

- 3 Baird J, Ma S, Ruger JP. Effects of the World Bank's maternal and child health intervention on Indonesia's poor: evaluating the safe motherhood project. *Soc Sci Med* 2011; **72**: 1948–55.
- 4 Lim SS, Dandona L, Hoisington JA, James SL, Hogan MC, Gakidou E. India's Janani Suraksha Yojana, a conditional cash transfer programme to increase births in health facilities: an impact evaluation. *Lancet* 2010; **275**: 2009–23.
- 5 Bennett S, Boerma JT, Brugha R. Scaling-up HIV/AIDS evaluation. *Lancet* 2006; **367**: 79–82.
- 6 Chandrasekaran P, Dallabetta G, Loo V, et al. Evaluation design for large scale HIV prevention programs: the case of Avahan, the India AIDS Initiative. *AIDS* 2008; **22** (suppl 5): S1–S15.
- 7 Piot P, ed. Emerging results from a scaled HIV prevention program—Avahan, the India AIDS Initiative. *Sex Transm Infect* 2010; **86** (suppl 1): 1–94.
- 8 Laga M, Wanke C, eds. Characterizing the Indian HIV epidemic and assessing large-scale prevention efforts—Avahan. *AIDS* 2008; **22** (suppl 5): S1–S181.
- 9 Dandona L, ed. Learning from large scale prevention efforts—findings from Avahan. *BMC Public Health* (in press).
- 10 Pickles M, Foss AM, Vickerman P, et al. Interim modeling analysis to validate reported increases in condom use and assess HIV infections averted among female sex workers and clients in southern India following a targeted HIV prevention programme. *Sex Transm Infect* 2010; **86** (suppl 1): i33–i46.
- 11 Ng M, Gakidou E, Levin-Rector A, Khera A, Murray CJL, Dandona L. Assessment of population-level effect of Avahan, an HIV-prevention initiative in India. *Lancet* 2011; published online Oct 11. DOI:10.1016/S0140-6736(11)61390-1.
- 12 Bryce J, Victora CG, on behalf of the MCE-IMCI Technical Advisors. Ten methodological lessons from the multi-country evaluation of IMCI. *Health Policy Plan* 2005; **20** (suppl 1): i94–i105.
- 13 Kumar R, Mehendale SM, Panda S, et al. Impact of targeted interventions on heterosexual transmission of HIV in India. *BMC Public Health* 2011; **11**: 549.
- 14 Victora CG, Black RE, Boerma JT, Bryce J. Measuring impact in the Millennium Development Goal era and beyond: a new approach to large-scale effectiveness evaluations. *Lancet* 2011; **377**: 85–95.

## The Lancet–University of Oslo Commission on Global Governance for Health, in collaboration with the Harvard Global Health Institute

Governance challenges in global health have gained attention in recent years. This increased scrutiny is a welcome recognition of the fact that improving health worldwide is not merely a matter of technical intervention or resource mobilisation, but also demands credible, legitimate decision-making processes and effective, efficient, and equitable action. The debates around global health governance have usually addressed the governance of the global health system—that is, actors whose primary intent

is to improve global health, and the rules, norms, and processes that govern their interaction.

What merits increased attention, however, is a broader consideration of the many actors and forces outside the global health system and the ways in which they influence health. The global context today differs dramatically from 1948 when WHO was created. Globalisation has tightened the links of interdependence binding together states, societies, and economies;<sup>1</sup> this has both increased the degree to which we face shared health threats, and opened up new opportunities for collaborative action by a diverse range of sectors.<sup>2</sup> New players also bring new resources, interests, and agendas to the table: today, non-state actors, such as private firms and civil society organisations, wield significant influence, alongside sovereign nation states and intergovernmental organisations. Finally, there is growing recognition that global governance processes outside the health sector, such as those relating to security, trade and investment, environment, education, agriculture, and migration, increasingly affect health both negatively and positively. For example, international intellectual property rules may restrict national policy space to control the price of medicines, whereas global norms on tobacco control may facilitate the adoption of national measures like tobacco taxes that can positively impact public health. Similarly,



Norwegian Minister of Foreign Affairs Jonas Gahr Støre

climate change negotiations can influence the scope of, and responses to, one of the most pressing health threats of our time. There are, however, no satisfactory mechanisms to protect and promote health in these other governance arenas. Rather, health concerns often come into direct conflict with other powerful interests, such as protecting national security, safeguarding sovereignty, and pursuing economic activities.

