

Speaker's Corner

The Copenhagen Consensus: “The world’s best investment: Vitamins for undernourished children”

Summary overview and introduction by the SCN Secretariat

In Speaker's Corner of this SCN News George Kent presents his views of the Copenhagen Consensus 2008 paper on hunger and malnutrition, where he lists the shortcomings he sees in relation to important issues such as sustainability, local solutions and global capacity for implementation. Being a democratic forum with room for many voices, we publish the paper, in addition to this brief summary overview and introduction as we feel it is important that the SCN News readers understand this project and are able to access the material to make their own judgements or to use it for advocacy.

The Copenhagen Consensus (CC) project is a strictly economic analysis, which looks at how to prioritize among a set of proposed solutions to major world challenges, such as malnutrition and hunger, disease, global warming, air pollution, gender issues, education, trade, conflict and terrorism. It focuses on the international community's effort to solve these challenges and on how to do this in the most cost-efficient manner - based on facts, science, and calculations rather than on political motives or media coverage which is far too often the case. Conceived in 2002 by a group at the Copenhagen Business School and headed by Bjørn Lomborg, the CC took place in 2004 (CC04) and again in 2008 (CC08).

The basic idea of the CC project is to gather some of the world's leading economists to assess and rank some 30 proposed solutions to address the identified challenges. For each challenge, a paper was commissioned from leading specialists in the field to propose solutions and estimate their costs and benefits. The challenge papers were then assessed by an expert panel of economists, many of whom Nobel Laureates. The panel discussed each of the challenge paper proposals in detail with its principal author and with other specialists who had been commissioned to write critical appraisals, before meeting in private to rank the proposals based on the costs and benefits of the solutions. The panel was asked to answer the question: "what would be the best ways of advancing global welfare, and particularly the welfare of the developing countries, illustrated by supposing that an additional \$75 billion of resources were at their disposal over a four year initial period?"

While we in the nutrition community all know that nutrition is one of the most worthwhile investments, it is encouraging to see how a group of leading economists ranked a nutrition intervention at the very top in CC08. Furthermore all five nutrition proposals included ranked among the top 10 out of the 30 solutions considered: micronutrient supplements ranked at 1st, fortification at 3rd, biofortification at 5th, deworming and other nutrition programs at school at 6th and community-based nutrition promotion at 9th. The CC04 which ranked outcomes (e.g. improved micronutrient status) rather than interventions, ranked four nutrition outcomes at 2nd, 5th, 11th and 12th among a set of 17 opportunities. The analysis and results are elaborated in the respective challenge and perspective papers listed below.

The CC analysis surely leverages global attention to nutrition in a way that we should welcome. Although the CC08 only concerned key interventions that do not address the underlying and basic causes of malnutrition, if implemented at scale they would contribute to reducing malnutrition rates today and therefore also improve nutrition of tomorrow's generation through improved maternal and child nutrition as well as empowering the affected communities through enhanced work capacity and educational performance. Thus, while the set of solutions proposed by one group of influential economists by no means suffice to achieve the SCN vision of a world free from hunger and malnutrition, we welcome the conclusions drawn by the prominent CC panel and recognize the need to implement at scale and without delay these essential actions while simultaneously addressing more structural causes and strengthening nutrition actors. Importantly, the CC process can be helpful when we advocate for nutrition to economists and budget planners. We hope the links provided below will facilitate for our readership to make full use of the CC project.

Useful links at www.copenhagenconsensus.com

- [CC08 Malnutrition and hunger website](#)
- CC08 Ranked list of solutions: Copenhagen Consensus (2008) *Results* ([online](#))
- CC08 Challenge Paper: Horton S, Alderman H and Rivera JA (2008) *Copenhagen Consensus 2008 Challenge Paper. Hunger and Malnutrition*. Draft, May 11 2008 (Online [full paper](#), [summary](#))
- CC08 Perspective papers:
 - Martorell R (2008) *Copenhagen Consensus 2008 Perspective Paper. Malnutrition & Hunger* ([online](#))
 - Deolalikar AB (2008) *Copenhagen Consensus 2008 Perspective Paper. Malnutrition & Hunger*. May 10, 2008 ([online](#))
- CC08 Press release: *The world's best investment: Vitamins for undernourished children, according to top economists, including 5 Nobel Laureates* ([online](#))
- [CC04 Malnutrition and hunger website](#)
- CC04 Ranked list of solutions: Copenhagen Consensus (2004) *Results* ([online](#))
- CC04 Challenge Paper: Behrman JR, Alderman H and Hoddinott J (2004) *Copenhagen Consensus – Challenges and Opportunities. Hunger and Malnutrition*. 19 February 2004 (Online [full paper](#), [summary](#))
- CC08 Opponents notes:
 - Svedberg P (2004) *Has the Relationship between Undernutrition and Income Changed?* Comment by Peter Svedberg on: “HUNGER AND MALNUTRITION” by Jere R Behrman, Harold Alderman and John Hoddinott ([online](#))
 - Appleton S (2004) *Hunger and malnutrition - comments*. 19 April 2004 ([online](#))
 - Summary of the two opponents notes ([online](#))

Meeting the challenge of global malnutrition

George Kent, University of Hawai'i

As part of its broad program of addressing major global issues, The Copenhagen Consensus 2008 (CC08) *Challenge Paper on Hunger and Malnutrition* makes an important contribution to the global discussion of nutrition issues. It is timely because recent rapid increases in the price of food worldwide are drawing a great deal of attention to the failures of the global food system.

