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Abstract

Health is increasingly recognized as a global as well as a domestic issue. This study thus examines the case for developing a Canadian global health strategy. It highlights the major strands of global health strategies already in place in Canada, the primary Canadian players in the field and the motivation for past actions. It examines the impact of global health trends on Canadians, and indicates where Canada has led and where it will be importantly involved in the future. It assesses whether there is a resulting need for an overall global health strategy for Canada, and specifies the benefits, costs, risks and risk-mitigation measures that could arise in developing such a strategy. It suggests how a Canadian global health strategy might be designed and what it might contain.

Canada could derive many benefits from a global health strategy. There are also costs and risks that could arise. However, a properly prepared, designed and executed global health strategy would lead to better health both within and outside Canada. A global health strategy would help to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the various actors and activities operating in global health. It would provide a clear focus for Canada’s global health goals, would mobilize and concentrate scarce human and monetary resources, and would provide a plan for how to reach Canada’s global health objectives. Without a strategy, Canada risks falling behind those consequential countries that already have or are likely to develop a strategy and it will be more difficult for Canada to compete and partner effectively with leaders in the field.

1 The authors gratefully acknowledge the research assistance of Caroline Bracht, Robin Lennox, Julia Kulik and Sophie Langlois.
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Executive Summary

Health is increasingly a global issue. National health challenges often have global sources and their solutions thus require global responses. Canada and its citizens are vulnerable to health challenges from abroad. And Canadians are committed to achieving better health outcomes at home and abroad for all.

For decades Canada has played an active role in global health. It has developed several health strategies to address a variety of health challenges. It has worked with governments, non-governmental organizations, businesses and academics to improve health outcomes. Canada has participated in numerous global forums to craft global health initiatives and commitments. And Canada has committed significant resources to improve the health and safety of Canadians and citizens abroad.

In the current climate Canada needs a global health strategy. There is an increasing number of health threats as well as greater mobility of individuals and health workers. Resources are limited and need to be used in the most effective and efficient manner possible. Research on global health challenges, trends and approaches has proliferated in recent decades and it is now understood that coordinated, global approaches are necessary for the effective governance of health. Canada is hosting three international summits in 2010 where it will have an opportunity to lead on global health. There has been a push for stronger accountability in the international system to ensure that countries, including Canada, are keeping their global health commitments. Other countries have already developed global health strategies, which have proven useful for mobilizing resources, setting clear priorities and improving internal collaboration, coordination, efficiency and effectiveness. And while governments have continued to focus attention and resources on global health challenges, the number of people inflicted with disease has continued to increase and thus an adequate global health response is still required.

Many benefits would arise from developing a Canadian global health strategy. It would lead to improved health in Canada and globally. It would provide Canadian global health actors with a better understanding of the health activities currently underway. It would provide greater transparency regarding Canada’s global health priorities and objectives. It would help Canada focus on which activities should be enhanced, eliminated or reformed in resource-constrained times. It would support collaboration, coordination and cooperation among the many departments, agencies and other actors that deal with health in Canada, fostering a more coherent and cost-effective approach. It would strengthen national security and international partnerships. It would mobilize more resources by giving Canadian and international actors clear, compelling priorities to support on a broad scale. It would ensure that Canada could respond effectively to the unexpected health crises that will inevitably arise. It would offer an opportunity for Canadians and others to cultivate a global health regime that supports Canada’s
interests and values. It would advance Canada’s foreign policy and international economic development goals.

Several costs also could arise from a Canadian global health strategy. It will take time and resources to develop a global health strategy. It could generate conflicts over whether there should be a strategy, what it should contain, who should be involved and who should lead. It could divert attention away from problems that also require attention. It could require a modification of mandates or operating procedures for certain actors. It could complicate relationships between different levels of government, departments or other actors.

Risks could also arise if the strategy is not developed properly. If the strategy is too inflexible, general, under-ambitious or over-ambitious, it could be ineffective. Satisficing, log rolling and accountability demands could all have potential negative affects as well. However, several measures could mitigate these costs and risks.

Canada’s global health strategy could focus on the health-related Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), the global health issues that have already had a significant impact on Canadians at home, the international issues or institutions where Canada plays a significant role, the global health commitments that Canada has already made but not yet met, niche areas where Canada has medical and research expertise, neglected topics where Canada could carve out a leadership role, or health issues that are critical in countries where Canada has a key foreign policy or development interest. Any one or combination of these factors could form the core of a Canadian global health strategy.

Available evidence suggests that Canada should develop a global health strategy and that the strategy should be commenced as soon as possible.
**Introduction**

*There is an increasing range of health issues that transcend national boundaries and require action on the global forces that determine the health of people. The broad political, social and economic implications of health issues have brought more diplomats into the health arena and more public health experts into the world of diplomacy. Simple classifications of policy and politics — domestic and foreign, hard and soft, or high and low — no longer apply.*

— Ilona Kickbusch, Gaudenz Silberschmidt and Paulo Buss

Since the 2000 G8 Okinawa Summit, there has been a significant shift in global health. The number of actors in the field has grown exponentially (Orbinski 2007). International health commitments have expanded in number and ambition (Guebert 2009; Sridhar 2009). Financial pledges to global health have risen substantially (see Appendix A; Fallon and Gayle 2010). Global health has increasingly been a priority for international development and a key component of foreign policy, security, trade and the environment.

At the same time, countries recognize that challenges to public health and safety at home often have global sources and that their solutions thus require global responses. The recent outbreaks of severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) and the H5N1 and H1N1 influenza viruses have dramatically shown Canadians and others how countries and societies are now integrally interdependent (Sridhar 2009; Fidler 2004). Canada and its citizens are vulnerable at home to diseases, pathogens, toxic contaminants and the effects of climate change that cross borders via the atmosphere, humans, animals, wildlife and imported food. Food safety in Canada depends partially on the regulatory structures of other countries (as in the case of melamine in Chinese baby food exports, the emergence and spread of bovine spongiform encephalopathy [BSE], and the use or non-use of bovine growth hormone in beef). The effects of climate change in Canada are largely due to human activities outside Canada. The 2.5 million Canadians who live abroad, the 50 million Canadians who travel abroad and the 250,000 citizens who migrate to Canada every year are vulnerable to abundant health risks beyond Canada’s borders, some of which they bring with them when they return (Cannon 2010; Canada, Department of Citizenship and Immigration 2009).

