



STEVE HOWARD

Founding Secretary General of The Global Foundation

Jérôme CONTAMINE, Executive Vice-President, Chief Financial Officer, and Member of the Executive Committee of Sanofi-Aventis

Thank you, Petra. As we discussed this morning, Steve, you rapidly understood the health industry somewhat in a short period of time, although you said you had very little knowledge of this industry. Could you share some of your views with us?

Steve HOWARD, Founding Secretary General of The Global Foundation

How do we get to the future? I think this is the question we want to end up with today. What was interesting as a revelation this morning was that it appears that the issues of health globally are not very well managed globally. Multinational companies operate at a global level and people operate internationally, but the international structures alongside the WHO have been the most prominent. There seems to be a gap or a vacuum there, so start from that position.

I have worked more intensively on food and water security at the global level, and also on energy can climate security, and I might come back to the climate parallel later on when we talk about process because we have now had three and a half years of working with the Chinese about getting to the point where they wanted to define and lead what they thought was important about the climate and sustainability agenda, which is now called their Green Growth Agenda. It is just starting to emerge with the failure of the Durban talks and the Kyoto protocol.

When we come back to the health industry globally and the point that was made by both of you in your very good presentations, it was about if you are talking about global R&D and innovation and intellectual property and who benefits and who contributes, there is a real question there about what role the developing world plays, which is non-traditional.

I just wanted to mention three things briefly. Bill Gates - I had the opportunity to host him in Melbourne, Australia 11 years ago. He gave his first public speech about the space he was moving into with his philanthropy and his contribution. The reason we did that is because one of my senior figures, an Australian medical scientist, badgered Bill Gates' father \$50 million at a time until he got to \$1 billion for what became GAVI, the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunisation. That was interesting because it was celebrity alliance stuff.

Traditionally, health seemed to have much more, if you like, managed by government or intergovernmental processes, but this new move 10 years ago to have celebrity alliances like Gates and Buffet and others was quite spectacular. I wonder about some of the distortion that occurs as a consequence of that and it is interesting about the policy making space.

The second issue to mention, although it is not deep for today, is that Australia is having a raging debate about tobacco legislation and about not banning tobacco, but plain paper packaging. This will be subject to court challenges, but it could well be a world leading position one way or the other quite profoundly. It raises interesting questions about rights. Did I hear that the Viennese are just about to reintroduce smoking? It is an interesting juxtaposition.

The third little health story I mention, it was only week that I met the founder and CEO, who is an Australian, and he has moved back from Columbia University to Australia to run a \$2 billion listed company, which apparently is the world's leading developer of clinical stage regenerative medicine based upon highly potent off-the-shelf adult stem cells. I had not made the connection between stem cell research and regenerative medicine turning into off-the-shelf



products, so I guess my point there is the health industry is a much faster moving and wider thing than I had expected.

The question I would raise, which is really where my expertise comes in maybe, is about goals. It is very hard to understand what global health goals are and who sets them. What is it that we are actually shooting to achieve and who determines that? There are of course the Millennium Development Goals, but how does this fit within a wider framework of human security and international decision making? I raise the question because I do not know, and if I do not know, then I am reasonably informed and I would like to know.

The second question is, 'How do you measure the progress on these matters?' You mentioned the Global Reporting Initiative, which I think is very interesting. There is another focus because I wonder sometimes about compartmentalising issues. If we put health too much into its own box, it might turn off all those who are not actually in the health sector. I am quite interested in the idea of human security and about health being part of a human security agenda. I have been involved, as have our chief statistician in Australia and a number of statisticians around the world, with the OECD in a rolling project on measuring progress. In this case, it is measuring Australia's progress around a whole range of social criteria, which include health. It is not just economic and not just environmental criteria.

This is a movement now at the global level and the OECD is moving aggressively into this space to ask, 'How do we measure what really matters in people's lives?' That might be very helpful in answering the question of benchmarking and about what matters in global health collaboration decision making.

The final point I would make in these opening remarks is that I am interested in pathways to the future, so if it is about global health, then it is about designing new models of cooperation. In food security, for example, and in these other agenda areas, we and others in my network are very involved with pushing the G20 towards being a leadership group on these issues, rather than a management group.

I missed half of the global governance discussion this morning, unfortunately, because we were having a briefing, but there is this notion about saying that the G20 is really a reform or leadership group to help set an agenda or targets to review progress and say, 'In all these areas, including health, what should we be shooting for in the world?' Then I think you adjust the institutional rules according to go with it. We can come back to that subject, but I am very interested in asking, 'Whatever the issues of content and substance, how do we actually progress them at the global level and take them forward?'

The big shift is that what was once not that long ago a governmental or intergovernmental role became then a kind of mixed model, public/private partnerships, celebrity alliance, and now I think we are seeing much more dependence as governments find health budgets much more difficult and the emergence of emerging countries to be players, where the private sector-led model, which is the industries that both Jérôme and Petra are involved in, becomes interesting. Then you raise the question of how viable they are going forward, given that you need global R&D and global innovation. Who pays for that? Who benefits? It is a really interesting question.

That is to start with.