Consultative Expert Working Group on Research and Development (CEWG): financing and coordination
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Set up in 2010 by WHA63 in response to concerns that insufficient resources were being devoted to target diseases which disproportionately affect people in developing countries.

– Report published in April 2012 for WHA65
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Concept of “essential medicines” introduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Commission on Health Research for Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Commission on Macroeconomics and Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Commission on Intellectual Property Rights, Innovation and Public Health (CIPIH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Ministerial Summit on Health Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Working Group on Public Health, Innovation and Intellectual Property (IGWG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Bamako Call to Action on Research for Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Consultative Expert Working Group on Research and Development (CEWG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>CEWG report in April 2012 for WHA65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>National and regional consultations to feed into open-ended global meeting (26-28 November 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Proposals for options to be presented WHA66, through the 132nd Executive Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REQUESTS regional committees to discuss at their 2012 meetings the report of the CEWG in the context of the implementation of the global strategy and plan of action on public health, innovation and intellectual property in order to contribute to concrete proposals and actions.
CEWG Recommendations

• All countries should commit to spending at least 0.01% of GDP on government-funded R&D; developed countries should consider committing 0.15%-0.2% of GDP to government-funded health research.

• A Global Health R&D Observatory under the auspices of WHO should be created to collect and analyse relevant data, to analyse lessons learned and propose options;

• A global framework on health R&D, and specifically a legally binding instrument, is needed.
Web-based regional consultation

Feedback requested around 4 questions around the 4 categories of CEWG recommendations:

1. For each category are there elements of the report you see as feasible and in what way could they be pursued?
2. Do you have any suggestions for strengthening each recommendation or for modified or alternative options?
3. Other comments on either the report or issues in general?
4. How can the CEWG work be taken forward concretely, both regionally and globally?
Regional Consultation Results (1/5)

Overall feedback (5 Member States)

- Responses complimented the good work of the CEWG and the report.
- Acknowledgement that current IPR rules and R&D model need review – now good time to develop specific mechanisms and incentives.
- Before tangible spending commitments or binding coordination mechanism agreed, options need to be explored.
- Many individual recommendations / options could be pursued outside of a binding framework.
Regional Consultation Results (2/5)

Select specific feedback (financing)

• Potential agreement in principle to a fixed GDP commitment, but any action is premature; at a minimum gaps for priority areas need identifying first
• First, existing data need to be better validated
• GDP commitment doubtful; proposal for a political declaration
• Obligatory contribution deemed “unacceptable”
• Use of pooled funds: both yes and no answers given

Overall: Scope for increased national contributions, but on a voluntary basis with appropriate monitoring
Select specific feedback (coordination)

- Support for WHO’s continued lead role in global coordination and management of health R&D; better leveraging of existing initiatives and structures.
- WHO as lead institution, but coordination needs to involve other actors given the multi-sectoral nature of the proposals.

**Overall:** Agreed need for improved coordination and a new or revised structure/platform, but with a nuanced scope vis-à-vis the CEWG proposals.
Regional Consultation Results (4/5)

Select specific feedback (convention)

• Scope for convention needs to be agreed first; suggestion to include a broad public health focus

• Doubtful that this is practically feasible

**Overall:** No immediate support for the current CEWG proposal, but options to explore via the coordination mechanism and countries engaging on a voluntary basis with appropriate monitoring
Where do we go from here?

“How can the CEWG work being taken forward concretely, both regionally and globally?” (Q4 from web-based consultation):

- Establishment of working group to develop specific proposals *by mid-October 2012*;
- Establishment of drafting group at this RC for proposals and action plan or potential draft resolution *at this RC*;
- Establishment of mechanism to incorporate feedback from national consultations?
- Other?