Canada’s role in global health has grown. Pathogens and health “problems without passports” have diminished the ability of governments to protect their people by erecting defences at their borders. This is especially the case for Canada, which has one of the longest land borders and the longest coastline in the world. Health issues must thus be dealt with at their source, anywhere in the world, before disease can erupt, spread and intrude into Canadians’ homes. At the same time, Canada remains committed to improving the health of all people, particularly the poorest and most vulnerable, in the world outside.
Various actors involved in global health within and outside Canada have cooperated on past projects. But Canada has no overarching global health strategy to guide a more comprehensive, collaborative and coordinated approach. Such coordinated responses for global and domestic action have become critical to solving many “national” health problems (Switzerland, Federal Department of Home Affairs and Federal Department of Foreign Affairs [FDHA/FDFA] 2006). Thus an inclusive, coherent global health strategy is critical to governing health. Several consequential countries and communities close to Canada have already developed their own global health strategies, among them the United Kingdom, the European Union and Switzerland. Other significant countries including the United States are working toward one (Ali and Narayan 2009; Fallon and Gayle 2010). Now is the time for Canada to identify the benefits, costs and risks of such a strategy to determine whether and why Canada should develop one of its own.
Canadian Principles for Global Health

The case for developing a Canadian global health strategy is supported by the consistency and coherence of the basic health-related principles that have been highlighted by Canadian governments led by both major political parties in their defining doctrines of national and international policy since 1945.2

- The first, fundamental principle, appearing since 1949, is a high-quality national healthcare program, equally benefiting all Canadians regardless of economic status.
- The second principle, first appearing in 1957, is the agricultural–health pathway, which has been a development priority that includes food, agriculture, famine relief (as in Ethiopia in 1984) and, by 2010, nutrition for children’s and maternal health abroad as well as a domestic priority involving food safety.
- The third principle, arising first in 1967, is the link between the environment and health, and the resulting need for a multi-stakeholder partnership among government, academics and the private sector; by 2002 climate change appeared as the key environmental element affecting health.
- The fourth principle, emerging in 1970 in the wake of the Nigerian civil war, is the international–domestic link, affirming that Canadians’ health cannot be protected if infection is rampant in other parts of the world.
- The sixth principle, foreshadowed in 1957, is the high priority afforded to the institutions of the United Nations and instruments of Canadian official development assistance (ODA), with a recent focus on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), a possible G20 summit on health, access to affordable medicines, the creation of the Public Health Agency of Canada (PHAC) in 2004 and the prominent place of children’s and maternal health on the agenda of the Canadian-hosted G8 summit in 2010.

There is thus a cumulatively clear, consistent, coherent, comprehensive set of core principles on which a Canadian global health strategy can now be built.

---

2 The analysis of Canadian principles relevant to global health was based on a systematic review of health-related passages in the Speeches from the Throne and major foreign policy statements issued by the Government of Canada since 1947.
Global Health Strategies and Canada

Current Health Strategies in Canada

The Canadian government has long led in advancing important global health initiatives. When the World Health Organization (WHO) was established, Dr. Brock Chisholm — a former Canadian deputy minister of health — was appointed as the first head. During the framing of the WHO constitution, a Canadian delegate aptly argued for broad and inclusive membership in the organization, stating:

We cannot afford to have gaps in the fence against disease; and any country, no matter what its political attitudes or affiliations are, can be a serious detriment to the effectiveness of the World Health Organization if it is left outside. It is important that health should be regarded as a world-wide question, quite independent of political attitudes in any country in the world (Sharp 1947).

Canada has subsequently developed specific strategies to address individual health challenges. They cover a wide range of demographic groups including youth, aboriginal people and women; diseases including diabetes and cancer; mental health; the determinants of health including food; and animal safety (Health Canada 1999; PHAC 2005, 2007, 2008a; Mental Health Commission of Canada undated-a, undated-b; Government of Canada 2008b). These strategies have largely been internally oriented, but have been influenced by or have contained an inherent international dimension. Canadian stakeholders have suggested that Canada should develop additional health strategies. These include a global health strategy for indigenous peoples and a Canadian global health strategy (Smylie 2004; Singer 2009).

Canada currently invests approximately $550 million annually on global health initiatives (Singer 2009). Federal, provincial and territorial departments and agencies have devoted substantial resources to developing and implementing strategies to tackle specific global health challenges. These include G8 health action plans and pandemic plans — particularly since the SARS outbreak in 2003, the H5N1 scare in the mid 2000s and the recent H1N1 pandemic (Canada, Department of Finance 2006; PHAC 2010a, 2010b; G8 2003). Several research institutes in Canada, many strongly supported by Canadian government resources, have developed collaborative national and international partnerships on health initiatives as well (Canadian Institutes of Health Research [CIHR] 2002; Health Research Council of New Zealand 2009; CIHR 2008; Ray, Daar, Singer and Thorsteinsdóttir 2009).

Canada has taken a leadership role in hosting meetings on global health. It hosted the first meeting of the Global Health Security Initiative (GHSI) in November 2001 (GHSI 2001). In October 2005, Canada convened an international
meeting to collaborate and coordinate pandemic influenza preparedness (DFAIT 2009). Canada is also one of five independent industrialized countries often called on to chair or mediate delicate global health negotiations (Silberschmidt 2009).

A Canadian global health strategy could thus strengthen, improve and foster comprehension, communication and coherence among this rich array of component sectoral strategies and partnerships. It could avoid unnecessary duplication and mobilize actors to work together for maximum impact in meeting Canada’s global and national health goals.

**Major Players in Global Health in Canada**

Within Canada, many actors play a key role in global health (see Appendix B). At the international and regional levels, Canada has a role in many intergovernmental institutions involved in global health (see Appendix C). Given the number and diversity of these institutions, there are benefits in having Canadian participation in each flow from a single global health strategy at home.

Within civil society and the private sector, there are many academic, research, business and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) — nationally oriented, transnational in nature or linked internationally — that are dedicated to global health. For example, Canadian civil society organizations such as the Canadian Public Health Association (CPHA) worked with the WHO and many international governmental and non-governmental partners to establish the 1986 Ottawa Charter for Health Promotion. This seminal international charter focused on enabling people to increase control over their health and on building healthy public policy across all domains of government beyond the health sector. Led by Canadian civil society through the 1990s and now into the 21st century, this charter has resulted in the globally successful Healthy Cities project that looks at environmental aspects of sustainable urban development as a determinant of health (Kickbusch 1989). In 2005, an offshoot of this process produced the domestically successful BC Healthy Communities Project, an initiative to build capacity for healthy thriving and resilient communities in Ontario, New Brunswick and Quebec (see <www.bchealthycommunities.ca>).

**Motivation for Canadian Action on Global Health**

Canadians have been motivated to act on global health as a result of the direct impact of global health challenges, such as pandemic disease, food safety and security, and climate change on health at home and abroad as well as by the international and domestic application of the core values that Canadians share. Many Canadians suffer from infectious and chronic diseases, many of which have spread from other countries (see Appendix D). Canadians want to maintain and improve their health and, at the same time, the health of others around the world (see Appendix E; International Development Research Centre [IDRC] 2008).
Beyond self-interest and altruism, Canadians increasingly recognize the interdependence of the health of people at home and the health of people abroad. Protecting the health and safety of Canadians has been a deep and durable priority of the Canadian government for decades. Canada spends 10.1% of its gross domestic product (GDP) on health — one of the highest in the world (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD] 2009b). The government has long pursued a foreign policy that reflects Canadians’ values of democracy, peace and equity and its distinctive national values of antimilitarism, environmentalism, openness, multiculturalism, globalism and international institutionalism (Singer 2010; Kirton 2007). This pursuit has led to supporting actions and initiatives on global health, such as the Global Polio Eradication Initiative (GPEI) since 1985, the MDGs since 2000, the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria since 2002, the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC) since 2003 and the International Health Regulations (IHR), which Canada was involved in negotiating and revising since 2004 and which entered into force in 2007. Numerous bilateral initiatives have been taken as well (see Appendix A).

Increasingly, the government has recognized that Canada’s interests are connected with the rest of the world (Government of Canada 2010). Thus actions on global health not only promote Canadians’ values and a broad range of Canadian interests, but are also necessary to directly protect Canadians’ own health.

