adult formulation tablets, which could be used but were not ideal for the treatment of small children. In 2003 the company announced jointly with MMV that it was beginning to develop a pediatric formulation which received regulatory approval in Switzerland in early 2009.<sup>45</sup>

The trajectory of Coartem reflects governance arrangements in flux: it was a product that was initially developed in the 1990s primarily for the Northern travelers’ market. In response to changing politics, norms and demands, an access program was introduced in 2001 to sell the drugs “at cost” or around 2.60 USD per adult treatment. By 2003 a changed political context made it feasible and desirable to begin developing a pediatric formulation that would primarily serve the developing world, and to drop the adult treatment price to around 1 USD.<sup>46</sup>

Notably, the Coartem story repeated itself but within a compressed timeline when DNDi and Sanofi-Aventis released their combination malaria drug (artesunate and amodiaquine, “ASAQ”) in 2007. ASAQ, like Coartem, was co-formulated into one tablet for ease of use and to facilitate patient adherence; however, it also allowed for a simplified once-a-day dosing schedule (compared to twice-a-day for Coartem). The combination was immediately marketed at a “no profit – no loss” price of about 1 USD/day, with a pediatric formulation available at about half the price, and an explicit no-patent policy to encourage generic competition in production of the drug.<sup>47</sup> That ASAQ was launched with affordability and children-under-five in endemic countries in mind reflects an ideational evolution in the purpose and intended beneficiaries of NPD efforts.

This evolution is also evident in other technologies for malaria. For example, the logistical problem posed by ITNs whose potency only lasted 6-

months was significantly mitigated when Sumitomo Chemicals developed a long-lasting insecticide-treated bednet (LLIN) that retained its potency for up to five years. Sumitomo engineers had first developed the key technology in 1992 for other purposes, and in 1999 produced a first batch of LLINs targeted at travelers and the Southeast Asian market.<sup>48</sup> In 2002, WHO approached Sumitomo and asked the firm to increase production volumes and also to consider transferring technology to an African firm to spur local production.<sup>49</sup> By 2006, A to Z Textile Mills in Tanzania, along with two production plants in China and one in Vietnam were producing LLINs through a non-exclusive, royalty-free license.<sup>50</sup> Significantly, affordability was an important criteria for the partnership; one objective of the technology transfer was to achieve production efficiencies at A to Z, which reduced the price of an LLIN from about 10 to 5 USD. While this price is higher than for a regular ITN, its per-year cost is about half that of ITNs.<sup>51</sup>

Both the development of new, affordable, fixed-dose combination malaria drugs and the LLINs reflect important ideational changes that put an unprecedented level of attention on NPD for the developing world.

By targeting the needs of the world's poorest, the PDPs represented an important change in the orientation of NPD efforts. However, the funding model has not changed dramatically since the 1970s when donor governments and philanthropists footed the bill for TDR. The scale of funding has undeniably grown, particularly due to the growing involvement of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, which has invested 11.7 billion USD in global health programs (many of them research oriented) from 1994-2008.<sup>52</sup> One analysis of funding sources for four major PDPs (MMV, DNDi, IOWH, and TB Alliance) found that over the lifetime of these PDPs (through 2005), philanthropic sources comprised 78 percent (212 million USD) of funds, of which the Gates Foundation accounted for 75 percent (159 million USD); Northern donor governments had contributed about 16 percent (44 million USD) of the total.<sup>53</sup> The rapid infusion of funds has kick-started multiple new research efforts in a short span of time, and quickly established these new institutional forms as important players in the NPD system. Nevertheless, the funding model underlying the PDPs is as donor-dependent as the initiatives in the previous 'international' phase. New ideas for financing NPD in ways that do not rely solely on donors are a characteristic of the next phase.

#### *Phase IV: Global Health: Present-?*

Today, we find ourselves at the beginning of a fourth phase whose contours remain undefined. There have been dramatic shifts in the organization of NPD for some infectious diseases over the past decade, leading to a broad array of new research efforts and an unprecedented level of political attention and funding; these developments bode well for the prospects for new, effective, adapted and affordable tools becoming available to promote global health. However, an important limitation is that these innovations have been limited to the so-called neglected diseases: malaria, TB, and a range of tropical diseases such as schistosomiasis, Chagas disease, leishmaniasis and dengue fever. The "neglected diseases" framework has a critical shortcoming, which is that it

focuses only on diseases that by definition *only* affect the poor. One side-effect is that attention may be shifted away from the question of how accessible and appropriate are medical interventions for diseases that affect both rich and poor countries, such as chronic non-communicable diseases (NCD) (henceforth “Type 1” diseases, following the WHO terminology).<sup>54</sup>

Effective institutions for NPD for the non-communicable diseases are critical for several reasons. First, the number of deaths and burden of disease from chronic non-communicable disease is projected to increase, while those due to infectious diseases (with the important exception of HIV/AIDS) will fall by 2030.<sup>55</sup> In low- and middle-income countries the burden of disease from NCDs has already increased from 35 percent in 1990 to 45 percent in 2003, and is projected to exceed 50 percent by 2030.<sup>56</sup> It is an urgent and critical question whether the current NPD system, including the recent institutional innovations, will be able to meet these coming challenges.

