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Key assumptions

- Resources are constrained, and becoming more so
- Malaria risk is unevenly distributed, and prioritizing on epidemiological risk is feasible
- Prioritizing LLINs/subsidies will not leave poor more vulnerable
- Prioritizing will increase efficient use of funds
Goal

• UNIVERSAL COVERAGE LEADING TO EVENTUAL ELIMINATION REMAINS THE PARTNERSHIP GOAL
• Increase efficiency in distribution of LLINs to reduce disease, death and transmission and maintain elimination as a goal
Objectives for an LLIN distribution strategy

- Sustain gains: No decrease in access to malaria prevention for economically or biologically vulnerable households or population groups
- Collaborate with GMP to provide evidence-based technical guidelines to help NMCPs translate strategy into action
Assumption #1  Resources increasingly constrained
See Lucy Pantain’s presentation
The Global Fund accounts for the majority of funding already committed between 2012 and 2015

Breakdown of committed funding by source, 2012-2015

- 68% Global Fund
- 14% PMI / USAID
- 6% DFID
- 6% World Bank
- 3% UNICEF National
- 2% Other

1 RBM Secretariat financing survey of 47 African countries

Board Ministerial Session, 18 May 2012, Geneva, Switzerland
Global Fund changes

- Allocations within a country’s envelope between the three diseases will be made by the CCM
Assumption #2
Malaria risk is unevenly distributed and prioritizing is feasible
Malaria risk is uneven

- EIRs vary across geography - large areas in Africa have EIRs <1
- Urban areas generally have low risk, and Africa is rapidly urbanizing (~50%)
- The proportion of the population living in intermediate and high transmission settings is not large - but needs to be quantified carefully
EIRs for *p. falciparum* 2010
Distribution of population in malaria endemic zones over EIR

Adapted from: O. Briet, Swiss Tropical Institute
Focusing resources on high-transmission areas?

• What would be the pros and cons of focusing subsidies/resources on high-transmission areas?

• Could low-transmission settings (especially urban areas) find more cost-effective LLIN distribution methods?

• Are LLINs the best control tools for urban settings?
Modeling suggests focus on high-transmission

- LLIN coverage + case management can move high transmission areas to intermediate EIRs
- Intermediate transmission is dangerous over long term due to reduced immunity
- Therefore urgent to push high EIRS down through intermediate to low
Assumption #3
Prioritizing LLINs/subsidies will not leave the neediest more vulnerable
Identifying “need”

• Combination of epidemiological risk of infection, biological vulnerability and financial/socio-economic status
• Access to prevention tools a key determinant of “need”
• How could this measure of “need” be operationalized? at geographic level?
Assumption #4
Prioritizing will increase efficient use of funds
Is prioritizing more efficient?

• What are the costs of subsidized sales?
• At what price point/subsidy percentage does a subsidized sale program begin to save a national program money?
• Are the savings worth the risk? In low-transmission settings?
• What are the alternatives?
• Would a more closely integrated approach with Dx & Rx be an option?
Next Steps
Process

1. Agreement prioritizing is worth investigating
2. Identifying the evidence and knowledge gaps
3. Finding existing evidence and opportunities to collect data to fill gaps
4. Re-assessing the value; if worthwhile establishing consensus
5. Developing the evidence base to inform technical guidelines from GMP
Urgency

• The possibility of a major crisis exists.
• We need a “Plan B” prepared to help NMCPs deal with a sharp decrease in funding at a potentially dangerous time.
• Immunity may be reduced in some high transmission settings.
• LLINs are generally not available through private sector channels.
Changing landscape

- CCMs are new advocacy targets- have we adapted?
- Domestic investment in Africa region has not increased
- Global economic crisis does not make bilateral increases likely over the next few years