An increased understanding of how public health can be better protected and promoted in various global governance processes is urgent, but complex and politically sensitive. These issues involve the distribution of economic, intellectual, normative, and political resources, and require a candid assessment of power structures. The Norwegian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Jonas Gahr Støre, has argued that there is a scarcity of empirical knowledge on how health can be better promoted through foreign policy making and other global governance processes. In a speech at the Harvard Kennedy School in December, 2010, Støre called for an academic commission on global governance for health to promote innovative thinking that would move beyond conventional wisdom.<sup>3</sup>

Therefore, we are launching an independent academic effort, *The Lancet–University of Oslo Commission on Global Governance for Health*, in collaboration with the Harvard Global Health Institute, to bring new research and analysis to bear on these questions. The Commission follows the Oslo Declaration of the Foreign Policy and Global Health Initiative,<sup>4</sup> which has pointed to the need to engage beyond the health sector to solve key challenges in global health.

It is proposed that the Commission analyse the inter-relations between health and other governance sectors, to assess how policies and actions in these areas affect global health objectives—and hence identify how targeted actions outside institutions of health governance may contribute to global health.

The Commission will propose recommendations on how public health can be more effectively protected and promoted in selected key policy-making domains. Moreover, the Commission will seek to build on, and relate to, ongoing work on achieving health in all policies<sup>5</sup> as well as the social determinants of health.<sup>6</sup>

Under the leadership of Rector Ole Petter Ottersen, the University of Oslo will anchor the Commission and engage Commissioners who bring diverse geographical, disciplinary, and personal perspectives to its work. Over the course of 2 years, the Commission will examine aspects of governance, at both national and global levels, with the aim of making recommendations for improving global governance for health.

*\*Ole Petter Ottersen, Julio Frenk, Richard Horton*

University of Oslo, 0316 Oslo, Norway (OPO); Department of Global Health and Population, Harvard School of Public Health, Boston, USA (JF); and *The Lancet*, London, UK (RH)  
rektor@uio.no

We are the Commissioners of *The Lancet–University of Oslo Commission on Global Governance for Health*, in collaboration with the Harvard Global Health Institute. We declare that we have no conflicts of interest. For further information or contribution, please contact Rector Ole Petter Ottersen.

- 1 Støre JG, Welch J, Chen L. Health and security for a global century. In: Chen L, Leaning J, Narasimhan V, eds. *Global health challenges for human security*. Cambridge, MA: Global Equity Initiative, Asia Center, Harvard University, 2003: 67–84.
- 2 Frenk J, Gómez-Dantés O, Chacón F. Global health in transition. In: Parker RG, Sommer M, eds. *Routledge handbook in global public health*. London and New York: Routledge, 2011: 11–17.
- 3 Støre JG. Health and foreign policy. Kennedy Forum, Harvard Kennedy School, Boston, Dec 6, 2010. [http://www.regjeringen.no/nb/dep/ud/aktuelt/taler\\_artikler/utenriksministeren/2010/helse\\_harvard.html?id=627344](http://www.regjeringen.no/nb/dep/ud/aktuelt/taler_artikler/utenriksministeren/2010/helse_harvard.html?id=627344) (accessed Oct 12, 2010).
- 4 Ministers of Foreign Affairs of Brazil, France, Indonesia, Norway, Senegal, South Africa, and Thailand. Oslo Ministerial Declaration—global health: a pressing foreign policy issue of our time. *Lancet* 2007; **369**: 1373–78.
- 5 Ståhl T, Wismar M, Ollila E, Lahtinen E, Leppo K, eds. *Health in all policies: prospects and potentials*. Helsinki: Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, Health Department, 2006: 279.
- 6 Marmot M, Friel S, Bell R, Houweling TA, Taylor S. Commission on Social Determinants of Health. Closing the gap in a generation: health equity through action on the social determinants of health. *Lancet* 2008; **372**: 1661–69.

## A global scope for global health—including mental health



Unprecedented opportunities to promote excellence and equity in health-care delivery for the world's most underserved populations are upon us. Successful programmes to reduce the transmission of and mortality from infectious diseases have invigorated discourse about the human right to health, and have

resulted in viable platforms for comprehensive health programmes that provide care to millions of people facing both poverty and chronic disease.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, the past decade has seen the introduction of the first such platforms designed to treat incurable disorders, from AIDS to diabetes. Rapid scientific advances

Published Online  
October 17, 2011  
DOI:10.1016/S0140-  
6736(11)60941-0  
See *Series* pages 1654 and 1664  
See *Series Lancet* 2011;  
**378**: 1502, 1515, 1581, and 1592