The emergence of PDPs in the past decade has led to a bifurcated NPD system (see Table 1). On the one hand, the private sector develops new products for diseases that affect the industrialized world, funded by a combination of public support for basic research and monopoly profits from sales. On the other hand, PDPs address the neglected diseases for which market mechanisms had failed to generate sufficient investment, and are financed by philanthropists and donor governments. However, reliance on this old funding model has raised questions regarding its sustainability. In addition, concerns have been raised about the governance of PDPs – how priorities are set, decisions made, and funding allocated.<sup>57</sup>

Furthermore, the PDPs, as they are currently organized, are likely to be ill-suited to the Type 1 diseases. The PDPs rely on cooperation and contributions from major pharmaceutical companies, who are willing to do so, in part, because the end products are not highly profitable; in other words, because there is virtually no market for a leishmaniasis drug, companies can share information and compounds with little fear of loss of competitive advantage. Furthermore, the PDPs can attract public and charitable funds precisely because they will not attract sufficient private sector money to function. These conditions do not hold for Type 1 diseases, and PDPs are likely not the appropriate response.<sup>58</sup> This is not to imply that cooperation between the public, private, and non-profit sectors will fall by the wayside. However, the model of cooperation currently embodied in the PDPs will not be viable when sizable profits are at stake.

If not the PDPs, then what about the patent system? If we take a global perspective of the needs, the current NPD system for Type 1 diseases generates innovative tools that are reasonably well-suited for the industrialized countries. (For the sake of brevity, I leave aside here concerns about the declining rate of innovation in the pharmaceutical industry.) But for many parts of the developing world, these innovations may not be affordable or well-adapted for use in resource-poor settings.<sup>59</sup> In some ways, the current situation for Type 1 diseases parallels the earlier nation-based NPD system, in that innovative products are developed in the industrialized world and will possibly later ‘trickle-down’ to the developing world, but the new tools that emerge will not necessarily be well-adapted or affordable. This was indeed the situation with antiretroviral drugs for

AIDS before global political mobilization changed the way in which access to these medicines was governed.

However, the key difference in the “global health” phase that we are now entering is that there is a global demand for access to new health tools for *all* diseases – not only for those labeled “neglected” – and growing understanding among all key actors that we need new global governance arrangements to manage public goods such as NPD.<sup>60</sup> Political pressure on the current NPD system is likely to grow. Will another wave of innovation in governance arrangements respond to the current shortcomings of the NPD system? The following sections discuss the most recent debates over the NPD system, and argue that there is nascent but increasing understanding that both the benefits and financing of NPD should be globally shared.

## **NEW APPROACHES**

### *Who Should Benefit from NPD?*

The AIDS epidemic and the struggle for access to antiretroviral (ARV) therapy is largely responsible for having catapulted the broader debate about access to medicines onto the global public agenda. After the AIDS drug debate, for the first time, widespread acceptance emerged of the idea that people in developing countries might have a right to access the fruits of research, even if it was largely carried out and funded by taxpayers and citizens of the North. In 2005, the Group of 8 industrialized countries even declared universal access to AIDS treatment by 2010 to be a shared goal. In part, the devastating scale of the epidemic may have been particularly convincing. However, it was also due to the salience of the idea that medicines (or possibly health tools more broadly) were a distinct category of goods. Not only could medicines restore health, but as knowledge-intensive products they also had the potential to be global public goods – meaning, consumption by one person would not necessarily reduce consumption by another.<sup>61</sup> In a globalizing world, political mobilization for access to essential health tools is likely to grow.

A recent example of such mobilization concerns the cancer drug Glivec (imatinib mesylate), patented by the Swiss drug firm Novartis. Glivec is one of the most effective new cancer drugs to emerge in many years, and is used for the treatment of chronic myeloid leukemia and gastrointestinal stromal tumors. However, Glivec’s high price, combined with its significant therapeutic advantages, have made it the target of cancer patient advocacy in many countries. In 2002, a patients’ association in South Korea pressured both the firm and the government to reduce the price of the drug, which cost up to 50,000 USD per year; they also filed a request for a compulsory license (government override of a patent), though this petition was denied.<sup>62</sup> More recently, in 2007 the patent on Glivec in India was overturned by a legal challenge from a patients’ organization and a generic company producing the drug at lower cost.<sup>63</sup> Finally, in January 2008, the government of Thailand issued a compulsory license for Glivec, but reversed its decision after Novartis offered to donate the drug free of charge to the national health system.<sup>64</sup> These developments occurred despite the global

donation program Novartis had launched for the drug, which was accused of moving too slowly and mixing humanitarian gestures with commercial motives.<sup>65</sup> The Glivec story reflects a broader problem in the NPD system: when new health tools are developed for diseases with global incidence, there are no clear governance arrangements to ensure that they are affordable or available to people who need them. However, AIDS has established the idea that access should be broadly-shared, thus, the kinds of political conflict that took place over Glivec are likely to recur with other effective new health tools.

The epidemiological transition in developing countries and consequent growing burden of non-infectious disease implies a greater similarity in health needs across the globe. Economic growth in China, India, Brazil, South Africa and other developing countries also implies both stronger domestic scientific research capacity and the funds to support it. While treating health products as global public goods can provide widespread benefits, it will also be necessary to address the classic economic problem with public goods: underinvestment and free-riding. Thus, new governance arrangements will need to address the problem of how to share the burden of research funding.

### *Who Should Pay for NPD?*

A full understanding of current discussions on NPD financing requires first a brief look at the evolution of the debate on patents as the primary financing mechanism for NPD.

Beginning in the 1980s, the research-based pharmaceutical industry began systematically lobbying the US government to push for an expansion in the number of countries granting patent protection on medicines, and a ratcheting-up of protection levels in countries where it already existed.<sup>66</sup> Such a system would, presumably, increase profits to the patent-holders, but the industry also portrayed it as a way of spreading the cost of financing research across the globe. These efforts were sustained throughout the Uruguay Round of world trade negotiations and came to fruition in 1994 when TRIPS was signed. TRIPS set in motion the globalization of a uniform set of intellectual property (IP) standards that would, in theory, allow a more broad-based system of extracting rents for future NPD investment.