The Need for a Strategy Now

Now is the time for Canada to develop its own global health strategy. Countries cannot govern health adequately on their own (United Kingdom, HM Government 2008; Cooper, Kirton and Schrecker 2007). Infectious diseases do not respect borders and therefore collaboration to deal with health threats at their distant source is necessary for a successful response. Development strategies are integral to advancing democracy and human rights, to creating a more prosperous, democratic and equitable world, to stopping and preventing terrorism, to building a stable global economy, to stopping and preventing conflicts, and to preventing and containing global pandemics (Clinton 2010).

All states, including Canada, have become increasing vulnerable to global health threats (Fischer 2009). This vulnerability became clear after the anthrax attacks in the United States immediately following the attacks of September 11, 2001, and the cases of SARS, H5N1 and H1N1 (Bennett 2009; Chan 2009a, 2009b; Global Health Security Initiative 2009). Canada is also vulnerable to the looming health impacts of climate change, such as increasing incidence of malaria (Berrang-Ford et al. 2009).

Demand for attention to global health and international health standards has been increasing due to the increased mobility of individuals and health workers
(through migration and travel), rising costs, increasing scientific knowledge and the growing technical complexity of health challenges and capacity to respond to those challenges (FDHA/FDFA 2006). By placing more emphasis on health abroad, Canada can help to limit diseases from spreading to its territory. More collaboration and regulation on food and product safety challenges such as BSE and avian influenza will help limit the negative health, trade and economic impacts that can result. For example, it is estimated that $1.5 billion was lost in economic revenue in Ontario alone as a result of SARS (Price-Smith 2009). Better collaboration and cooperation could prevent or at least limit similar impacts in the future. Both the awareness of global health challenges and global health research have increased and much more is known about the interconnectedness and interdependence of health challenges (Kirton 2009). There is thus more evidence to support the development of a global health strategy now.

In 2010, Canada has a unique opportunity to play a leadership role on global health as it will host the G8 summit in Muskoka and the G20 summit in Toronto in June and the North American Leaders’ Summit in September. The Prime Minister has already declared that children’s and maternal health is a top priority for the G8 Muskoka Summit. A strategy could support the initiatives that have already been put forward at Muskoka and other international meetings.

A strategy could also help keep Canada and others accountable to their past and future health commitments, including the MDGs, which remain far from being reached. As the Prime Minister said at the World Economic Forum in January 2010, “Accountability … is the prerequisite for progress” (Harper 2010b). A global health strategy could help Canada reach the MDGs by their 2015 deadline (HM Government 2008). It could also assist in ensuring accountability on Canada’s commitments made in a broad array of international forums in recent years.

Other countries have recently recognized the benefits of developing a global health strategy. The growing number includes some of Canada’s closest international partners. Switzerland, now one of Canada’s free trade partners, was the first to adopt a global health strategy, doing so in October 2006 (Sridhar 2009; FDHA/FDFA 2006). The United Kingdom and European Union adopted strategies in 2007 and 2008 respectively (Commission of the European Communities 2007; HM Government 2008). The United States, China and Brazil are currently considering similar policies (Kickbusch and Erk 2009; Ali and Narayan 2009; Fallon and Gayle 2010). Norway, which allocates the highest percentage of GDP to ODA and has taken the lead in pushing countries to reach MDGs 4 and 5, is considered one of the most active countries in global health (Silberschmidt 2009). To be competitive with its peers and to partner effectively with them, Canada needs its own global health strategy.

Moreover, Canada should develop a global health strategy because the world simply will not wait. Population growth, climate–health impacts and the spread of infectious disease will not improve unless drastic measures are taken to prevent
and stop them. The health, economy, security and stability of many at home and abroad will suffer greatly without action.

### Why Now?

1. Vulnerability to global health threats has increased.
2. Individuals and health workers are more mobile.
3. Better, more effective use of scarce resources is needed in today's time of restraint.
4. More is known about the interdependencies, intersections and impacts of health.
5. Canada will host three major summits in 2010 at which global health could be a focal point.
6. Increased accountability for compliance on health commitments is needed.
7. More countries are developing global health strategies.
8. The world will not wait.

A global health strategy would help ensure the health and safety of Canadians. It would strengthen progress and plans for future actions. It would help outline Canada's short-, medium- and long-term global health goals and ensure that the individual health-related commitments Canada makes in international forums and at home are consistent and coherent parts of an overall approach. It would help render consistent and synergistic provincial, national and international plans. It would provide a mechanism for better coordination. It would clearly set out Canada's global health priorities so that all the actors involved have a clear understanding of Canada's objectives. It would enable Canada to take a more proactive role on global health (as opposed to a reactionary and defensive one). It would provide more effective and efficient responses that are increasingly needed to save and enhance human lives and to reduce the soaring social and economic costs both in Canada and abroad (Kates, Fischer and Lief 2009).

### Benefits, Costs and Risks of a Strategy

There are benefits, costs and risks that could come from developing a Canadian global health strategy (see also Appendix F).

#### Benefits

Canada could derive many benefits from the process of developing a Canadian global health strategy as well as from the strategy itself. A global health strategy would lead to better health in Canada and abroad (World Vision International 2009; HM Government 2008). It would provide the various Canadian actors involved in global health with a clearer understanding of what their relevant colleagues are currently doing. It would provide greater transparency and a clear framework of what Canada’s global health priorities are, how Canada plans to meet them and what each actor’s role should be. This framework would also help to focus research efforts. It would provide guidelines for collaboration, coordination
and cooperation particularly among actors from non-health areas and those with traditional health backgrounds. It would improve internal cooperation and provide shared objectives and better clarity for all Canadian actors in the field of global health and the Canadian public as a whole (FDHA/FDFA 2005). It could help to build stronger partnerships with key international actors. It would help ensure that Canada is using its scarce resources to best effect. It would catalyze others, including philanthropists, to contribute more resources to defined, identified and compelling priorities. It would help improve preparation and response for unexpected health crises that will inevitably arise. It would promote Canadian interests and values (see Appendix E). And it would help to ensure that Canada meets its foreign policy and international development goals.

### Benefits

1. Improved health in Canada and globally.
2. Clearer understanding of current and relevant global health activities.
4. Clear framework of Canada’s global health priorities.
5. Guidelines for collaboration, coordination and cooperation.
6. Strengthened international partnerships.
7. More effective and innovative application of resources.
9. Promotion of Canadian interests and values.
10. Support for Canadian foreign policy and international development goals.

### Costs

A global health strategy will bring some costs to Canada. It will take time and resources to develop. There will be potentially conflict-generating conversations about whether such a strategy is necessary, how it should be done, who should lead, what the role of each actor is and what the common priority goals should be. The process of developing the strategy could divert attention from other individual and immediate problems. It may require some actors to change their missions, expertise and even authorizing legislation to play their full intended part as an integral component of the larger whole. It might also require that an analysis of current commitments and component strategies be conducted, which would be time consuming and would delay progress. Canada’s complex federal system also adds complications.

