
The Center for International Economic Growth

July 9, 1987

**A NEW R_x IS NEEDED FOR
WORLD HEALTH CARE**

INTRODUCTION

The United States Agency for International Development and other bilateral and multilateral donors for three decades have been assisting the health care of developing countries mainly by large resource transfers through public sector institutions. Funds have gone from government agencies in the West to affiliated recipients in the Third World. The goal of this has been to finance, in effect, a mass prescription to cure the most disease and suffer the greatest number of countries with the least amount of effort.

The motivation of such an approach is admirable. And at one time such an approach might have been justified in the face of massive poverty and rampant disease in independent nations with fragile public infrastructures. In a few of the poorer countries, this strategy still may be justified. There is no doubt, moreover, that the world health community has achieved successes. Among these are the successful eradication of major communicable diseases, the construction of clinics and hospitals throughout the world, the training of thousands of doctors and other health care personnel, expanded access to clean water and sanitation, and the provision of medicines to the neediest for their day-to-day health needs as well as in emergency situations. Yet there are growing doubts that public sector transfers are the most appropriate for solving health problems in Third World countries.

Ignoring Changing Times. Steady gains in life expectancy, growing urbanization and employment, declining infant mortality, expanded education, and economic growth characterize today's developing world. So does the complex and sophisticated epidemiological pattern which increasingly resembles that of the industrialized world. Recognition of this change has been prompting development policy makers in agriculture and manufacturing sectors to rethink their state-centered and protectionist approaches of the past. Most international health and nutrition professi

This is the first of a series of studies on the U.S. Agency for International Development.

contrast, have ignored the changing times and continue to emphasize p financed programs for universal application.

Typical of this is the U.S. Agency for International Development, AID. AID's approach to health care assistance to developing countries through two phases. In the first phase during the 1960s, AID funded infrastructure such as hospitals and clinics, human capital in the trainin personnel, and major disease eradication. AID, for example, has fundec dollars worth of government clinics and small rural hospitals in Pakista countries.

During the second phase in the 1970s and through the present, h and other donors shifted from basic investments and specific disease cc supporting the planning and operations of public sector health systems. community, in effect, assumed responsibility for funding and, in some c the actual health programs. In virtually all cases, this planning has refle public sector perspective of the international health community.

Creating Dependence. It now is time for AID to change its focus strategy. To refuse to do so merely will ensure in recipient nations the creation of dependence rather than development in health and nutrition taxpayer resources, moreover, needed to finance the recurrent costs of current AID health programs are limited. Nor are they likely to expand future. Nor ought they, given the economic and epidemiological change process. If past efforts have paid little attention to issues of finance an responsible future efforts will have to do better, and will, of practical r to do so by working with private health resources.

To become more responsible to the developing nations receiving assistance and to the American taxpayer underwriting this assistance, A change its programs. Such changes should include:

- ◆◆ A realistic assessment of the health problems of recipient cou decade from now. This will provide the forward projections needed to diversified health portfolio as compared to the current one of universal

- ◆◆ Retooling AID's project analysis machinery to bring health fin economic analysis, and private sector skills into the project design phase

- ◆◆ Utilizing advanced U.S. technology in health care organization manufacturing, and finance to develop local systems in the Third World flexible, growth oriented, and financially sustainable.

- ◆◆ Creating an independent body or institution, overseen by priva members who are not recipients of foreign aid dollars, to introduce acc and ensure excellence in AID's health and nutrition programs.

- ◆◆ Evaluating thoroughly U.S. resources being provided to intern: agencies. Are these agencies using funds efficiently? Do they involve

health care skills and resources in their planning and project design plans are they developing self-sustaining health and nutrition programs?

The U.S. Agency for International Development, of course, is only one problem. Its outdated strategies simply mirror those of other industrialized such multilateral agencies as the World Health Organization (WHO), the World Bank, UNICEF, and the United Nations Development Program (UNDP).