However, globalizing patents on health tools was extremely controversial. Historically, many countries had adopted national IP policies to meet domestic needs, with less industrialized countries usually offering lower levels of IP protection.<sup>67</sup> Many countries, even relatively wealthy ones, also excluded food and medicine from patentability because of the negative effects of monopoly pricing of these products on social welfare; for example, Spain, Norway and Greece did not grant product patents on medicines until 1992.<sup>68</sup> However, TRIPS required all WTO Members to provide a uniform level of IP protection (e.g. 20-year patent terms) and disallowed the exclusion of food or medicines from patentability.

Many scholars and civil society groups were highly critical of TRIPS, characterizing it as a wholesale rent transfer from poor to rich countries that would retard rather than induce industrialization and economic development. Of

particular concern was the expected increase in the price of new medicines in developing countries;<sup>69</sup> patents could also increase the prices of other critical innovative health products, including insecticides, vaccines and diagnostics.

Thus, throughout the 1980s and '90s there was a push to globalize the financing of health NPD through a uniform system of patent protection. However, strong social reaction coupled with growing concern about the AIDS epidemic undermined support in many parts of the world for this NPD financing model.

Understanding that the PDPs are only likely to work for some diseases, today, many actors are seeking new governance arrangements for funding NPD on a sustainable and globally equitable basis that would provide alternatives to the patent system. These concerns have led to increasing discussions regarding the role of the public sector of both donor and developing countries in funding NPD.

### *Increasing Global Burden-Sharing*

The idea of global burden-sharing for NPD is critical for maintaining long-run political support for the idea of global access, particularly in light of the growing economic power of some large developing countries and the ongoing global economic recession. There have been several important indications that the idea of global burden-sharing has gained momentum.

For example, in 2005, hundreds of prominent scientists, scholars, and health activists signed a letter asking the WHO Commission on Intellectual Property, Innovation and Public Health to consider proposals for a medical R&D treaty.<sup>70</sup> The treaty proposal suggested that countries commit to contributing to global R&D efforts, commensurate with their levels of GDP, through a range of policy mechanisms including: direct funding for R&D, tax credits, prize funds, or purchases of medicines.

Another innovative financing model has been operationalized by the UNITAID partnership, which was co-founded by five countries in 2006 and has implemented an airline tax to finance the purchase of health products in low-income countries. The driving rationale was that predictable, long-term funding would be necessary to sustain global health efforts. As of November 2008, the progressive tax was implemented in 7 countries, and in process in 15 others.<sup>71</sup> Notably, only one-fourth of the 29 committed donor countries are OECD members while roughly half are UN-designated Least-Developed Countries, reflecting the idea that all countries – even the poorest – can help to shoulder the burden of NPD financing. Furthermore, participating countries have significant flexibility to adapt the tax to their specific contexts. While UNITAID began as an international drug purchasing facility, it has since expanded its activities and has begun working on establishing a patent pool to facilitate the development of new products such as fixed-dose combinations.<sup>72</sup> Annual funding for 2007 was \$320 million and is projected to reach \$500 million by 2009. The institutional design of UNITAID reflects the growing importance of several ideas: the need to share globally the burden of financing health tools, the importance of adjusting that burden to local contexts, and the utility of long-term dependable financing.

Another important arena in which there has been increasing discussion of global burden-sharing is among Member States involved in the WHO Intergovernmental Working Group on Public Health, Innovation, and Intellectual Property (IGWG). The IGWG process can be understood as an attempt to build a sustainable system for funding the development of global public goods for health with the support of all WHO Member States. As such, it can also be interpreted as an attempt to build a more stable financing model and a more broad-based governance system for NPD. The IGWG process was launched by a World Health Assembly (WHA) resolution in 2006, sponsored by Kenya and Brazil, and charged with identifying a “global strategy and plan of action” aimed at “securing an enhanced and sustainable basis for needs-driven, essential health research and development relevant to diseases that disproportionately affect developing countries [and] proposing clear objectives and priorities for research and development.”<sup>73</sup> The creation of IGWG traces its roots to two earlier initiatives: the publication in 2002 of the UK Government Commission on Intellectual Property Rights, which was followed in 2006 by the report of the WHO Commission on Intellectual Property, Innovation and Public Health. Both of these reports, drafted by a diverse and respected group of expert commissioners, concluded that a patent-based system would be insufficient to finance and set global health priorities for NPD.<sup>74</sup> In the past several years a broad range of new ideas have been put on the table, including<sup>75</sup>: a global R&D treaty (discussed above), a global R&D fund (India), international agreements for access to compound libraries, global free access to publications based on publicly-funded research, special licensing arrangements for publicly-funded research, patent pools, advanced market commitments,<sup>76</sup> funding for clinical trials as global public goods, and a series of prize funds for specific new products.<sup>77</sup> Many of these measures would involve contributions from developing countries.

After intense eleventh-hour negotiations, particularly over the thorny IP issues, IGWG concluded at the 2008 World Health Assembly (WHA)<sup>78</sup>; in 2009, the WHA approved the Global Strategy and agreed parts of the Plan of Action that had emerged from the IGWG process.<sup>79</sup> One important idea that all Member States agreed upon was that it would be necessary to finance and stimulate NPD for *all* diseases that affect the developing countries— not only the neglected diseases. Furthermore, eight PDPs issued a position statement at the 2008 meeting, emphasizing the need for new incentive mechanisms and new funding for NPD.<sup>80</sup> In other words, many of the PDPs did not see themselves as the sole sufficient response to global health NPD needs. The IGWG agreements reached so far indicate the beginnings of a normative shift toward a new “global health” phase of NPD, based on the principles of global access and global burden-sharing for the production of global public goods.