---

3 Because there is a diverse array of actors involved in global health in Canada, conflicting or competing objectives may arise. For example, actors in trade may have different views and objectives from those in development, complicating the treatment of issues such as access to affordable medicines (Silberschmidt 2009). Similarly, environmental actors and health actors may have different views on the use of dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (DDT) to fight malaria. These varying views will be challenging to overcome.
Costs
1. Time and resources.
2. Conflict-generating conversations.
3. Diverted attention from individual and immediate problems.
4. Possible changes for actors’ missions, expertise and authorizing legislation.
5. Time-consuming analysis of current commitments and component strategies.
6. Complications from federal-provincial relations.

Risks
As with any new development, there are potential risks to developing a global health strategy. Inflexibility in policy and resource investment could result from developing a fixed comprehensive approach. This in turn would make it more difficult for Canada to shift its priorities after putting a public global health strategy in place. An emerging crisis that requires immediate attention might be ignored or dealt with inappropriately or inadequately as a result. At the other end of the scale, there is the danger of setting objectives that are too general in scope or provide insufficient guidance. Such generality may contribute to confusion due to multiple interpretations. Under-ambition could result from a consensus that rests at the lowest common denominator or defines global health too narrowly. Over-ambition may result from defining global health too broadly. A poorly designed global health strategy could alienate key actors that should be involved in the process, causing further division and inconsistency. There is also a chance of overcrowding, with too many actors diluting the usefulness of such an exercise or making it unmanageable. Satisficing could result as actors may meet merely the minimum requirements to comply with their obligations, preventing more ambitious commitments from being achieved. Log rolling — exchanging favours to mutual benefit — could cause incoherence and synthetic, forced synergies. There is also the risk that existing commitments could be disregarded. The specification of goals in a global health strategy could imply that they trump older, but still important, commitments.

Risks
1. Inflexibility.
2. Generality.
4. Over-ambition.
5. Alienation.
6. Overcrowding
7. Satisficing.
8. Log rolling.
9. Diverted or neglected attention to existing commitments.
Cost and Risk Mitigation Measures
Measures can be taken to mitigate the costs and risks involved in a global health strategy.

First, a list of all the possible costs and risks should be identified. This will ensure that measures are taken to prevent or reduce them.

Second, the global health strategy should be properly thought through. An exercise undertaken in haste is more likely to produce unintended risks and costs.

Third, all the relevant actors should be included in developing a global health strategy. A comprehensive and consultative approach will help guarantee a sense of inclusiveness and a coherent, synergistic and successful strategy. Any competing, inconsistent on irrelevant proposals can be tackled at an early stage.

Fourth, goals and limitations should be clearly identified at the outset. The articulation of why a global health strategy is desirable and what it aims to achieve is critical to creating a coherent and useful strategy.

Fifth, it is important to identify who will supply the resources necessary to developing the global health strategy.

Sixth, the global health strategy needs to be properly balanced. It needs to be sufficiently flexible to adapt to emerging crises, yet be bound in such a way that it is clear, concise and constraining in what it hopes to achieve.

Seventh, it must respect existing commitments and support their implementation. Doing so will uphold the integrity of the actors involved in developing the global health strategy and keep them accountable for their past promises.

Potential Areas for Action and Initiative
Canada’s global health strategy could focus on several subjects, in particular the following:

- The health-related MDGs that deal with children’s and maternal health, which the Prime Minister has already set as one of Canada’s priorities for the G8 Muskoka Summit (Harper 2009, 2010a; Government of Canada 2010).
- Global health issues that have already significantly affected Canadians at home, such as West Nile virus, SARS, BSE and H1N1 (see Appendix D; Maioni 2008; Bennett 2009; Price-Smith 2009; Chan 2009a, 2009b; PHAC 2009d, 2010b).
- Those international issues or institutions where Canada has played a significant role in the past, such as the Global Fund, polio, the International AIDS Vaccine Initiative (IAVI), tuberculosis, the GAVI Alliance, the International Partnership for Microbicides, infant and child health, maternal health, micronutrient deficiencies and the strengthening of health systems (see Appendix A; Government of Canada 2008a; Kirton and Guebert 2010a; Singer 2009; Cannon 2010).
• Other health commitments already made on the global stage but not yet met, such as pledges made at the G8 summit (Guebert 2009).
• Any niche where Canada has medical and research expertise, such as diabetes or global health research (Phillips 2001; CNW Group 2009a; Singer 2009).
• The identification of a neglected topic where Canada could carve out a leadership role, such as global health diplomacy, neglected tropical diseases, food security, gender equality, the definition of global public health goods or innovation (Singer 2009).
• Health issues that are critical in countries where Canada has a key foreign policy and development interest, notably Afghanistan, Haiti, the Dominican Republic, India, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua (see Appendices A and G).
Components of a Canadian Global Health Strategy

Canadian Priorities
A Canadian global health strategy will reduce pandemic risk and improve the health and safety of Canadians at home and abroad. It will help ensure that Canadians are protected from security threats such as bioterrorism. It will foster innovation in global health. It will help Canada plan and protect its citizens against the negative health-related effects of climate change, unsafe food and products, and migration (Berrang-Ford et al. 2009; Kirton and Guebert 2010b).

A global health strategy will also express Canadians’ interests and values abroad. Canadians believe that health care is one of the most important domains that politicians should address. In repeated public opinion surveys, Canadians have identified health care as the most important (or one of the most important) issues for politicians to deliberate on. Canadians approve of them doing so abroad as well as at home (see Appendix E; Bildook 2008; Public Works and Government Services Canada 2008; Robbins SCE Research 2010; Association of Faculties of Medicine of Canada et al. 2010).

As an integral part of protecting Canadians’ health and promoting their interests and values, a global health strategy will help meet Canadians’ international responsibilities in the many communities that they share with others. These responsibilities start geographically with the North American and Arctic communities and extend to the Americas, the Atlantic and Asia Pacific regions, Africa through the Commonwealth and Francophonie, and the global community as a whole.

Canada has also committed to solving global health challenges in a variety of international forums over the past decades. Many of these commitments still need to be fulfilled. In addition to the MDGs and commitments made at G8 summits, promises made at Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) summits and at Commonwealth and la Francophonie heads of government meetings, Canada has bilateral commitments with countries including Afghanistan, Haiti and Sudan (CIDA 2009a). Canada could use a global health strategy to help meet these objectives in a reasonable and responsible way.

Global Demands
Many actors have devoted time and resources to developing and using global health strategies because many health challenges are increasing, are often inherently global and therefore require global coordination in response (FDHA/FDFA 2006; HM Government 2008; Commission of the European Communities 2007; Sridhar 2009).

There has also been an increasing recognition that non-health influences actors from abroad — especially those that are inherently and fully global — can severely
affect human health (Sridhar 2009; HM Government 2008; Kirton and Guebert 2010b). Non-health influence begin with climate change, food and agriculture, trade and migration. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has identified numerous connections between climate change and health (see Appendix H; IPCC 2007a, 2007b). A 2007 survey showed that 82% of Canadians were concerned with “climate change and its impact on health” (Canadian Medical Association 2007).

The food and agriculture–health connection was highlighted by recent experiences with BSE, H5N1 and H1N1 (Government of Canada 2008b).

The Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property (TRIPS) at the World Trade Organization (WTO) forged a necessary collaboration between trade and health, while Canada’s growing array of bilateral free trade agreements intensify the trade-health connection as well (DFAIT 2010a; see Appendix G).

