

Policy Brief

Making Bioscience Related Health Innovations Work for the Poor: Are Public-Private Partnerships the Answer?

Joanna Chataway, Rebecca Hanlin and James Smith, February 2005

Introduction

Public Private Partnerships (PPPs) in the area of health are currently the focus of considerable debate. They are seen by some as a way of overcoming the crisis of 'neglected diseases' and the fact that 90% of the world's spending on health related research benefits only 10% of its population. A recent workshop hosted by the Genomics Forum and attended by policy experts, practitioners and academics examined the role of global PPPs (GPPPs) in developing new drugs and vaccines designed to combat diseases that are common in poorer countries. This policy brief focuses on two issues highlighted at the workshop. Participants felt these issues require the attention of policy makers if GPPPs are to be successful in the long-term.

Analysis

PPPs are innovative: producing new technologies and building capacity. GPPPs have generated new drug development initiatives focussed on the needs of the world's poor. A number of these operate with relative autonomy from large public sector or multi-lateral bureaucracies. They are relatively flexible and responsive to changing and complex environments. For example, the International AIDS Vaccine Initiative (IAVI) and the South African AIDS Vaccine Initiative (SAAVI) have been particularly adept at global and local advocacy work. They have brought into focus the ways in which science and technology might be used to address the needs of people in poorer countries.

In the case of AIDS, although a vaccine has yet to emerge, IAVI has nevertheless made a substantial contribution to capacity building in developing countries. This is an important observation because capacity building is not part of IAVI's mission even though it is a strategic necessity. Particularly in Africa, real achievements have been made in the areas of scientific and technological capabilities – including competence to prepare and carry out clinical trials. Because such initiatives cut across traditional boundaries and systems, such as public and private, health and industrial sectors, a broad range of capacities can be built through product oriented activity. For example, with IAVI's assistance, Rwanda, Kenya and Uganda have developed potential centres of excellence in vaccine clinical trials.

Product development GPPPs offer valuable ways forward in producing vaccines *and* in capacity building in developing countries. However, the success of GPPPs is rooted in how they link to a variety of other organisations and institutions. This broader institutional and organisational context and the broader capacity building benefits should not be ignored.

Maintaining a broader perspective and a balance of methodological issues. Workshop participants expressed concern that narrow approaches may lead to short term formulas but may miss the point. For example, current discussions about the role of advanced purchase agreements, tax credits and other incentives for private sector involvement are likely to deliver appealing policy recommendations. But the formulas will be based on narrow assumptions that economic 'pull' policy mechanisms will resolve underlying problems. The development of PPPs and the extent to which they are able to offer solutions to the development and diffusion of vaccines will be affected by a broad range of social, cultural and political issues not simply those of an economic nature.

Also, there is considerable evidence that organisational capacities and broader institutional mechanisms are crucial in creating constructive participation in drug development. An important consideration for example is that many private sector companies have withdrawn from vaccines development because profit prospects were unappealing. The loss of expertise and capacities to produce vaccines will not be restored via financial incentives alone.

A range of other perspectives and methodologies can provide additional research and recommendations that will lead to more rounded and viable solutions. Historical work on vaccine development can provide insights into success and failure in past vaccine development. In particular, historical analysis suggests that the public sector may have an essential role to play in maintaining expertise in areas which are critical over the longer term. Additionally, a sociological framework can provide perspective on the role of the private and public sectors in sustaining the development and delivery of appropriate vaccines over the longer term.

This mix of methodologies can be used to examine a wider range of issues particularly in relation to health systems delivery capacity that need thorough consideration if new drugs are to be effectively diffused as well as developed. Maintaining a broader perspective and methodological framework will provide better opportunities for a full range of expertise to be engaged in planning for product production and delivery within local contexts. The implication here is that funding for GPPPs should not substitute for supporting a range of actors needed to deliver drugs and services to the world's poor.

Conclusions

GPPPs offer exciting opportunities and the best deserve further funding. This funding, however, needs to be delivered in ways that reinforce the involvement of a range of actors. Not all funding oriented towards developing new vaccines and drugs can be channelled into GPPPs. More active involvement of private sector companies, although welcome, is unlikely to deliver a panacea to the problem of bridging the gap between modern bioscience and applications essential to the majority of the world's population. Funding needs to be balanced with additional finance and support for a range of science based organisations, particularly public sector laboratories and public and private sector organisations and institutions engaged with product diffusion and delivery.

About the authors

The authors are all members of INNOGEN, an ESRC research centre on social and economic research on innovation in genomics. Dr. Joanna Chataway from the Open University works on biotechnology and public-private partnerships. Dr. James Smith from the University of Edinburgh works in the area of biomedical innovation in Africa. Rebecca Hanlin is a PhD student at the University of Edinburgh with experience in national level African public-private partnerships.

About the workshop

The workshop on "Making vaccines work for the poor: Are public private partnerships the answer?" was held at ESRC Genomics Policy and Research Forum, University of Edinburgh, December 13th-14th 2004. It was organised by the ESRC INNOGEN Research Centre. For a full list of attendees see www.innogen.ac.uk/events.

About this series

These Policy Briefs are published by the Economic and Social Research Council's (ESRC) Genomics Policy and Research Forum. They draw on the research of the ESRC's Genomics Network. They aim to provide valuable information and analysis but should not be treated as a source of advice or recommendations.

For more information please contact:

The Administrator
ESRC Genomics Policy and Research Forum
College of Humanities and Social Science
The University of Edinburgh
St John's Land
Holyrood Road
Edinburgh
EH8 8AQ

Tel: +44 (0)131 651 4747

Fax: +44 (0)131 651 4748

Email: genomics.forum@ed.ac.uk