## **SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS**

This article has outlined the progression of the NPD system through four main phases: it began at the start of the twentieth century with the ‘national’ system in which financing, intended beneficiaries and policy frameworks were confined to the national level mostly in the industrialized countries; it then progressed in the



1960s-70s to an “international” system in which donors put increasing emphasis on NPD for the health needs of the developing world; by the 1990s we had shifted to a “global/neglected disease” phase, in which both state and non-state actors were called upon to contribute to NPD for the “neglected diseases”; and finally, we are perhaps at the beginning of a fourth phase of “global health,” in which the scope of diseases is expanded to include all diseases of global incidence, with the understanding that all populations should benefit from and contribute to NPD efforts.

As the history of the evolution of NPD systems demonstrates, there is momentum and political demand for a system that will be ever more inclusive. The outlines of this most recent phase remain blurred, and it will likely take many years and some policy experimentation to achieve concrete outcomes. Nevertheless, there are two core governance principles that ought to shape future initiatives and that the Obama Administration should consider adopting: first, knowledge and innovation for all diseases should be treated as a global public good; and second, NPD should not be based on a charity- or donor-based model, but rather should be supported through a politically sustainable governance arrangement through which the burden of providing funding and scientific expertise is globally-shared.

As a major contributor to global health financing, the world’s largest pharmaceutical market, home to innovative researchers and institutions, as well as the highest drug prices in the world, the US has much to contribute and much to gain from a more health-sensitive, equitable global health innovation system. The ability to extract and develop the world’s best health knowledge would benefit not only the world’s poorest, but the world’s most powerful country as well: in 2003, when 290 US Marines briefly went ashore to support international peacekeepers in Liberia, over one in four returned with malaria.<sup>81</sup> Though artemisinin-based combination therapy was not then available in the US, this example demonstrates the potential advantages of developing new health tools as global public goods.

***Suerie Moon*** is a PhD Candidate in public policy at the Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, and a Giorgio Ruffolo Doctoral Research Fellow in the Sustainability Science Program at Harvard’s Center for International Development.

*The author wishes to thank William C. Clark, Catherine M. Michaud, and Nicole A. Szlezak for insightful comments, and Folasade Odeniyi for very helpful research assistance. She is also very grateful for support provided for this work from: the Harvard Kennedy School Dean’s Acting in Time Initiative, the Sustainability Science Program at the Center for International Development at Harvard, the Norberg-Bohm Fellowship, and the Hauser Center Research Fund.*

**Table 1. Evolution of Governance Arrangements for New Product Development**

<b>Time</b>	<b>System</b>		<b>Targeted End-Users</b>	<b>Funding</b>	<b>Innovators/Product Developers</b>	<b>Disease Type</b>
Late 19 <sup>th</sup> -mid-20 <sup>th</sup> century	National (e.g. US military)		National, High-income countries	Public, Private via national patent systems	Public research organizations, academia, private sector	Diseases affecting industrializing countries
1960s-80s	Inter-national	Multinational pharmaceutical industry	Higher-income countries	Public, Private via national patent systems	Public research organizations, academia, private sector	Diseases affecting high-income countries
		TDR, Fogarty Center, Rockefeller Foundation	Developing countries	Public, Philanthropic	Public research organizations, academia	Diseases primarily affecting low/middle-income countries
1990s-present	Global/Neglected Disease	Multinational pharmaceutical industry:	High- and middle-income countries	Public, Private via globalized patent systems	Public research organizations, academia, private sector	Diseases affecting high- and middle-income populations
		PDPs for neglected diseases	Developing countries (Global)	Philanthropic, public, in-kind private	Public research organizations, academia, private sector	Diseases primarily affecting low/middle-income populations
Future ?	Global Health		Global	Public, philanthropic,	Public research	All

			private	organizations, academia, private sector	
--	--	--	---------	---	--

<sup>1</sup> Ge c.340 AD, as cited in Elisabeth Hsu, "Reflections on the 'discovery' of the antimalarial Qinghao," *British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology* 61, no. 6 (2006): 666-670.

<sup>2</sup> Hsu, "Reflections on the 'discovery' of the antimalarial qinghao."

<sup>3</sup> Though technology is far from the only element necessary to improve public health, it can sometimes play a pivotal role between sickness and well-being.

<sup>4</sup> For a concise account, see Ellen F.M. 't Hoen, *The Global Politics of Pharmaceutical Monopoly Power: Drug patents, access, innovation and the application of the WTO Doha Declaration on TRIPS and Public Health* (Amsterdam: AMB Publishers, 2009). Available online at [http://www.msface.org/fileadmin/user\\_upload/medinnov\\_accesspatents/01-05\\_BOOK\\_tHoen\\_PoliticsofPharmaPower\\_defnet.pdf](http://www.msface.org/fileadmin/user_upload/medinnov_accesspatents/01-05_BOOK_tHoen_PoliticsofPharmaPower_defnet.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> James Love has been a leading proponent of re-framing the "access" debate as an "innovation and access" debate. See, for example: Tim Hubbard and James Love, "A New Trade Framework for Global Healthcare R&D," *PLoS Biol* 2, no. 2 (2004): e52. Available online at [doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.0020052](http://doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.0020052).