The migration of health workers remains a challenge for countries of origin, many of which are already suffering from major deficiencies in health workers (WHO 2007). Canada is home to more than 15,000 scientific and health-related professionals from developing countries (Singer 2010). There is also the possibility that current and prospective Canadians and other citizens who enter or immigrate to Canada can bring illness contracted abroad that may spread (Kirton and Guebert 2010b).

The levels and trends in some major communicable diseases such as HIV/AIDS, and non-communicable diseases such as diabetes, obesity, cancer and tobacco-related illnesses have risen and are predicted to continue to rise (see Appendix D; WHO 2006, 2009).

The public has increasingly demanded that governments justify their spending, particularly in recent times when resources have become limited (Clinton 2010). Global health strategies provide a tool for governments to communicate why it is important to spend money on global health initiatives and to clearly indicate where funding is allocated.

**Canada’s Comparative Advantage**

Canada can contribute to global health and improve its impact on the health of Canadians and others through international leadership, accepting global responsibilities and expanding its international influence. Canada has a strong and capable community of health professionals, facilities, research, development, innovation and training to mobilize in a coordinated way (Singer 2009). Canada’s academic institutions, private sector innovators, civil society actors and organizations, and research bodies, led by the CIHR and IDRC, can all contribute to a strong Canadian global health strategy (Singer 2010; Canadians for Health Research 2008).

Canada can contribute financially to global health through public sector, private sector, civil society and other non-governmental disbursements, including
to those global initiatives where Canada has already made a leading contribution (see Appendix A; CIDA 2009a).

Canada can lead on global health issues in key international institutions, starting with the hosting of the G8, G20 and North American Leaders’ Summit in 2010. Canada has already made health a priority of the G8 Muskoka Summit in June. The stated topic of children’s and maternal health could also be discussed with the G20, which deals with the health-related issues of finance, trade, food security and development (Silberschmidt 2009; Kirton and Guebert 2010a). At the North American Leaders’ Summit in September, a continued discussion of pandemic preparedness and planning and best practices would be useful (Kirton and Guebert 2010c, 2010d).

Canada could build on its global health leadership by seeking to appoint respected officials to the executive boards and senior staffs of health-related international organizations of consequence, including the WHO, Pan American Health Organization (PAHO) and the OECD. It could encourage any new international health organizations that arise to locate their secretariats in Canada. It could make sure that Canadian representatives at health-related meetings of consequence includes high-level officials. It can draw on the Canadian experience of those who are already in positions of power, and those such as WHO director Margaret Chan, who obtained her medical degree from the University of Western Ontario.

Canada could also lead in creating a platform to explore and support innovation as it applies to global health. This would mean recognizing that innovation includes seeking success through experimentation while accepting that risk is a necessary component of innovation, because tolerance for failure is a learning stage in developing genuinely effective new global health initiatives and strategies. Such a process would draw from domestic and international civil society actors, the private sector, academia, philanthropic entities, and governmental and intergovernmental bodies to explore and experiment with the factors, actors and enablers that can lead to resilient and healthy individuals and communities domestically and globally.

Canada could also consider identifying specific responsibilities and assuming leadership in neighbouring and strategic regions, including the Arctic, the North American community, Haiti and Afghanistan. Within these areas, it should focus on the most vulnerable first.

**Canada’s Partners**

With regard to a partnership strategy, several lessons can be learned from the evidence and cases of what others have done (see Appendix I).

First, it is important to establish why a strategy would be useful and beneficial in Canada. This report and the companion one written by Ronald Labonté and Michelle Gagnon (2010), as well as others exploring a Canadian global health
strategy, should be shared with the various Canadian global health actors. Their comments and questions should be taken into consideration and explored further where necessary.

Second, Canada should determine the factors driving it to consider a national global health strategy. Two main aims drove the UK to develop its global health strategy: “to use health as an agent for good in foreign policy” and to ensure more transparency and clarity on the impact of foreign and domestic policies on global health (Sridhar 2009). Switzerland, which hosts the WHO in Geneva, recognized that internationally coordinated responses were required in health; these two factors drove it to develop a global health strategy (Sridhar 2009). Others have suggested that the search for effective ways to use scarce resources was a key driver. New research and evidence that highlighted the effectiveness and benefits of more integrated and focused global health approaches also had an impact. A clear understanding of the reasons behind Canada’s desire for a strategy will help to frame the context and narrative of the overall policy.

Third, the main aims of the global health strategy must be identified. The UK’s “stability first” strategy targeted five actions: enhance global health security to improve economic and political stability; create stronger, fairer and safer systems to deliver health; make international organizations including the WHO and the EU more effective; engage in stronger, freer and fairer trade for better health; and strengthen the way the UK develops and uses evidence to improve policy and practice (HM Government 2008). The EU identified three main objectives: fostering good health in an aging Europe, protecting citizens from health threats and supporting dynamic health systems and new technologies (Commission of the European Communities 2007). The five main priorities of the Swiss government’s global health strategy are to protect national health interests from global health threats, including influenza pandemics, consumer health threats and non-communicable disease; harmonize national and international health policies; improve the effectiveness of international collaboration in the area of health; improve the global health situation; and safeguard Switzerland’s role as host country to international organizations and major companies working in health (FDHA/FDFA 2006). Canada can look to all these areas and objectives to see which should be adopted in a Canadian global health strategy. Certain ones, such a strengthening health systems, protecting citizens from global health threats and harmonizing national and international health policies, stand out as worthy candidates. Canada’s global health strategy should consider aims that are best suited to Canadian values and interests.

Fourth, the resources necessary for developing and executing the global health strategy must be determined. As with the EU and Switzerland, Canada need not necessarily find new resources at the outset. Funds could be drawn from existing individual global health initiatives. The global health strategy would therefore be reinforce the goals already targeted (Sridhar 2009). However, allocating new resources, as the UK did, would signal that Canada is serious about implementing
its strategy and committed to seeing it through. It could also help catalyze or mobilize funding from other sources.

Fifth, a global health strategy should identify one-year, five-year and 10- to 15-year initiatives. The strategy should be reviewed after each period with reports published publicly, including recommendations for future actions and changes. There should be a balance of specified and flexible initiatives, so that clear goals can be set. At the same time there should be room to adjust to any crises that might arise, such as the 2010 earthquakes in Haiti and Chile or a future influenza pandemic. A five-year approach as an initial base would be a suitable timeline, following the example of the UK, the EU and Switzerland. Starting in 2010/11, it would also fit within the MDG timeframe. It could also include shorter plans and longer plans, as in the U.S. strategy (Fallon and Gayle 2010).

Sixth, the strategy should build on Canada’s strengths in the academic, civil society, business and government sectors. It should also identify areas where Canada can improve and close critical gaps. It should specify what departments and agencies should be responsible for each initiative. It should also focus on merging non-health actors, such as those in trade, agriculture and the environment, and match them with those with relevant technical capacity, understanding and expertise in health.

Seventh, Canada should consider collaborating with other key actors, including those countries that have developed or are developing health strategies. It should continue to collaborate with long-standing partners starting with the WHO as the lead intergovernmental organization, and also with the UK, the U.S. and the EU. Canada should also encourage other countries to develop their own global health strategies, as part of a broad, globally coordinated approach.

Eighth, following the UK, Canada should consider appointing an independent, third-party body or office to review the success and effectiveness of a Canadian global health strategy. This same independent body should produce the progress reports and provide constructive advice on the next steps to ensure the strategy is implemented effectively.