The sums transferred to developing nations for health purposes have been considerable. Although the most recent available figures are nearly a decade old, WHO estimated that donor agencies transferred approximately \$3 billion in health sector assistance to developing countries in 1978. This excluded funds transferred from rich OPEC countries and from the private sector. In a 1978 survey of U.S. companies' health budgets in the international arena, the 154 which were transferring some \$452 million annually.

The \$30 Billion Question. If the trend in AID's health budget is any indication, the total amount spent on international health has increased significantly. In 1978, AID expended approximately \$75 million from its economic development budget on bilateral health programs. In Fiscal Year 1987 the figure is \$1.2 billion. General increases in most of the donor organizations health programs over the last decade. Such expenditures ought to prompt questions:

What has been achieved for this investment?

What sustainable, self-financed development today is attributable to this investment?

Why are so many Ministries of Health unable to even finance their operating budgets?

How will maintaining the productivity of past investments be paid for in the future?

These are some of the questions that must be addressed by the health care professionals at AID and similar agencies. They have an obligation to ensure that every expenditure, in every case, maximizes the future development capabilities of the World recipients and produces the sustainable independence intended by the taxpayer.

The leverage represented by the tens of billions of donor health care dollars spent in the next decade, especially in the face of a widespread economic and epidemiological evolution, clearly demands a careful and critical assessment of strategies, purposes and assumptions in donor health programs. What is the need for more money, but a better way to invest the money already available.

THE WRONG DIAGNOSIS

AID and most of the donor agencies are still addressing the health problems of the 1950s. Life expectancies were low then because infectious diseases like tuberculosis, smallpox--took a heavy toll. Few people could pay for health care because the wage-based population was practically nonexistent. So health care was proclaimed a "right" by the United Nations and many Third World governments. This was widely interpreted as a government obligation to give free health care to all. Multilateral and bilateral donors, private voluntary organizations, and large firms all helped provide the vaccines and antibiotics which proved to be extremely cost-effective ways of improving health status in developing areas.

Today, most international health analysts continue to diagnose Third World nations as having the same health problems as 30 years ago. It is as if the "developing world" has not evolved epidemiologically or economically.

It has. The economic and health statistics confirm this. In all but a few cases, average life expectancies have climbed and now exceed 60 years. Infant mortality rates have been reduced by one-third to one-half in most developing countries (See Table I for some illustrative examples). No longer are the fastest growing causes of death and disability in many developing countries tropical diseases; instead, they are diseases of the Western world--cardiovascular, diabetes, hypertension, and cancer. Revealingly, when asked recently what the country's major health problem was, the Minister of Health of Tunisia responded immediately, "The diseases of the Western world." This Ministry cannot afford to open two newly built public sector hospitals because of the higher cost of responding to the growing burden of chronic disease consuming the health budget.

Shifting Labor Force. This is not to say that infectious diseases have been completely conquered. Clearly, the current AIDS pandemic, new strains of influenza virus which are changing frequently, drug-resistant malaria parasites and non-B hepatitis require the attention of the international health community. The evolution of the infectious disease problem has not been met by an equal increase in donor funding. Not until 1986 did WHO and the rest of the international health community seriously start addressing the AIDS problem. As this deadly disease spread rapidly in Africa in great numbers during the early 1980s, the international health community was focusing on "GOBI," the UNICEF acronym for growth monitoring, rehydration, breastfeeding, and immunizations.

The labor force in many developing countries has shifted significantly from subsistence agriculture to the wage-based industry and services sectors, increasing disposable income and demand for various new goods and services including health care (See Table II). Growing urbanization will continue to accelerate this trend. According to a 1986 study by the New York Academy of Sciences, by the year 2000 there will be 22 mega-cities of over 10 million people in the world; 18 of these will be in the developing world. (See Table III for figures on urbanization.)

With the increasing purchasing power and changing consumer preferences of Third World citizens, it is clear that many of them would pay for health care.