<sup>6</sup> United States Trade Representative. "2009 Special 301 Report." 30 April 2009. Available at <<http://www.ustr.gov/about-us/press-office/reports-and-publications/2009/2009-special-301-report>>

<sup>7</sup> Sheryl Gay Stolberg. "Obama seeks a global health plan broader than Bush's AIDS effort." *The New York Times*. 5 May 2009. Available at <[http://www.nytimes.com/2009/05/06/health/policy/06medical.html?\\_r=1&scp=1&sq=global%20health%20%2463%20billion&st=cse](http://www.nytimes.com/2009/05/06/health/policy/06medical.html?_r=1&scp=1&sq=global%20health%20%2463%20billion&st=cse)>

<sup>8</sup> For a thorough discussion of the challenges of achieving coherence between trade and health policy, see the six-part series in *The Lancet*, January-February 2009. See especially David P. Fidler, Nick Drager and Kelley Lee., "Managing the pursuit of health and wealth: the key challenges," *The Lancet* 373, no. 9660 (2009): 325-331.; Kelley Lee, Devi Sridhar, and Mayur Patel, "Bridging the divide: Global governance of trade and health," *The Lancet* 373, no. 9660 (2009): 416-22.

<sup>9</sup> Suerie Moon and Gonzalo Fanjul. "Algo más que una gripe," *El Mundo*, 26 May 2009. Available at <<http://www.elmundo.es/opinion/tribuna-libre/2009/05/15195783.html>>

<sup>10</sup> Among 160,000 French and British troops fighting in Greece in 1918, there were 80,000 hospital admissions due to falciparum malaria. See Mark Honigsbaum, *The Fever Trail: In Search of the Cure for Malaria* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2001), 224. More recently, it was the leading cause of medical disability for US troops in the Vietnam war. See Christian F. Ockenhouse, Alan Magill, Dale Smith, Wil Milhous, "History of U.S. Military Contributions to the Study of Malaria," *Military Medicine* 170, no. 4:12 (April Supplement, 2005): 12-16.

<sup>11</sup> Though the compound itself was first synthesized in Germany in 1934, it was the US military research effort that discovered its ideal safety and efficacy profile. See: J.H. Burckhalter, "Modern Antimalarial Drugs," *Transactions of the Kansas Academy of Science* 53, no. 4 (1950): 433 – 440.

<sup>12</sup> Ockenhouse et al., "History of U.S. Military Contributions to the Study of Malaria."

<sup>13</sup> Paul F. Russell, "Introduction" in United States Army, Medical Department, *Preventive Medicine in World War II, Volume VI Communicable Diseases: Malaria* (Washington D.C.: Office of the Surgeon General, Department of the Army, 1963), 8.

<sup>14</sup> Honigsbaum, "The Fever Trail," 241-243.

<sup>15</sup> C.F. Curtis et al., "Impregnated bed nets and curtains against malaria mosquitoes," *In* C.F. Curtis, ed., *Control of Disease Vectors in the Community* (London: Wolfe Publishing, 1991): *GLOBAL HEALTH GOVERNANCE*, VOLUME II, NO. 2 (FALL 2008/SPRING 2009) <http://www.ghgj.org>

- 5-46.; V. Robert et al., "Pyrethroid-impregnated bed nets in the malaria control strategy at community level," *Acta Tropica* 46, no. 4 (1989): 267-268.
- <sup>16</sup> F. Binka & P. Akweongo, "Prevention of malaria using ITNs: Potential for achieving the millennium development goals," *Current Molecular Medicine* 6, no. 2 (2006): 261-267.
- <sup>17</sup> Ockenhouse et al., "History of U.S. Military Contributions to the Study of Malaria."
- <sup>18</sup> However, the widespread long-term use of chemoprophylaxis in endemic settings is not likely. See C. Hughes, R. Tucker, B. Bannister, D.J. Bradley, "Malaria Prophylaxis for Long-term Travelers," *Commun Dis Public Health* 6, no. 3 (2003): 200-8.
- <sup>19</sup> Christian Lengeler, Jacqueline Cattani, and Don de Savigny, *Net Gain: A New Method for Preventing Malaria Deaths*, IDRC. Co published by the World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland, 1996.
- <sup>20</sup> Military Infectious Diseases Research Program, "Licensed Products Information Papers." 22 June 2005. Bethesda, MD: Military Infectious Diseases Research Program.
- <sup>21</sup> Kirsten Myhr, "Comparing Prices of Essential Drugs between Four East African Countries and with International Prices." Amsterdam: Health Action International, 2000.
- <sup>22</sup> Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye Jr., "Power and interdependence." *Survival* 15, no. 4 (1973): 158-165.
- <sup>23</sup> Robert Desowitz, *The Malaria Capers* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1991); Government Accounting Office, "Foreign Aid: AID's Malaria Vaccine Research Activities," NSIAD-90-9 October 17, 1989. Available at <<http://www.gao.gov/docdblite/summary.php?rptno=NSIAD-90-9&accno=139769>>
- <sup>24</sup> World Health Organization, Special Programme for Research and Training in Tropical Diseases (WHO/TDR), *Making a Difference: 30 Years of Research and Capacity Building in Tropical Disease* (Geneva: WHO, 2007). Available at: <[http://www.who.int/tdr/about/history\\_book/pdf/anniversary\\_book.pdf](http://www.who.int/tdr/about/history_book/pdf/anniversary_book.pdf)>
- <sup>25</sup> British Broadcasting Company, Programme Transcript: Science & Nature Horizon: "Defeating the Curse," 2006. Accessed 10 May 2008 at <[http://www.bbc.co.uk/sn/tvradio/programmes/horizon/malaria\\_trans.shtml](http://www.bbc.co.uk/sn/tvradio/programmes/horizon/malaria_trans.shtml)>
- <sup>26</sup> M.I. Hossain and C.F. Curtis, "Permethrin-impregnated bednets: Behavioural and killing affects against mosquitoes," *Medical and Veterinary Entomology* 3, no. 4 (1989): 367-376; R.K. Gupta et al., "Personal Protection Measures Against Arthropods," *Military Preventive Medicine: Mobilization and Deployment*, Office of The Surgeon General Department of the Army, United States of America, 2003, 511.
- <sup>27</sup> P. Alonso and SW Lindsay, "The effect of insecticide-treated bed nets on mortality of Gambian children," *The Lancet* 337, no. 8756 (1991): 1499; C Lengeler and R.W. Snow, "From Efficacy to Effectiveness: Insecticide-treated bednets in Africa," *Bulletin of the World Health Organization* 74, no. 3 (1996): 325-332; F. Binka & P. Akweongo, "Prevention of malaria using ITNs."
- <sup>28</sup> WHO/TDR, "Making a Difference."
- <sup>29</sup> World Health Organization "Tropical Diseases: Progress in Research 1989-1990. Tenth Programme Report of the UNDP/World Bank/WHO Special Programme for Research and Training in Tropical Diseases (TDR) (Geneva: WHO, 1991). Available at [http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/1991/9241561432\\_eng.pdf](http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/1991/9241561432_eng.pdf).
- <sup>30</sup> Joseph DiMasi, Ronald Hansen, Henry Grabowski, Louis Lasagna, "Cost of innovation in the pharmaceutical industry." *Journal of Health Economics* 10, no. 20 (1991): 107-142.
- <sup>31</sup> Theodore M. Brown, Marcos Cueto, and Elizabeth Fee, "The World Health Organization and the Transition from International to Global Public Health." *American Journal of Public Health* 96, no. 1 (2006): 62-72.
- <sup>32</sup> Commission on Health Research for Development, *Health Research: Essential Link to Equity in Development* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990): xvii-xix.
- <sup>33</sup> World Bank, *World Development Report 1993: Investing in Health* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).
- <sup>34</sup> WHO Ad Hoc Committee on Health Research Relating to Future Intervention Options, *Investing in Health Research and Development* (Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization, 1996).

