

**ECOSOC SPECIAL EVENT
PHILANTHROPY AND THE GLOBAL PUBLIC HEALTH AGENDA
CLOSING KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT BILL CLINTON**

Thank you, thank you very much Madame President, Mr. Dossal, Mr. Under-Secretary-General. Let me begin by saying a simple thank you to the representatives of the philanthropic community and the corporations that are here today who are committed to continuing this important work, particularly to those who have made specific commitments. This is coming at a good time; in the last five months, more than 30 trillion dollars in wealth has disappeared globally. That is well over twice America's annual GDP, and a little over half the world's annual GDP. So the question is, can we continue to count on philanthropy and corporate giving to the extent we have seen it in the last few years and if it is going to continue, how can it be done in the way that is most effective that saves the largest number of lives? In particular, since you're here on the global public health agenda, I want to commend you for these special papers that were put out by ECOSOC; they're both very, very good. How will we go about doing this? I would just like to offer a few observations.

In the last decade, we have seen more or less parallel with the rise of democracy and the rise of vast private fortunes in finance, a staggering increase in NGO activity. In the United States, there are now more than a million foundations, half of them started in this decade - more than half a million active in India, about 400,000 are registered in China, perhaps many more than that unregistered. The NGO movement in developed and developing countries alike is exploding. It arose, I think, in no small measure because of a confluence of factors, but the most important is, that I think we all recognize there will always be a gap between what the private economy will produce and what government policy can solve, and civil society needs to step into that gap and secondly, when there is a high level of cooperation at the local level, it is possible for NGOs to do a lot of this work more quickly and in a less-costly fashion than would otherwise be the case.

So when we think about where we're going from here, particularly in the area of global health, we should think about what kind of philanthropy we mean, and philanthropy is simply giving. Are we giving money? Are we giving time? Are we giving skills? Are we doing it in partnership with local governments? Are we doing it in partnership with local NGOs? There are serious questions to be asked and answered.

But let's begin by acknowledging that, as far away as we remain from reaching the Millennium Development Goals in maternal and child health and in untreated tropical diseases, especially, there has been a staggering amount of progress made in this decade. And part of this is due to the concentration of donor efforts, public and private, through the Global Fund, through GAVI, through GAIN, through the Drugs for Neglected Tropical Diseases Initiative, Malaria No More, through UNITAID, which I have the honor of working with. So the question is can we sustain what we're doing? How will we do more in a difficult time? And what arguments will we make or devices will we use to broaden the number of people who are a part of this philanthropic community?

First, let's talk about giving, and giving by the private sector - part of it is money, part of it is organizational skills, part of it may be materials, but I think the most important thing I'd like

to say is that I expect that much philanthropic activity will have to be financed in a different way going forward and there will be a financial restructuring in the NGO movement that roughly parallels the restructuring of financing of regular economies in a lot of wealthy countries that have suffered financial collapse and that parallels the restructuring of political financing in my country where we've been through several cycles now where internet donations to campaigns that amount to a lot of money, even though individually they're relatively small, have become more and more important. But in the history of this, the three most important internet campaigns have been the three that were the most prominent last year – President Obama's, Hillary's and Senator McCain's. In other words, it is the tide of history.

UNITAID, I would argue therefore - it's father, Philippe Douste-Blazy is here - is, I think, the wave of the future in a lot of philanthropic giving because UNITAID uses the airline tax, which I earnestly hope the French will extend, to generate very large amounts of money in small individual donations appended to airline transportation, and that money has been a magnet to attract contributions from over two dozen other countries, so that the donations are big, but were not given by billionaires. In this case, the government served as a market-maker, if you will, to amass large numbers of smaller donations and then concentrate significant funds on a real problem.