Table I
Illustrative Examples of
Life Expectancy Indicators

	Life Expectancy at Birth		Infant
	1960*	1983**	R 1960*
Honduras	46	60	145
Egypt	46	57	128
Morocco	47	58	161
Philippines	51	65	106
Thailand	51	63	103
Costa Rica	62	73	74
Peru	48	59	163
Guatemala	47	61	92
Turkey	51	63	184
Tunisia	48	61	159
Jamaica	64	70	52
Dominican Republic	51	63	120
Ecuador	51	63	140
Colombia	53	64	93
Jordan	47	64	136
Malaysia	57	67	72
Chile	57	67	119
Brazil	57	63	118
Mexico	58	66	91
Indonesia	41	53	150

*World Development Report, 1981, Washington, D.C.: The World Bank

**State of the World's Children, New York: UNICEF, 1986.

***World Development Report, 1985, Washington, D.C.: The World Bank

Table II
Percentage of Labor Force in

	Agriculture		Industry		Services	
	1960	1981	1960	1981	1960	1981
Ghana	64	53	14	20	22	27
Indonesia	75	58	8	12	17	30
Morocco	62	52	14	21	24	27
Philippines	61	46	15	17	24	37
Nigeria	71	54	10	19	19	27
Peru	53	40	19	19	28	41
Guatemala	67	55	14	21	19	24
Turkey	78	54	11	13	11	33
Tunisia	44	35	26	32	30	33
Jordan	44	20	26	20	30	60
Malaysia	63	50	12	16	25	34
Brazil	52	30	15	24	33	46
Mexico	55	36	20	26	25	38

1960 data from World Bank Development Report 1981, Washington, D World Bank.

1981 date from World Bank Development Report 1985, Washington, D World Bank.

**Table III
Urbanization**

	Urban Population as Percentage of Total Population		Perce in Urt
	1965	1983	
Zaire	19	38	
Tanzania	6	14	
Somalia	20	33	
India	18	24	
Togo	11	22	
Ghana	26	38	
Kenya	9	17	
Sudan	13	20	
Mauritania	7	25	
Bolivia	26	43	
Zambia	24	47	
Ivory Coast	23	44	
Cameroon	16	39	
Peru	52	67	
Turkey	31	45	
Tunisia	40	54	
Jamaica	36	52	
Dominican Republic	35	54	
Ecuador	37	46	
Colombia	54	66	
Jordan	47	72	
Chile	72	82	
Brazil	51	71	
Mexico	55	69	

World Development Report, 1985, Washington, D.C.: The World Bank

it available. In the absence of sufficient and affordable private health care, however, Third World governments must stretch their resources to serve populations which now have more expensive, hospital-based diseases.

The result: Public sector health programs that must offer everything or provide next to nothing.

THE WRONG PRESCRIPTION

The international health and nutrition community, including Americans, places an undue emphasis on a universal prescription for all developing countries. These standard formulas include centralized public planning of health care, village health workers, lists that limit the number of available drugs, but oral rehydration salts, and growth charts, among other things.

These would have been helpful and appropriate for most of the developing world of the 1950s. Indeed, much of the newly industrialized countries over the last quarter century has resulted in large-scale public sector investments in physical and human capital such as electricity, water, education, health training, and immunizations.

Affording a Choice. The problem is that this prescription as it is relevant today for only Bangladesh, Ethiopia, and other extremely poor countries. The trouble is that the international health community has been unable to differentiate a Bangladesh from a Brazil, Costa Rica, Colombia, Malaysia, Egypt, Morocco, Tunisia, and Jordan.

In these nations, an ever-increasing portion of the population can afford the choice of a more expensive or slightly different drug because it has less side effect; can bottlefeed a baby safely, if they need or choose to do so, but they have electricity, refrigeration, and clean water. They are really not interested in obtaining health care from a paraprofessional who has been trained for months and who has no incentive to perform because he or she has no salary by the central government in eight months. In these industrializing countries, an emerging wage-based population is increasingly seeking higher quality, private medical care instead of public services.

Example: According to World Health Organization criteria, Egypt has met a key goal set forth in its "Health for All by the Year 2000" program; Egyptians now have geographic access to a Ministry of Health facility. However, utilization of these facilities has fallen dramatically over recent years as more people seek private health services.