However, the group's analysis is flawed in several ways. For example, it is based on the premise that there is a global pot of money that could be used to deal with problems of hunger and malnutrition. It asks how that money could be allocated most efficiently. The reality is that different types of hunger and malnutrition problems attract money in different ways from different sources. The funds are not fungible, meaning they cannot be readily transferred from one use to another. For example, the funds that are available for the preparation of therapeutic foods could not easily be reallocated to breastfeeding promotion. Similarly, if food aid funds were required to be used for purchases at the destination rather than in the donating countries, the level of funding made available by donating countries would be sharply reduced. They would be reduced even further if the purported beneficiaries were to decide how the money should be spent. Humanitarian assistance generally cannot be untied without reductions in the total amounts available. The Copenhagen Consensus (CC) group identifies "solutions" to problems of hunger and malnutrition by identifying those courses of action that are most likely to be cost-effective. We have been told these things many times before, by Lancet, UNICEF, and others. The CC group focuses on what could be done to solve the problems, but it does not give enough attention to what it would take to actually get them done.

The CC08 website says "More than 55 international economists, including 5 Nobel Laureates, will assess more than 50 solutions and assemble a list of priorities for everyone involved in solving the world's biggest challenges." This is not an auspicious start. Who gave these 55 wise people the authority to assemble a list of priorities for everyone? The CC is a consensus among a small number of intellectuals, based on the naïve assumption that everyone wants to have these problems solved, and that there is some unique best way to solve them that all will accept. Theirs is an engineering approach, devoid of political analysis. Are those who would have to take the action sufficiently motivated? We should not assume that those who control the resources are eager to get on with the work, and are just waiting to be told the "solutions". In many cases, the costs would have to be borne by one group while another group enjoys the benefits. The evidence we have so far indicates that those who have the resources do not really care enough about those who have the problems.

The CC people, like the World Bank and others, use misleading language about "investment" in solving nutrition problems. Yes, there might be a high benefit to cost ratio from, say, the iodization of salt to prevent goitre, but if I am interested in buying a bigger car, I am not going to "invest" in salt iodization programs on the other side of the world. Investment normally means pulling some money out of my pocket in order to get a larger amount of money into my pocket a while later. When the benefits go to someone else, that is not anything like investment as normally understood. The conclusion of the CC08 paper says, "there is no question that intervention in nutrition is highly desirable and highly beneficial." For whom? Is it beneficial for the factory owner who benefits from the cheap labour that hungry

people are willing to provide? Is it beneficial to consumers who enjoy products made with cheap labour—including food? If solving nutrition problems really were beneficial to all, there would be no trouble in raising funds for nutrition interventions, even for those that might be second best. Let's not fool ourselves in a way that conceals the real challenges that need to be addressed. The language of "investment" in relation to nutrition interventions masks the disconnect between those who have the power and those who have the problem. If we don't look at that disconnect in a straightforward and honest way, we are not dealing with the realities that need to be addressed.

The CC group has focused on interventions whose impacts are not likely to continue long after the intervention has ended. It is really not difficult to find ways of helping to overcome malnutrition now. If a child is seriously deficient in a particular nutrient, you provide that nutrient. The real puzzle, however, is to figure how that nutrient could be provided after you are gone. How does one create sustainable impacts? That question cannot be addressed by looking only at household level or clinical level interventions. One must begin to look at societal forces, economics, and politics. The answers must deal with institutional arrangements, and find ways to replace those structures that endlessly reproduce poverty and malnutrition. You can end hunger in the world by providing sandwiches for everyone, but that sort of answer really misses the point.

The CC group speaks as if there were a need to identify which of several alternative approaches to nutrition problems is the best globally. Why do that? Would it make sense to study which is the best material for building houses globally? Choices need to be attuned to local circumstances. There is no need for a single global choice. Such choices should be made locally to the extent possible, with full participation of the people who are supposed to benefit from them. The CC group has prepared an elegant analysis, but on the wrong question.

There are things that should be done at the global level to facilitate the making of good choices locally. However, there has been little serious global planning and management to deal with hunger and malnutrition. The Millennium Development Goals are not really global at all; they place all the responsibility on the separate national governments. If the CC people really were able to come up with "solutions" to the world's nutrition problem, to whom would it hand those answers? There is no agency in place ready to receive and act on such advice. There is little actual global planning and management to deal with nutrition issues, and little capacity for such activities. This is partly due a broad aversion among the nations of the world to global governance or global government of any kind. As the problems continue to get worse, however, it becomes increasingly clear that we will have to overcome that aversion. The current wave of increases in the price of food highlights the need for doing something to fix the global food system. Official responses so far seem to be more concerned with quelling the food riots than with addressing the deeper problems. If more and more people are falling off the edge of a cliff, we have to do more than put them back up on that cliff edge. We need to address the fact that there are so many millions of people so close to that edge all the time. So far there has been no serious global conversation about how to fix the global food system. Instead of presenting their own views, the world's intellectual leaders would do a greater service by facilitating a well designed broadly participatory global planning process for fixing the badly broken global food system.