My foundation works with UNITAID to purchase children's ARVs, and because of UNITAID, we now are treating more than 200,000 children with ARVs; that's about 2/3 of all of the children in the developing world who've been added to the ranks of treatment since the creation of UNITAID, and we are able to buy the nutritional supplements that are necessary for the medicine to take hold in the children's bodies – because of UNITAID. We also buy second-line anti-retrovirals with them, which are necessary for about 10% of all those who have to take medicine to stay alive, once they've developed full-blown AIDS. And it's much more expensive because the volume is smaller, but much cheaper than it would be, were it not for UNITAID, which gave us the marketing power to bargain for a whole different way of selling AIDS medicine, something I had been able to do earlier, thanks to the donations of the Irish and Canadian governments and a few others, with AIDS medicine generally. We basically changed the market from a low volume, high-profit margin uncertain payment business to a very low-margin, very high volume absolutely certain payment business. These are the kinds of things that the NGO movement can do. It is a form of giving - making the money go further, finding a way to turn good intentions into positive changes. But the larger point I want to make here is that none of this would have been possible in the last items I mentioned - were it not for UNITAID. So I believe we'll have to have more of that kind of philanthropy as well.

Secondly, I think it's worth trying to keep the governments in the mix. I hope that my government will actually increase its assistance this year, even under difficult circumstances, and any sort of cost-benefit analysis shows that this is about the best money governments can spend beyond their borders. When we eliminated malaria, which still kills a million kids in Africa every single year, it saved the American economy two billion dollars a year. When small pox was wiped out in my country, or globally, it saved every month, every single month, in economic output increases what it cost to eliminate it. So I hope that the governments will not get out of this business.

The last point I would like to make is there needs to be an examination - if we're going to go forward with maternal and child health and with neglected tropical diseases - without falling back in the other areas, and you want the NGO movement to be a part of it, and I can tell you from my own experience, that donors, both the large philanthropic donors and donor nations, and the organizations, have to decide what it is they are willing to fund, because my experience has been that almost no one in the world will die this year because of the cost or the lack of availability of AIDS medicine but many people will die of AIDS this year because of the absence of effective health care systems in rural areas of the poorest countries. And, in those same areas, people are dying for lack of maternal and child health, they're dying of neglected tropical diseases.

In the roughly more than two dozen countries in which my foundation operates its AIDS programme, and in Tanzania, where we're doing malaria, and we hope the drugs in the same way, we hope to do it in ten more countries next year, we find that whenever we build the networks in rural areas, to deal with HIV and AIDS, the small lab facilities, the tiny refrigerators, the generators, the tiny solar reflectors; all these things - pretty soon, we're training people who are improving maternal and child health, who are diagnosing neglected tropical diseases. In other words, I think the most important thing that needs to be done in the developing world is to build out these health networks. And donors which have been incredibly generous in saying "I'll pay for the medicine", go get the money to build out the health networks from somewhere else. We have to recognize that there may not be as many "somewhere else's" now, in this economic downturn. My foundation experienced this last year, and I dipped into our savings to continue to keep our networks alive so that we wouldn't have to close any clinics and we wouldn't have to cut back on what we were doing. But I have to now persuade donors that this is every bit as important as buying the medicine and you can use AIDS and malaria, if you will, as a leader into building rural health networks that will then inevitably have trained people there who can improve maternal and child health and deal with neglected tropical diseases. Unless you get the networks out there, we're not going to meet the Millennium Development Goals. And you can probably get the networks out there more inexpensively through the NGOs, than through direct stand-up networks from donor nations, so I want you to think about that.

Second thing I'd like to say is in addition to the philanthropy, I believe that there are opportunities for the private sector to actually make money in a responsible way that advances the public health. I think there are new technologies for developing countries that are sold at modest but sustainable margins can follow the models that we did with anti-retrovirals. Recent innovations in bed-net technology or in treating malnutrition - these things can be sold at a profit and create sustainable businesses in communities, which stabilize communities, and actually improve the public health.

The third thing I'd like to emphasize is one which has already been mentioned. It's very important that corporate partners and philanthropists apply their expertise to maximize the impact of every dollar spent. This is really, really important. An enormous number of the problems which exist today in the world come from a lack of proper organization. The kinds of things we most of us took for granted as we were growing up, even if we grew up in poor countries, and we got a good education. We were insistent that there was a predictable result flowing out of whatever effort we exerted. The fundamental problem all over the world today in the poorest countries is that that does not exist, and I can give you many

examples but I am sure you all know that. I just believe that focusing on how to do things better will generate more support from donors and that if you're serious about philanthropy, you have to be serious about not only counting the results but whether you have turned your good intentions into positive changes in the most cost-effective possible way. In a world in which there is not enough money to go around, and people die every time you make a mistake, it is immoral not to be relentlessly focused on how we can be more effective every single solitary day.