Being Attentive to Future Diseases. A simple but largely overlooked principle is that Most of the "developing world" is more like the developed world than Bangladesh or Mozambique. International health and nutrition providers should differentiate their products and determine the types of initiatives most appropriate for different countries in their different stages of development.

Even in those least developed countries with the lowest health level, a legitimate concern that the pattern of health services development being pursued should be attentive to future diseases and a more sophisticated demand for health care. In 1970 experts from 20 African countries met at a conference organized by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) to discuss demographic and epidemiological transitions in their countries. While the data were sparse on health trends, these African experts acknowledged that "tuberculosis, other infectious and parasitic diseases, maternal and infant mortality, and unknown causes of death have decreased whereas the percent of other causes of mortality have increased." The experts concluded that, in addition to the problems of anemia and infant diarrhea, Africa was already in the early stages of an epidemiological transition with an "increase of incidence of cardiovascular diseases and accidents."

Even the poorest countries therefore should be planning for how to pay for health care and other social services for all those children who survive despite various primary health problems. Incorporating user fees and encouraging health insurance systems wherever possible can encourage a more rational system in the least developed countries.

Insurance premiums do not even need monetized wages. Example: In Kenya, very low income cooperative members, represented by the National Dairy Development Board, have their health premiums deducted when they turn their milk into butter. The value of a set portion of their milk covers their employee contribution to a prepaid system.

CREATING DEPENDENCE NOT DEVELOPMENT

Despite increased demand for health and other goods and services, the majority of international health resources are being funneled into centralized health programs which are premised on "free health care for all"--even those who cannot afford to pay. These Ministries of Health are now so burdened with responsibilities that they lack the funds to do the very jobs that public health systems are best at: nutrition and health surveillance, providing or reimbursing services for the poor, conducting immunization campaigns, and other public health measures. Experimentation with such creative private sector health options as:

- 1) Prepaid or other insurance schemes;
- 2) Privatization of certain hospital functions;
- 3) Attracting investment money for public/private partnerships; or
- 4) Encouraging health products manufacturing.

As a result, the limited public resources are dissipated across large areas rather than being focused on those in need. There are, to be sure, a few exceptions.

Example: In Brazil, Hospital Corporation of America, a private hospital management company, owns and runs the world's largest health organization outside the United States. With 860,000 members, it operates a health system with only one American on-site and delivers comprehensive preventive health care for \$10 per family per month. This cost is shared between the company and its blue collar employees. Some 60 percent of the members of the private system previously were covered under Ministry of Health auspices. This private sector alternative has shifted part of the cost burden of health care from Brazil's government to the private sector.

Paying Little Attention to Cost. Instead of wisely focusing on health care costs and a few others may be guides for a strategy for health care financing in a period of declining public budgets and rising health care costs, the World Health Organization has endorsed a global program called "Health For All by 2000." This program is predicated on public sector outlays and systems with little attention to cost and finance issues. Even when donors discuss health care financing in the private sector, private sector financing and management expertise is rarely involved. At the World Health Organization's annual meeting in Geneva this May, for example, the theme was how to finance the health programs of ailing nations. Yet the meeting did not invite private sector health care industry businessmen. Even more surprising, AID turned down an offer by seasoned private sector finance and management executives to contribute their knowledge and experience to the technical assistance program. While the conference paid obligatory lip service to the private sector, by not involving it, the results will be the same old public sector prescriptions bankrupting Third World treasuries.

Lacking intense financial scrutiny, donor health programs often incur costs beyond anything that impoverished Ministries of Health can afford. AID designed an \$80 million child survival program in Egypt. The program had projected no recurrent costs yet rough calculations indicate that the Ministry of Health budget would have to be increased by about 20 percent for this one program to continue after donor aid ends.

Major Health Problems. The point is certainly not that child survival programs be abandoned. In the least developed countries, a significant portion of health resources should continue to go into these and other primary health care programs. In a large and growing number of developing countries, however, malaria and child diseases and deaths do not represent the major health problems.