- <sup>35</sup> 't Hoen, *The Global Politics of Pharmaceutical Monopoly Power*.
- <sup>36</sup> David Pilling and Nicola degli Innocenti, "A crack in the resolve of an industry." *The Financial Times*. 18 April 2001.
- <sup>37</sup> World Trade Organization. "Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health. WT/MIN(01)/DEC/2.;" 't Hoen, "The Global Politics of Pharmaceutical Monopoly Power."
- <sup>38</sup> Médecins Sans Frontières, "Untangling the Web of Price Reductions: a pricing guide for the purchase of ARVs for developing countries." Geneva: MSF, 2008.
- <sup>39</sup> For an analysis of why major drug firms participate in PDPs, see: Mary Moran et al., *The New Landscape of Neglected Disease Drug Development* (London: The Wellcome Trust and The London School of Economics and Political Science, 2005). Also see Oxfam America, *Ending the R&D Crisis in Public Health: Promoting pro-poor innovation* (Boston: Oxfam America, 2008). Available at [http://www.oxfamamerica.org/newsandpublications/publications/briefing\\_papers/ending-the-r-d-crisis-in-public-health](http://www.oxfamamerica.org/newsandpublications/publications/briefing_papers/ending-the-r-d-crisis-in-public-health).
- <sup>40</sup> R Widdus & K White, *Public-private partnerships for health: Their main targets, their diversity and their future direction* (Geneva: IPPPH Publications, 2003).; Kent Buse and Andrew Harmer. "Seven habits of highly effective global public-private health partnerships: Practice and Potential," *Social Science and Medicine* 64 (2007): 259-271; Moran et al. "The New Landscape of Neglected Disease Drug Development."
- <sup>41</sup> Patrice Trouiller, Piero Olliaro, Els Torrelee, James Orbinski, Richard Laing, and Nathan Ford, "Drug development for neglected diseases: A deficient market and a public-health policy failure." *The Lancet* 359, no. 9324 (2002): 2188-2194.
- <sup>42</sup> Malaria Vaccine Initiative, "MVI Vaccine Development Portfolio," 2008. Accessed 10 May 2008 at [http://www.malariavaccine.org/ab-current\\_projects.htm](http://www.malariavaccine.org/ab-current_projects.htm)
- <sup>43</sup> Patricia M Graves, and Patricia M. Levine, eds., *Battling Malaria: Strengthening the U.S. Military Malaria Vaccine Program*. Committee on U.S. Military Malaria Vaccine Research: A Program Review. Medical Follow-Up Agency (MFUA). Institute of Medicine of the National Academies (Washington D.C.: The National Academies Press, 2006).
- <sup>44</sup> Malaria Vaccine Initiative. "MVI Vaccine Development Portfolio."
- <sup>45</sup> International Federation of Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Associations (IFPMA), Medicines for Malaria Venture and Novartis agree to develop a pediatric formulation of Coartem. 11 October 2003. Accessed online at <http://www.ifpma.org/News/NewsReleaseDetail.aspx?nID=91>; Medicines for Malaria Venture, "Coartem® Dispersible, the first dispersible ACT[\*] for children, launched this week in Africa by Novartis and Medicines for Malaria Venture," 2009. Available online at: [http://www.mmv.org/article.php?id\\_article=580](http://www.mmv.org/article.php?id_article=580)
- <sup>46</sup> For further information on the evolution of prices for artemisinin-combination therapies for malaria, see: Suerie Moon, Carmen Pérez-Casas, Jean-Marie Kindermans, Martin de Smet and Tido von Schoen-Angerer. "Focusing on quality patient care in the new global subsidy for malaria medicines." *PLoS Medicine*, forthcoming.
- <sup>47</sup> Drugs for Neglected Diseases Initiative (DNDi), "New, Once-a-Day Fixed-Dose Combination Against Malaria Now Available." 1 March 2007. [http://www.dndi.org/pdf\\_files/press\\_release\\_march\\_1-eng.pdf](http://www.dndi.org/pdf_files/press_release_march_1-eng.pdf)
- <sup>48</sup> Takaaki Ito and Takeshi Okuno, "Development of 'Olyset® Net' as a Tool for Malaria Control," *Sumitomo Kagaku* (translation). Vol. 2006-II.
- <sup>49</sup> World Health Organization, The United Nations Children's Fund, and the Rockefeller Foundation, *Business Plan for Stimulating the Development, Manufacturing, and Widespread Distribution of Long-Lasting Insecticidal Nets*, World Health Organization, 2004, 1-104.
- <sup>50</sup> Ito and Okuno. "Development of Olyset Net as a Tool for Malaria Control."
- <sup>51</sup> Joshua Yukich, Fabrizio Tediosi, and Christian Lengeler, *Operations, costs and cost-effectiveness of five insecticide-treated net programs (Eritrea, Malawi, Tanzania, Togo, Senegal) and two indoor residual spraying programs (Kwa-Zulu-Natal, Mozambique)*, Swiss Tropical Institute, Basel, Switzerland. July 12, 2007. Available online at [http://www.malariafreefuture.org/news/2007/20070713\\_OperationsCostcosteffectiveness.pdf](http://www.malariafreefuture.org/news/2007/20070713_OperationsCostcosteffectiveness.pdf); Kim A. Lindblade, et al., "Evaluation of long-lasting insecticidal nets after 2 years of household