I'll just give you an example – we work on agriculture in Rwanda and Malawi, and I know the World Bank's President already said this; I was here on World Food Day, so I won't get off into that, but this is a health-care issue – whether people can feed themselves is a health-care issue. The world made a terrible mistake to walk away from supporting the development of sustainable agriculture and all the other jobs that spun out of that in 1981. We are getting back to it. I think that you ought to think about what role that has in meeting the global public health agenda. When I was in Ethiopia last summer looking at our projects there, already people were organizing to deal with another hunger shortage or hunger problem and food shortage in the horn of Africa, but every place we had clinics in Ethiopia, south and west of Addis Ababa had bumper farm crops but no systems for storage, no systems for distribution, no one financing the movement of that food. Rich countries like the United States are still giving food aid and food grown in America and transported to the site, instead of paying farmers to grow their own food in the places closest to the hunger zones and then develop distribution networks. These are the kinds of things that we can no longer afford to do. In a difficult economic time, we have to improve our resource allocation and our capacity, and that brings me to the last point I want to make.

I was honored, when you said, Sir, that you got these commitments and you were sort of following as we walked in – the kind of thing that we've been doing now for four years at the Clinton Global Initiative, which meets every year at the opening of the UN, so that we can bring political leaders from all over the world together with philanthropists and corporate leaders and NGOs. We also bring NGOs from some of the poorest countries in the world that are really effective to the meeting, and people actually sit down and they talk about how to do these things.

For most of my life, I was in politics, and for most of my life in politics we talked about two questions: what are we going to do, and how much money are we going to spend on it? The political system did not spend nearly enough time thinking about the how. How are we going to do this? How are we going to debate the best delivering mechanisms? And when I did a lot of that I was often made fun of as a policy wonk and a kind of a crazy person who shouldn't have an elevated position like President, where you are only supposed to inspire people. People are no longer inspired when they can't eat or work and their children can't stay alive.

We all need to get in the how business. Every one of us needs to be in the how business. What are we going to do is important. How much money we are going to have is important. But how is the question of the 21st century, and so we had in this four years in the Clinton Global initiative 1300 commitments affecting two hundred million people and one hundred and fifty countries - some of them from profitable business advancing in the social good, most of them in the traditional way that we do this work. Thirty-four million people got

access to treatment for neglected tropical diseases. Twenty-five million women and girls, in our focus on child health and nutrition got assistance. This year will be our fifth year when we have our meeting on September and we are going to frame traditional discussions on global health and poverty and climate change and education in ways that help businesses and NGOs leverage their comparative advantage and therefore make public money go further. We are going to really focus on that even more strongly this year and so I'll leave you with that. The donors of the world, the philanthropists, if they don't have as much money as they had last year and they can't give us much, well they can't. But no one can walk away from this. We cannot solve the problems from the 21st century nor can meet the Millennium Development Goals without the involvement of governments, corporations in their business mode, the private sector, and civil society.

Civil society cannot operate unless people donate: money, time, specific skills, specific materials and I think this is a time we should be redoubling our effort, not walking away from it. Look, I know we are in a mess now but no serious person believes that it won't come to an end at some time. And do you want to be living, when we come out of the other side of this financial crisis, with the wreckage of yet more years of neglect or do we want to keep on going on this when you know as well as I do, that working in the poorest countries in the world is the least expensive thing we can do to fulfill our responsibilities as global citizens.

So, again I thank the donors who are here, I thank the corporations who are here and thank all of you who are trying to build your civil societies. I ask you to redouble your efforts and remember this, at least it's my experience, if you want to do something about maternal and child health and neglected tropical diseases, build out elemental health care networks, which would also teach people how to take their antiretroviral medicine, that would get high quality and lower cost on Artesiminin related malaria related drugs that actually work instead of having poor people wasting money on things that won't. Build the systems and the rest of us can fill in the blanks - that is what we have to do, and for those of you that want to discuss this further I hope to see you in September. I thank you more than I can say that in this difficult time you still care about things that matter most.

Thank you very much.