Written evidence submitted by Malaria No More UK and Medicines for Malaria Venture

Background

1. Malaria No More UK (MNM UK) and Medicines for Malaria Venture (MMV) welcome the opportunity to make a submission as part of the consideration by the International Development Select Committee for their inquiry ‘Beyond Aid: The Future UK Approach to Development’. This evidence provides an outline of what MNM UK and MMV view as key areas of importance.

Summary

2. The main points raised in the below evidence are:

- The UK’s approach to development post-2015 must recognise the importance of building on the significant progress made since 2000, under the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). For example, if the UK’s future approach to development does not sustain support for controlling malaria, the progress achieved could be swiftly reversed. The inclusion of ‘missing issues’ on the UK’s post-2015 international development agenda has merit indeed, but it is crucial that these build on the UK’s success in driving progress under the MDGs, rather than leaving behind an unfinished agenda.

- The Department for International Development (DfID) should play a more active role in facilitating and encouraging pan-Whitehall coherence on international development issues, from conducting joint analysis to pooling resources on specific areas of mutual interest. This is particularly important due to how policy implications are increasingly interconnected. Firstly, development-specific policies are often inextricably linked with several other substantive policy areas such as climate, trade, and security. Secondly - with this policy interdependence in mind - there is a strong argument that the UK’s non-aid policies have a major impact on developing countries.

- DfID should remain a stand-alone department in the future and it should be recognised that this plays a crucial role in the UK remaining a global leader in international development, particularly in terms of innovation. Folding DfID into another department would risk jeopardising this unique and respected role, risking marginalisation of development voices and pan-Whitehall coherence on international development reduced.

Key points

3. In a speech\(^1\) on 7 July 2014, the UK’s Secretary of State for International Development stated that the UK’s post-2015 approach to development would need
to include “the missing issues from the MDGs: economic growth, governance, rule of law, tackling corruption, peace and stability, and putting women and girls first.” This IDC inquiry has, therefore, recognised that this approach would demand a set of policies from UK Government departments that together provide a ‘coherent, comprehensive approach’. However, this submission wishes to emphasize, foremost, that the UK’s future approach to development must recognise the importance of building on the significant progress made since 2000, under the MDGs.

3.1 The inclusion of ‘missing issues’ in the post-2015 international development has merit indeed but it is crucial that these are additional goals alongside the unfinished objectives of the MDGs. Firstly, regarding malaria, there have been significant gains in the global fight against malaria – for example between 2000 and 2012, the WHO estimated 3.3 million lives were saved by a scale-up of malaria interventions. There has also been significant progress in reducing malaria mortality rates among children; since 2000, child mortality from malaria in Africa reduced by an estimated 54%. However, the progress achieved in controlling malaria could be swiftly reversed if the momentum is not sustained and there is a funding shortfall.

3.2 Secondly, there is a strong case for how tackling malaria also tackles some of the ‘missing issues’ raised by the Secretary of State. For example, in terms of economic growth, malaria is estimated to cost Africa’s economy $12 billion annually in lost Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and the world economy stands to gain $208 billion by 2035 if progress towards reducing and eliminating malaria is achieved.3

4. For a long-term sustainable and successful approach to international development, the UK’s future approach must recognise that policy implications are increasingly interconnected and development-specific policies are often inextricably linked with several other substantive policy areas such as climate, trade, health and security. With this policy interdependence in mind, there is also a strong argument that the UK’s non-aid policies have a major impact on developing countries.

4.1 There are multiple mechanisms the UK government could adopt to more proactively address the increasing interconnectedness of policies and develop a more comprehensive approach to future to international development post-2015.
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4.2 Firstly, DfID should play a more active role in facilitation across UK Government departments; this would include working more closely with other department to assist developing countries as well as influencing the policy-making to ensure the impact on international development is routinely considered.

4.3 Secondly, instruments which assist and encourage pan-Whitehall facilitation should be actively pursued by DfID in areas where there is a shared mutual interest amongst departments. For example, the ‘Conflict Pool’ brings together DfID, the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) and the Ministry of Defence to ensure a coordinated response on conflict prevention, stability and peacekeeping activities; on a practical level, it is funded outside of individual departmental budgets by HM Treasury.

4.4 As a 2010 DfID paper rightly identified “[i]ncluding other departments in the review and evaluation of programmes or in the design of new ones can be a useful way of adding value, especially enabling a pooling of expertise and analysis from different perspectives.”

5. For the UK to hold a successful future in the arena of international development, DfID should remain a stand-alone department.

5.1 Firstly, DfID being folded into another department could be a highly risky approach in that development voices could be marginalised. To be clear, DfID does not need to be folded into another department to ensure a coherent, comprehensive approach to international development policies. As Lord Jay of Ewelme, a former official of the ODA (now DFID) and former Permanent Secretary of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, stated in 2012 to the Economic Affairs Select Committee inquiry on the economic impact and effectiveness of development aid: "the right structure [for UK international development policy] is to have a separate DFID from the Foreign Office, but working closely together."

5.2 Secondly, the UK is a world leader in international development and integrating DfID under another department could reduce pan-Whitehall coherence as there would not be a clear responsibility for sector oversight.

5.3 Thirdly, another concern of folding DfID into another department would be the potential negative impact this could have for UK public support on the importance of international development. Particularly in light of the crucial role overseas development assistance has across multiple sectors, such as security and trade.
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5.4 Finally, a crucial aspect of DfID as a stand-alone department is how it enables the UK to provide strong leadership on key international development areas; for example, **DfID is viewed as world leader in health and development and it should be lauded for its approach to supporting innovative models such as PDPs, the Global Fund, and GAVI.**