These countries need a much more balanced prescription than they are currently receiving. Such a prescription should include:

- 1) **More attention** to the chronic disease problems of aging populations;
- 2) **Emphasis on cost containment** and payment systems;
- 3) **Studies on how to expand affordable private sector health services and products;**

4) **Exploration of the potential** for regional health sector banks to increase capital for expanded health products and services (such as cap private practices and health products manufacturing);

5) **Training in health financing** and cost analysis; and

6) **Industrial health** and safety program development.

The future of health in the developing world will entail a constant set of disease, disability, demographic, economic, and social patterns. No prescription, no "silver bullets," no unified easy path will contribute any waste and chaos to the development of future health care in these countries and individually tailored approaches will be required.

If the resources to sustain future health systems are to be counted with any confidence, it is essential that the international health community begin vigorous and creative discussions with Third World Ministries of Health on the alternatives for structuring future health systems. Financial authorities must become active participants in health system development decisions, bring their needed financial expertise to the evaluation of health and nutrition options.

LOST OPPORTUNITIES AT AID

The rhetoric of the U.S. Agency for International Development has been overtaken by a quiet but dramatic revolution in health and socioeconomic conditions. Rather than advocating old solutions, as it does, the U.S. foreign aid program should be on the cutting edge of understanding changing disease patterns and providing imaginative ways to deal with them in a climate of decreasing health sector outlays. The U.S. enjoys a clear and undisputed international competitive advantage in health care technology, organization, management, and financing. American donor programs have failed to capitalize on U.S. national strengths.

Experience reveals that it can be extremely cost effective to spend money to involve U.S. health management and financial expertise in the early stages of Third World projects. Such expenditures give maximum leverage to the U.S. for they can attract much larger investments from the private sector, both domestic and local. Among the few examples of AID supported private health activities:

◆◆ In the Dominican Republic, a multinational insurance company has completed a plan for a private sector health maintenance organization. The plan was funded with the understanding that if the venture turns out to be viable, the insurance company will then be committed to a multi-million dollar investment in the country.

◆◆ In Indonesia, AID funded a feasibility study to privatize the services of the nation's largest employer, the state-owned oil company, PERTAMINA. Several U.S. companies are now considering investing in

with Indonesian partners. Moreover, the business plan envisions that a health premiums be used for community health programs including immunization and other preventive measures.

LACK OF ACCOUNTABILITY

The innovation needed to deal with future demand will be difficult from within the international health and nutrition community. There is almost no tolerance of a critique of existing health programs by established experts. The field, astoundingly, lacks a tradition of vigorous give-and-take on technical and policy issues. Technical dissent soon equates to professorial dissent with the "community" which then closes ranks against criticism. As a result, international health care institutions become monoliths; accountability for failures is rare. Most journalists, meanwhile, have neither the means to travel the great distances to investigate projects nor the technical expertise to analyze the problems.

Many failures are never reported or never acknowledged as mistakes in the international health community. Thus, they rarely are corrected. In some cases, the results are more wasted resources. In other cases human lives are at stake. Examples:

◆◆ In Trinidad, a 650-bed hospital built by French foreign aid stands unused. It has been unable to open for lack of operating funds.

◆◆ In Somalia, the EEC built a top-of-the-line pharmaceutical plant, determining whether there was any demand for this expensive facility. It stands unused.

◆◆ In Honduras, the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO) and the Inter-American Development Bank have built seven hospitals, most of which are unfinished and unused.

◆◆ In Egypt, AID is currently constructing a large public hospital in Cairo, with 21 uncompleted public hospitals already, some dating back to the 1950s.

Increasingly in the field of international economic, health, and social development, the tendency is to search for easy solutions to deeply complex problems and then put extraordinary amounts of money behind those solutions. With huge sums of money, the thinking typically goes, the problems of dying, stagnating economies would disappear. In turn, the money available for such projects attracts hordes of programs and consultants, some good and some bad. The drive to spend that money and the insistence on easy answers is not consistent with the rigor in distinguishing the good from the bad, what works from what does not, or what is scientifically accurate from what is well-spoken ideology.