Ninth, Canada should ensure that it remains open and transparent about conflicting interests that exist between departments and agencies, such as trade and development or environment and health. It should make it clear that it is ready to resolve discrepancies, or at least reduce differences, by clarifying roles and highlighting synergies. With the Canadian government already focused on accountability, this approach would strengthen its commitment to transparency.

Tenth, as with Switzerland’s strategy and its federal sensibilities, the Canadian government should use its global health strategy to improve the integration and synergies among provincial, national and international health policies. It should clearly specify which actor or actors should lead and which should play a supporting role on each initiative for better clarity, cooperation, coordination and cost effectiveness.
Specific steps for delivering a strategy following these guidelines are identified in Appendix J.

A more systematic survey should be undertaken to explore the potential impact of a Canadian global health strategy. Cross-Canada consultations should be undertaken with academics, NGOs, politicians, bureaucrats and members of the business and industry communities. New public opinion polls should be conducted. Interdepartmental workshops should be convened. International stakeholders, particularly those from consequential countries that have already developed global health strategies, should be included in these processes.
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Appendix A: Canada’s Global Health Contributions

Selected Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria</td>
<td>US$100 million (2002–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Alliance Vaccine Initiative (core funding)</td>
<td>US$149 million (2002–06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalytic Initiative to Save a Million Lives</td>
<td>CA$105 million (2007–12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avian and/or pandemic influenza</td>
<td>CA$1 billion (2006–11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilateral aid to India for the health sector</td>
<td>US$1 million (2006–07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilateral aid to Nigeria for the health sector</td>
<td>US$9 million (2006–07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilateral aid to Kenya for the health sector</td>
<td>US$3 million (2006–07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilateral aid to South Africa for the health sector</td>
<td>US$6 million (2006–07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilateral aid to Mozambique for the health sector</td>
<td>US$8 million (2006–07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilateral aid to Ethiopia for the health sector</td>
<td>US$37 million (2006–07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilateral aid to Zambia for the health sector</td>
<td>US$15 million (2006–07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilateral aid to Tanzania for the health sector</td>
<td>US$11 million (2006–07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilateral aid to Uganda for the health sector</td>
<td>US$1 million (2006–07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilateral aid to Pakistan for the health sector</td>
<td>US$7 million (2006–07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilateral aid to unspecified recipients for the health sector</td>
<td>US$358 million (2006–07)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Recipients

- Afghanistan
- Bangladesh
- Bolivia
- Ethiopia
- Haiti
- Honduras
- Indonesia
- Mali
- Mozambique
- Pakistan
- Peru
- Sudan
- Tanzania
- Ukraine
- West Bank and Gaza

Additional recent and current initiatives include support for:
- Responding to cholera outbreaks in Angola
- Community-based treatment of malaria and pneumonia in all African countries
- UNICEF’s Recovery of Vital Social Sector program in Iraq
- Support for the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, which includes funding to the Middle East and Eastern Europe
- Support for the Pan American Health Organization, which includes the Americas
- The CARE Canada program, which focuses on HIV/AIDS and assists Cambodia and Nepal, and others
- Asia-Pacific Strategy for Emerging Diseases, a component of the Canada-Asia Regional Emerging Infectious Disease Project (CAREID) in South East Asia and China
- Strengthening Health Systems, a World Health Organization project in Bozni-Herzegovina
- HIV/AIDS Harm Reduction, an Open Society Institute project in Russia, Ukraine and Georgia
- The World Bank’s Montenegro Health System Improvement Project
- Canadian Society for International Health’s Primary Health Care Policy Reform in the Balkans

Note: Canada announced in 2009 that it would focus 80% of bilateral resources in 20 countries of focus chosen according to real needs, capacity to benefit from aid and alignment with Canadian foreign policy priorities.
Sources: Global Polio Eradication Initiative (2010); Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (2010); GAVI Alliance (2010); Canada International Development Agency (2009b, 2009c, 2010); Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2009a); Canada, Department of Finance (2006).
Appendix B: Global Health Actors in Canada

- Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA)
- Canadian Institutes for Health Research (CIHR)
- Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)
- Department of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada
- Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) (formerly Department of External Affairs)
- Department of National Defence (DND)
- Environment Canada
- Health Canada
- Health Council of Canada
- Indian and Northern Affairs (INAC)
- Industry Canada
- International Development Research Council (IDRC)
- Prime Minister’s Office (PMO)
- Privy Council Office (PCO)
- Public Health Agency of Canada (PHAC)
- Public Safety Canada
Appendix C:
Canada’s Role in Regional and International Health-Related Organizations

International – Multilateral
• Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)
• Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS)
• United Nations General Assembly (UNGA)
• United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR)
• World Health Organization (WHO) and the World Health Assembly (WHA)
• World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)
• World Trade Organization (WTO)

International – Plurilateral
• Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC)
• Commonwealth
• Global Health Security Initiative (GHSI)
• Global Public Health Intelligence Network (GPHIN)
• Group of Eight (G8)
• La Francophonie
• Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)

Regional
• Arctic Council
• Commission for Environmental Cooperation of North America (CEC)
• North American Leaders’ Summit
• Pan American Health Organization (PAHO)
### Appendix D:
**Canadians Affected by Diseases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>West Nile Virus</th>
<th>Tuberculosis</th>
<th>HIV</th>
<th>AIDS</th>
<th>SARS</th>
<th>H1N1</th>
<th>Seasonal Influenza</th>
<th>Measles</th>
<th>Diabetes</th>
<th>Obesity</th>
<th>% of Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cases</td>
<td>Deaths</td>
<td>Cases</td>
<td>Deaths</td>
<td>Cases</td>
<td>Deaths</td>
<td>Cases</td>
<td>Deaths</td>
<td>Cases</td>
<td>Deaths</td>
<td>Cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1,997</td>
<td>1,466</td>
<td>912</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>2,018</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>2,109</td>
<td>1,755</td>
<td>1,292</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>2,012</td>
<td>1,829</td>
<td>1,412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>2,074</td>
<td>32,878</td>
<td>1,789</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1,931</td>
<td>2,948</td>
<td>1,651</td>
<td>1,501</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1,849</td>
<td>1,17</td>
<td>2,737</td>
<td>1,189</td>
<td>1,063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1,975</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2,471</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>473</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>2,293</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1,821</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>2,191</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>7,027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,724</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>2,105</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>265</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,154</td>
<td>~200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,773</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>2,217</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,771</td>
<td>~10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,104</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,666</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2,469</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>3,517</td>
<td>~10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1,481</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,613</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>2,482</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11,435</td>
<td>~10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,613</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,879</td>
<td>~10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2,496</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,422</td>
<td>~10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,654</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,133</td>
<td>~10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2215</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,577</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>2,452</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,256</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2,623</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,262</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33,477</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>39,044</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

SARS = severe acute respiratory syndrome.

a. Incidence rate is per 100,000. Numbers for 2008 are provisional.

b. The number of positive HIV test reports by year up to February 13, 2009. Annual data are unavailable for positive HIV test reports prior to 1995. Positive HIV test reports vary for cases under two years of age.

c. The number of reported AIDS cases by year of diagnosis goes to February 12, 2009, except for Quebec, for which no data are available after June 30, 2003.

d. In 2008–10 there has been an increase in cases due to pandemic (H1N1) 2009 influenza virus. The 2009–10 influenza season began on August 30, 2009. Cases include influenza A and B up to February 6, 2010.

e. Data for 2000–04 include adults ages 20–64. Data for 2005 and 2007 include adults over age 18.

f. Number of cases reported between 1985 and 1994.