Use,” *Tropical Medicine & International Health* 10, no. 11 (2005): 1141-1150.

<sup>52</sup> Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, “Grants Overview: Funding from 1994 to Present,” 2009. Available: <http://www.gatesfoundation.org/grants/Pages/overview.aspx>

<sup>53</sup> Moran et al. “The New Landscape of Neglected Disease Drug Development.”

<sup>54</sup> The WHO Commission on Macroeconomics and Health divided diseases into three categories based on the populations affected. Type I refers to diseases that affect both rich and poor countries, with large populations affected in each (e.g. cardiovascular disease, diabetes). Type II are diseases prevalent in both rich and poor countries, but with a large proportion of cases in poor countries (e.g. HIV/AIDS). Type III diseases are those that almost exclusively affect the poor countries (e.g. most of the ‘neglected diseases’)

<sup>55</sup> Colin D Mathers and Dejan Loncar, “Projections of Global Mortality and Burden of Disease from 2002 to 2030,” *PLoS Medicine* 3, no. 11 (2006): e442 doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.0030442

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>57</sup> K. Buse & G. Walt, “Global public-private partnerships: Part 1 – A new development in health?” *Bulletin of the World Health Organisation* 78, no. 4 (2000): 549-561.; Kent Buse, “Governing public-private infectious disease partnerships.” *Brown Journal of World Affairs*, 10, no. 2 (Spring 2004): 225-242.; Anne-Emanuelle Birn, “Gates’ grandest challenge: transcending technology as public health ideology.” *The Lancet* 366, no. 9484 (2005): 514-519; Donald G. McNeil, “Gates Foundation’s Influence Criticized,” *The New York Times* 16 February 2008.

<sup>58</sup> One exception may be IAVI, since an AIDS vaccine would be of tremendous value in both the developing and industrialized countries. However, there are other key differences between an AIDS vaccine and tools for NCD, including the high uncertainty around a vaccine, the unprecedented amount of global attention paid to AIDS, and the discrepancy between the financial attractiveness of a drug versus a vaccine. It is notable that there is no PDP for antiretroviral drugs for AIDS.

<sup>59</sup> Notably, even in the United States and even for the insured population, the rising cost of new medicines is becoming a heavy financial burden. See Gina Kolata, “Co-Payments Soar for Drugs with High Prices.” *The New York Times*, 14 April 2008; “When Drug Costs Soar Beyond Reach.” *The New York Times*, 15 April 2008.

<sup>60</sup> John G. Ruggie, “Reconstituting the Global Public Domain,” *European Journal of International Relations* 10, no. 4 (2004): 499-531.

<sup>61</sup> Inge Kaul et al., *Providing Global Public Goods: Managing Globalization* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003).

<sup>62</sup> Hee Seob Nam and Sung Ho Park, “Request for a Compulsory License.” Submitted to the Korean Intellectual Property Office, 30 January 2002. Accessed online at <[http://glivec.jinbo.net/Request\\_for\\_CL\\_Final\\_version.htm](http://glivec.jinbo.net/Request_for_CL_Final_version.htm)>

<sup>63</sup> C.R. Sukumar, “Novartis loses patent claim on cancer drug – Patents Controller upholds Natco Contention,” *The Hindu Business Line* (India), 25 January 2007. Accessed online at <http://www.thehindubusinessline.com/2006/01/26/stories/2006012601150500.htm>.

