RBM Partnership To End Malaria

Vector Control Working Group

Question and answer session

Dr. Corine Ngufor, VCWG co-chair

29th October 2024

Question 1

Submitted questions:

1. Can someone (WHO VCAG) talk a bit about the feasibility of insisting that manufacturers commit to a requirement which states something like "All ITN's provided by manufacturers as part of the Global Fund procurement process will need to carry a guarantee of a 100% mortality impact on susceptible strains of targeted malaria vectors for at least 24 months, as benchmarked by reference nets kept in storage and available for official testing if required. LLINs should therefore not just comply with a once-off delivery date compliance with bioefficacy standards, but also a product mid-life standard".

2. What method would be acceptable to WHO as an assay to determine the residual bioefficacy of an ITN, which will be the global standard which can be used by an independent institution to resolve disputes about residual bioefficacy of LLINs?

3. How can product development be incentivized?

Question 2

Submitted questions:

2. What method would be acceptable to WHO as an assay to determine the residual bioefficacy of an ITN, which will be the global standard which can be used by an independent institution to resolve disputes about residual bioefficacy of LLINs?

Question 3

Submitted questions:

3. How can product development be incentivized?

Question 4

Submitted questions:

4. Are minimum benchmarks included in the present WHO QA as part of the requirements of manufacturers submit when submitting dossiers of their nets? I do not see any in the WHO QA website. If not, I would like to see a basic requirement that all net dossiers submitted to WHO QA should at least match the efficacy results they received during their prequalification with WHOPES in the past i.e. if they passed WHOPES with cone bioassay tests under WHOPES they should continue to do so with cone bioassay tests now. Also, all nets should also have a minimum target for durability i.e. 50% still usable after three years.

Questions 5, 6 and 7

Submitted questions:

5. What are the new indicators of LLIN physical durability in the field: Bursting Strength (according to ITN specifications) vs durability index which include: 1. bursting strength, 2. abrasion, 3. secondary hole enlargement and 4. snag force. Where can I find the new ITN specifications?

6. Is there any other method for predicting physical durability other than bursting strength, in particular to PBO containing ITN which have lower bursting strength and might have a shorter life due to whole formation?

7. Will PQT VCP implement durability index (abrasion, Snag, secondary hole formation, bursting strength) as a future indicator of physical durability?