### Appendix E:
Canadian Public Opinion on Health Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Poll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2004</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>Canadians believe their member of Parliament should be spending time on discussions of the Canada Health Act and its practical evolution in maintaining high standards of health care for all Canadians</td>
<td>RSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canadians approve the overall quality of healthcare services available</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2006</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harper was wrong not to attend the International AIDS conference</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2006</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canadians are not confident that Canada will have enough healthcare professionals in 10 years</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2006</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canadians believe that health services are best improved with increased numbers of health professionals</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2007</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canadians have been affected by an environmental health concern</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2007</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canadians have taken action to protect their health from the environment</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2007</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canadians think the federal government is doing enough to address environmental and health concerns</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2007</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canadians are concerned about environmental standards in other countries and impact on imported food</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2007</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canadians are concerned about climate change and its impact on health</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2007</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canadians are concerned about the potential for climate change to encourage spread of disease</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2007</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canadians are concerned about air pollution</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2007</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canadians are concerned about heat and sun exposure</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2007</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canadians are concerned with the use of herbicides and pesticides</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2007</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canadians are concerned with the effects of soil contamination on local fruits and vegetables</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2007</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canadians are concerned with water quality</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2007</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canadian approved of the overall quality of healthcare services available</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2007</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canadians believe it is important for government to help increase access to treatment for people with HIV/AIDS in developing countries</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2007</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canadians believe government’s foreign spending on HIV/AIDS is not enough</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2007</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canadians are concerned about HIV/AIDS when they think about global issues</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2007</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canadians believe if they can prevent people from getting infected with HIV they have a moral obligation to try</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2007</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canadians think government should do more to ensure people get HIV/AIDS treatment</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2008</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canadians think there is a shortage of doctors</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Poll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2008</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canadians think the government should address the shortage of doctors</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2009</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canadians strengthening public health care rather than expanding for-profit services</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2009</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canadians aged 15 and over reported being “very satisfied” or “somewhat satisfied” with the way overall healthcare services were provided</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2009</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canadians believe Canada should use its influence in hosting the G8 and G20 to reduce global child mortality</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2010</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canadians believe that Canada should be a global leader in global health and medical research</td>
<td>RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2010</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canadians think health and medical research makes an important contribution to the economy</td>
<td>RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2010</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canadians believe basic research should be supported by the government even if it brings no immediate benefit</td>
<td>RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2010</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Canadians think health care is the most important issue facing Canada today</td>
<td>RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2010</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Canadians think health care should be the top priority for Canadian leaders</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
IR=Ipsos Reid; NR = Nanos Research; RC = Research Canada; RSR=Robbins SCE Research.

Italics indicates polls related to international issues.

a. Canadian were asked to choose between discussions of the Canada Health Act and its practical evolution in maintaining high standards of health care for all Canadians (35%), the role of Canada’s Armed Forces in negotiations related to Canadian sovereignty and strategic missile defence with U.S. president George W. Bush (32%), the issue of Charter rights and specifically the rights of gay men and women to marry (3%), and the use of the employment insurance surplus of $50 billion to reduce negative impact of high employment insurance rates on employees and employers (34%).

b. Of 14 issue areas, health care was ranked third most important after the economy (32%) and the environment (13%).

c. The economy was ranked first (36%), followed by health care (23%), the environment (17%), and jobs and unemployment (16%).

Appendix F:
Benefits, Costs and Risks of a Global Health Strategy for Canada

Benefits
A global health strategy for Canada would:
• lead to better health in Canada and globally
• provide added value for each ministry involved
• improve the understanding of what is being done among Canadian actors and stakeholders
• improve effectiveness and efficiency, in terms of both financial and human resources
• provide a clear framework, aim and focus
• support Canada in meeting its domestic and international health objectives
• be an example of cooperation that could be followed in other areas, such as agriculture
• provide articulated and identifiable goals
• provide greater transparency on Canada’s global health goals and on actions taken to achieve them
• determine topics, subjects and research that might be explored
• address any competing objectives that exist within different departments or agencies
• coordinate and streamline the health-related departments and agencies
• ensure that Canada can respond to unexpected health-related crises
• ensure that Canada’s interests and values are reflected in its global health initiatives
• support Canada’s foreign policy and international economic and development goals
• strengthen national security through better partnerships at home and abroad
• respond to the desires of Canadians and stakeholders who want Canada to play a larger role in global health
• mobilize more resources by providing a centralized forum where all actors can identify opportunities for cooperation
• identify activities to be enhanced, eliminated or reformed during resource-constrained times
• help Canada coordinate best practices
• support Canada’s collaboration with partner countries that already have a global health strategy

Costs
Costs involved in a global health strategy include:
• financial and human resources to developing a strategy (staffing, consultations, etc.)
• diversion of resources and attention from other challenges
• possible adjustment or modification of missions among actors
• possible difficulty in agreeing on a comprehensive approach
• possible factions or divisions among actors involved
• delays in developing the strategy
• time-consuming analysis of existing commitments and component strategies
• potential requirement or modification of legislation to authorize the involvement of some actors or resources
• possible complications that arise from Canada’s complex federal system
**Risks**

Risks to Canada in having a global health strategy include:

- dissatisfaction among actors due to conflicting priorities
- alienation among actors
- overcrowding of actors
- possible unintended consequences, such as resources diverted from issues that need more attention
- negative consequences for other countries (such as seeking health providers from other countries)
- unwanted debates
- a strategy that is too rigid to be able to adapt to changing situations and needs
- a strategy that is under- or over-ambitious
- a strategy that does not include all the relevant actors
- a strategy that is too general or insufficiently focused
- limits to coherence in investments
- satisficing
- log rolling
- failure to achieve declared goals
- failure to fulfil expectations and satisfy demands for accountability
- disregard for existing commitments in favour of new priorities or pledges
- reduced competition among health actors

Note: This is a compilation of points identified through research of published materials, key interviews and brainstorming exercises.
Appendix G: Canada’s Free Trade Agreements

Canada has free trade agreements with the following:
• Chile
• Colombia
• Costa Rica
• Iceland (Canada-European Free Trade Association)
• Israel
• Jordan
• Liechtenstein (Canada-European Free Trade Association)
• Mexico (North American Free Trade Agreement)
• Norway (Canada-European Free Trade Association)
• Panama
• Peru
• Switzerland (Canada-European Free Trade Association)
• United States (North American Free Trade Agreement and previously the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement)

Canada is negotiating free trade agreements with the following:
• Americas
• Andean Community
• Caribbean Community
• Centre American Four — El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua
• Dominican Republic
• European Union
• India
• Korea
• Morocco
• Singapore
• Ukraine

