

't Hoen, Ellen

Médecins Sans Frontières - Campaign for Access to Essential Medicines,
NGO

Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) wishes to raise the following points on the draft global strategy and global plan of action:

1. It risks failing to build on the CIPIH report's analysis

Some of the points of the plan of action seem to disregard the analyses and conclusions of the CIPIH report and want to redo the work, or to water down the report's recommendations. The draft fails to reflect the CIPIH's analysis on the barriers posed by intellectual property in relation to both innovation and access.

2. The draft strategy and plan of action does not give a strong enough leadership role to WHO on key policy issues

Several areas covered by the plan require greater and more proactive involvement from WHO, particularly in areas where the agency must show concrete policy leadership. WHO must show greater leadership on the full and immediate implementation of the Doha Declaration on TRIPS and Public Health. WHO must outline how it will assist countries to "adopt or effectively implement competition policies and apply the pro-competitive measures allowed under the TRIPS Agreement in order to prevent or remedy anti-competitive practices related to the use of medicinal patents", as recommended by the CIPIH.

3. MSF welcomes the fact that the draft embraces the idea of exploring new mechanisms for financing for R&D, but more needs to be done

It is encouraging that the draft does not shy away from these proposals. Nevertheless, these need to be given greater urgency and priority: relying on patents for financing R&D will merely perpetuate what is recognised as an inefficient system, and addressing the funding gap for R&D will require new approaches that go beyond good will and philanthropy. MSF would like to see WHO move forward with WHA60.30's call for the development of further proposals that address "the linkage of the cost of research and development and the price of medicines".

4. The draft global strategy and plan of action risks not being translated into concrete action, because:

- the list of eighty action points are given without any sense of prioritisation, making coherent progress difficult.
- the timeframes for individual actions are too loose and need to be tightened up to reflect the urgency of the needs.
- it fails to allocate specific individual responsibilities. It must allocate concrete action points to individual actors, as did the CIPIH.
- each action point must be accompanied by concrete meaningful progress indicators, whereas many of the progress indicators in the draft are not pertinent to the task at hand.