Q: Why is there so little reliable data on malaria, yet it’s such a big killer?
A: The first step is to have a good measurement tool. With HIV you have an antibody test. Tuberculosis is harder. You can estimate the burden of disease indirectly through tuberculin surveys or from prevalence surveys or notification rates. Malaria is harder again because you don’t have a good measurement tool. You can’t simply estimate prevalence or incidence by asking somebody if they have malaria, often they don’t know if they had it. Diagnostic tests have improved — but not enough — and it is equally difficult to establish if someone has died of malaria.

Q: How is WHO helping countries to improve their health system information?
A: Working through Health Metrics Network with a broad strategy of addressing the whole array of health system, clinical and population health information is currently a priority for WHO. We also focus on weak areas such as vital statistics systems with causes of death and the basic information on health systems. Many low- and middle-income countries don’t have information on distribution of services across districts and the density of facilities but also the availability of key interventions such as Caesarian section, antiretroviral treatment or human resources. We are working with Uganda, Kenya, Rwanda, Zambia and Tanzania to develop and implement a basic subnational health system monitoring system based on a WHO software package called Health Mapper. This tool generates maps and summary statistics on service availability, perhaps on a quarterly or six-monthly basis.

New report focuses on health in a “borderless world”

WHO welcomed the first Global Health Watch report that stresses the importance of making health care accessible to people in need in a “borderless world”, but said the report fails to address WHO’s role in preventing global outbreaks of disease.

Global Health Watch 2005–2006, published on 20 July, was compiled by campaigners from three nongovernmental groups: Medact in London, the People’s Health Movement in Bangalore and the Global Equity Gauge Alliance in Durban. The report covers selected issues, including the shortage of health workers in countries with a high disease burden, health-care systems and gene technology.

Billing itself as “the alternative World Health Report” as a challenge to WHO’s flagship report, Global Health Watch 2005–2006 charges that WHO’s influence has declined while “competing” organizations, such as the World Bank, were raising their public health profiles.

“Starved of resources and sometimes poorly led and managed, [WHO] is failing to find an effective response,” said the report, which is due to appear every two years.

WHO spokesperson Christine McNab welcomed Global Health Watch 2005–2006 saying that many of its central messages — particularly on access to health care for all — are a core part of WHO’s values. She said that WHO Director-General Dr Lee Jong-wook had “continuously stressed the importance of equity and social justice”.

She said that WHO not only supported “vertical” or single-disease programmes — which the report criticizes as damaging to fledging health systems — but also encouraged countries and donors to take a more “horizontal” approach to build and reinforce health systems and primary health care. Both approaches were necessary, McNab said.

McNab said that an important part of WHO’s work was to minimize the risk that disease poses to people’s lives and health: “In a globalized world where more people than ever are crossing borders, WHO’s Member States have made clear that detecting outbreaks of old and new diseases and controlling them is vital to global health security.”