Source: Canada, Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (2010b).
### Appendix H:
**Effects of Climate Change on Human Health Identified by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very High Confidence</th>
<th>High Confidence</th>
<th>Medium Confidence</th>
<th>Low Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate change contributes to global burden of disease and premature deaths</td>
<td>Emerging evidence shows that climate change has altered seasonal distribution of some allergenic pollen species</td>
<td>Emerging evidence shows climate change has altered distribution of some infectious disease vectors</td>
<td>Projected trends will increase number of people at risk of dengue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected trends will affect malaria: contract in some areas and expand in others; transmission season may change</td>
<td>Projected trends will increase malnutrition and consequent disorders, including those relating to child growth and development</td>
<td>Emerging evidence shows that climate change has increased deaths related to heat waves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development is component of adaptation but cannot insulate population from disease and injury due to climate change</td>
<td>Projected trends will increase the number of people suffering from death, disease and injury from heat waves, floods, storms, fires and droughts</td>
<td>Projected trends will increase burden of diarrheal diseases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projected trends will change range of some infectious disease vectors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projected trends will increase cardiorespiratory morbidity and mortality associated with ground-level ozone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projected trends will bring some benefits to health, fewer deaths from cold, but likely outweighed by negative effects of rising temperatures, especially in developing countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adaptive capacity needs to be improved; impacts of recent hurricanes and heat waves show that even high-income countries not well prepared for extreme weather events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adverse health impacts will be greatest in low-income countries and, in all countries, on urban poor, elderly, children, traditional societies, subsistence farmers and coastal populations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (2007b).
## Appendix I: Comparison of National Global Health Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles</th>
<th>Britain</th>
<th>Switzerland</th>
<th>European Union</th>
<th>United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Do no harm; evaluate impact of domestic and foreign policies on global health to ensure intentions are fulfilled</td>
<td>• Based on shared health values</td>
<td>• Consider health the greatest wealth</td>
<td>• Match ambitions with long-term commitments at the highest levels of US leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Base global health policies and practice on evidence; develop evidence where it does not exist</td>
<td>• Consider Health in All Policies (HIAP)</td>
<td>• Strengthen the EU’s voice in global health</td>
<td>• “Trust but verify”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use health as agent for good, recognizing it can promote a low-carbon, high-growth global economy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Build on existing successes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promote global health outcomes that support the MDGs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Prioritize prevention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promote health equity through foreign and domestic policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Be targeted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure effects of foreign and domestic policies on global health are explicit; ensure transparency on conflicts between the policy objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Embed global health investments within larger development enterprise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work for leadership through reformed, strengthened institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learn from other countries’ policies and experience to improve population health and healthcare delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Protect health by tackling health challenges that begin abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work with other governments, multilateral agencies, civil society and business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Better global health security</td>
<td>• Protect health interests of the Swiss population</td>
<td>• Fostering good health in an aging Europe</td>
<td>• Maintain commitment to fight against HIV/AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stronger, fairer and safer systems to deliver health</td>
<td>• Harmonize national and international health policies</td>
<td>• Protecting citizens from health threats</td>
<td>• Prioritize women and children in US global health efforts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More effective international health organizations</td>
<td>• Improve effectiveness of international collaboration in health</td>
<td>• Supporting dynamic health systems and new technologies</td>
<td>• Strengthen prevention and capabilities to manage health emergencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stronger, freer and fairer trade for better health</td>
<td>• Improve global health situation</td>
<td>• Strengthening of the way evidence is developed and used to improve policy and practice</td>
<td>• Ensure the United States has capacity to match global health ambitions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strengthening of the way evidence is developed and used to improve policy and practice</td>
<td>• Safeguard role as host to international organizations and base for companies in health sector</td>
<td>• Invest in multilateral institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Establish coordinating office for health foreign policy</td>
<td>• Create information platform for health foreign policy</td>
<td>• Actions supported by existing financial instruments until end of 2010 financial framework (2013), without additional budgetary consequences</td>
<td>• $63 billion for Global Health Initiative (2009–14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 07% of GNI on international development by 2013</td>
<td>• Create Interdepartmental Conference on Health Foreign Policy</td>
<td>• $25 billion annually (adjusted for inflation) (2010–15)</td>
<td>• increase multilateral funding from 15% to 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• £6 billion on health systems and services (2008–15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• £1 billion for the Global Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• £400 million for global health research (2008–13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No additional resources planned for implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes:
Bold indicates actions where Canadian priorities and interests overlap.

Global Fund = Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria; GNI = gross national income; MDGs = Millennium Development Goals.

Sources: Switzerland, Federal Department of Home Affairs and Federal Department of Foreign Affairs (2006); United Kingdom, HM Government (2008); Commission of the European Communities (2007); Sridhar (2009); Fallon and Gayle (2010).
Appendix J:
Steps for Creating a Canadian Global Health Strategy

The next steps to consider when developing a Canadian global health strategy should include the following:

1. Choose a task team that will be responsible for overseeing and reviewing the process, reporting on implementation and suggesting next steps. An independent, third-party could make up this team or it could comprise key officials from Health Canada, Public Health Agency of Canada (PHAC), the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) and the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT). The team would be responsible for overseeing the Canadian global health strategy and coordinating the additional departments and actors involved.

2. Engage in two phases of consultations with all key actors, both within Health Canada and PHAC as well as interdepartmentally at the federal level, to include the Prime Minister's Office, DFAIT, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, Environment Canada, Indian and Northern Affairs, Public Safety Canada, Department of National Defence, Industry Canada, CIDA and the Canadian Food Inspection Agency. Consultations should also include the Health Council of Canada, the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, the International Development Research Centre, and provincial and territorial governments. They should also draw on expertise that exists in the private sector and in civil society, including philanthropic entities, non-governmental organizations and academia.
   • Phase One: Identify the objectives of the Canadian global health strategy and their underlying principles of those objectives. The task team should compile a list of all the objectives and principles. Any contradictions that cannot be resolved internally should be addressed with the involvement of relevant outside actors. Provincial, international and public objectives and principles should be next considered and compared with those identified for a national global health strategy.
   • Phase Two: Determine the priorities of the Canadian global health strategy. The specific targets should be weighted according to those with the most support among stakeholders and then placed within a broader framework. The lead and supporting actors for each action should then be identified.

5. The task team should choose an appropriate time line that fits with the established priorities. A five-year term is consistent with the other countries’ global health strategies and fits well within the Millennium Development Goals. However, the priorities chosen should dictate the time frame. The schedule for conducting reviews should also be decided so that the strategy can remain relevant and effective.

6. The task team should identify partners within Canada from outside government, including academia, the private sector and civil society, as well as other national governments and international organizations.

7. The task team should identify necessary resources to develop the global health strategy, including financial commitments, human resources and programming costs to implement the global health strategy.
Appendix K: Research Methodology

A team of researchers from the University of Toronto’s Global Health Diplomacy Program and G8 Research Group compile the appendices from published and public material. The analysis used to identify the Canadian principles relevant to global health was based on a systematic analysis of all health-related passages in the Speeches from the Throne and major foreign policy statements since 1947, including statements by Canadian prime ministers at the United Nations General Assembly and statements made by Cabinet ministers. Materials are available upon request.

Interviews were conducted with key stakeholders and experts in the fields related to Canada and global health.

Deliberations held at the Global Health Diplomacy Program’s conference on “Accountability, Innovation and Coherence in G8 Health Governance: Seizing Canada’s G8 Opportunity” in January 2010 at the Munk Centre for International Studies in Trinity College at the University of Toronto were considered.

The authors’ field experiences and past research were drawn on.