No Change in Mortality Rate. Valid critiques thus rarely find their way into the international health community. Those few that do raise disturbing questions were in a 1986 article in The Economist examined the lack of success of primary health care. Such care, of course, is the primary health strategy of AID and WHO.

Economist cited data from a British Medical Research Council study that after four years of the primary health care program, there had been a 50% reduction in the overall infant mortality rate.

A paper delivered by Dr. W. Henry Mosley of Johns Hopkins University challenges the WHO and AID approach which holds that inexpensive technologies such as oral rehydration therapy (ORS), breastfeeding, and immunization can achieve major reductions in child mortality. He writes: "Except in circumstances where health programs can be imposed involuntarily, the lifesaving potential of these technologies will generally be severely compromised by the social and economic constraints." Nor have those so adamantly favoring an international code of ethics formula acknowledged statements by leading U.S. pediatric groups and scientific studies which refute the major assumptions of the code.

A STRATEGY FOR HEALTH CARE

AID should be entering a new phase of international health care. New ways of financing health care will have to be found. New people will be needed to address these new requirements and approaches. The international and donor community must cast a wider net in seeking skilled professionals. They likely need more Masters of Business Administration than Masters of Public Health, more financial analysts than public health educators, and more hospital insurance administrators than professors.

AID and the international health profession must put aside their traditional assumptions and what appears to be an inherent fear of change. They must recognize that private sector resources can serve the public interest in many ways, not the least of which is to liberate scarce public funds for better uses where needed most. Future complex problems and needs will require that the simple solutions of the past be replaced with an appreciation for the complexity of problems and an uncompromising demand for excellence.

There is no quick fix, no single prescription for the creation of successful health systems in the developing world. The problems to be faced are complex and change rapidly. The development profession must be equally agile and flexible in responding, contributing to their resolution.

Catalytic Role. What is clearly called for is a careful examination of the direction of health changes in the developing world, the future availability of public and private resources to finance the systems needed to respond to those changes, and the optimal catalytic role to be played by donor dollars to bring about a future sustainable development.

AID's increasing international health expenditures have cast it into the role of global leadership. AID has the responsibility to assure Congress and the American people that these dollars are used as an international investment rather than an international entitlement program.

At least five near-term actions can be taken toward this end:

1) **AID should carry out** a ten-year forward assessment with recipient countries, organized by their level of health and economic development framework for breaking free from the current "universal prescription" approach to health program design and funding. This assessment would permit AID program expenditures to meet the individual and locally acknowledged needs of recipient countries, financing public health interventions where those are needed and requested, but taking advantage of more sophisticated investment options which support the expansion of emerging pluralistic national health systems.

2) **AID should "retool"** its project analysis machinery, developing health finance and financial analysis skills in its health and project staff.

3) **AID should begin projects** that use advanced U.S. technology, health care organization, manufacturing, and finance to develop local systems that are flexible, growth-oriented, and financially sustainable.

4) **Congress should create** an independent board of private sector members who are not recipients of foreign aid dollars, to introduce accountability and excellence in the health and nutrition development program. An initial study should carefully examine the last five years of health assistance at the project level. This assessment should compare project investments against the evolving health issues and the future needs of developing country health systems. The board should examine where the billions of health assistance dollars went, where the investments were made, and how health dollars should be targeted in the future.

5) **The U.S. should require** the health programs of the United States, including the WHO, World Bank, UNICEF, and United Nations Development Program, to apply the same standards of evaluation to their programs in assessing their contribution to improved health levels and self-sustainability.

In sum, AID and the development profession must accept accountability for their efforts because increasingly high standards of accountability and effectiveness will be demanded, both by outside observers and by the governments that they serve.

Prepared for The Heritage Foundation
Carol Adelman, D.P.H.
Jeremiah Norris
Susan Raymond, Ph.D.

The authors are officers of the Consultative Group on Development (CGD), a non-profit institution in Washington, D.C. designed to promote self-sustaining economic growth in developing countries.