<sup>64</sup> William New, “New Thai Minister May Review Compulsory Licenses on Cancer Drugs.” *Intellectual Property Watch*, 8 February 2008. Accessed online at <<http://www.ipwatch.org/weblog/index.php?p=914>>

<sup>65</sup> Stephanie Strom and Matt Fleischer-Blac, “Company’s Vow to Donate Cancer Drug Falls Short.” *The New York Times*, 5 June 2003.

<sup>66</sup> Peter Drahos and John Braithwaite, *Information Feudalism: Who Owns the Knowledge Economy?* (London: Earthscan, 2002).

<sup>67</sup> World Intellectual Property Organization, “Existence, scope and form of generally internationally accepted and applied Standards/Norms for the Protection of Intellectual Property,” Note prepared by the International Bureau of WIPO – Revision, 15 September 1988, MTN.GNG/NG11/W/24/Rev.1.

<sup>68</sup> Jean O. Lanjouw and William Jack, “Trading Up: How Much Should Poor Countries Pay to Support Pharmaceutical Innovation?” *CGD Brief* 4, no. 3 (2004). Available at <http://are.berkeley.edu/~lanjouw/Ramseybrief.pdf>.

<sup>69</sup> Shubham Chaudhuri, Pinelopi K. Goldberg, and Panle Jia, “Estimating the Effects of Global

---

Patent Protection in Pharmaceuticals: A Case Study of Quinolones in India,” NBER Working Paper 10159, 2003.

<sup>70</sup> Consumer Project on Technology, Letter to ask World Health Organization to Evaluate New Treaty Framework for Medical Research and Development, 2005. Available: <http://www.cptech.org/workingdrafts/rndsignonletter.html>

<sup>71</sup> Implemented: Chile, Côte d'Ivoire, France, Republic of Korea, Madagascar, Mauritius, Niger (Norway dedicates part of its CO2 tax on airline fuel to UNITAID).

In process of implementation: Benin, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Congo, Gabon, Guinea, Liberia, Mali, Morocco, Namibia, Senegal, São Tomé and Príncipe, Togo. Source: <http://www.unitaid.eu/en/How-innovative-financing-works.html>, last accessed 7 June 2009.

<sup>72</sup> Ellen 't Hoen and Tido von Schoen-Angerer, “A Patent Pool for Medicines.” *The World Today* 65, no. 2 (2009). <http://www.chathamhouse.org.uk/publications/twt/archive/view/id/1871/>

<sup>73</sup> World Health Assembly Resolution 59.24. “Public health, innovation, essential health research and intellectual property rights: towards a global strategy and plan of action.” 27 May 2006. Accessed 12 September 2007 <<http://www.cptech.org/ip/health/who/wha59-4.pdf>>

<sup>74</sup> Commission on Intellectual Property Rights, “Integrating Intellectual Property Rights and Development Policy.” London: Department for International Development, 2002. Available at [www.iprcommission.org](http://www.iprcommission.org); WHO Commission on Intellectual Property Rights, Innovation and Public Health, *Report of the WHO Commission on Intellectual Property Rights, Innovation and Public Health* (Geneva: World Health Organization, 2006).

<sup>75</sup> Karin Timmermans, “National and Regional Documents and Perspectives,” Presentation at Roundtable Workshop on Public Health, Innovation and Intellectual Property, Beijing, 24-25 September 2007.

<sup>76</sup> Ernst R. Berndt et al., “Advance Market Commitments for Vaccines Against Neglected Diseases: Estimating Costs and Effectiveness.” Working Paper 98. Washington D.C.: Center for Global Development, 2007.

<sup>77</sup> Joseph Stiglitz, “Innovation: A Better Way than Patents.” *The New Scientist*, 16 September 2006.; James Love, “Drug development incentives to improve access to essential medicines,” *Bulletin of the World Health Organization* 84, no. 5 (2006); Mision Permanente de la Republica de Bolivia, Ginebra, “Working Document Proposed by Barbados and Bolivia, April 2008.” 17 April 2008; Letter to WHO Secretariat for Public Health, Innovation and Intellectual Property, available online at [http://www.keionline.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=175](http://www.keionline.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=175).

<sup>78</sup> William New, “WHO Adopts ‘Most Important Document Since Doha’ On IP and Public Health.” Intellectual Property Watch, 29 May 2008. Accessed online at <<http://www.ipwatch.org/weblog/wp-trackback.php?p=1067>>

<sup>79</sup> World Health Assembly. “Global strategy and plan of action on public health, innovation and intellectual property.” 24 May 2008. Sixty-first World Health Assembly, Resolution WHA61.21. Available at < [http://apps.who.int/gb/ebwha/pdf\\_files/A61/A61\\_R21-en.pdf](http://apps.who.int/gb/ebwha/pdf_files/A61/A61_R21-en.pdf)>.

<sup>80</sup> International AIDS Vaccine Initiative, Pediatric Dengue Vaccine Initiative, Drugs for Neglected Diseases Initiative, Innovative Vector Control Consortium, Medicines for Malaria Venture, Aeras Global TB Vaccine Foundation, Global Alliance for TB Drug Development, Malaria Vaccine Initiative, “Position paper on Issues Raised in the Intergovernmental Working Group on Public Health, Innovation and Intellectual Property (IGWG) 29 April 2008.” Accessed 30 April 2008 at <[http://www.mmv.org/article.php?id\\_article=475](http://www.mmv.org/article.php?id_article=475)>

<sup>81</sup> United States Navy. Malaria Outbreak Among Members of JTF Liberia: Consensus Conference Report, 2003. Accessed 27 March 2008 < <http://www-nehc.med.navy.mil/downloads/prevmed/JTFMalaria.pdf>>