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1. Vector Control programming in Global Fund Grants 2024 – 2026
Malaria programmes are facing a range of challenges, within and beyond vector control

Striving to deploying most effective tools:

- **Cost**: CFP Dual Al nets ~halved cases compared to pyrethroid-only nets in trials, but cost more; IRS has higher absolute cost than ITNs
- **Some factors still unclear how to best address**: residual transmission, urban malaria, *An. stephensi*

Programmatic issues

- **ITN coverage** - not maintained between campaign years
- **Field performance and durability** - challenging to maintain effective coverage given ITN durability
- **Use** - whilst most people who have a net use it, there is still sub-optimal use given access in some places.

External issues

- **Financing** - Unprecedented fiscal pressure
- **Population growth** - 41% increase in population in Global Fund supported countries since 2002
- **Insecurity** - 24 countries classified as COE have 76% of malaria cases
- **Climate** - climate change and extreme weather events drive major upsurges
These challenges are affecting ITN programming, but this area of vector control continues to be prioritized by programmes

• 18 countries have ITN gaps and/or gaps to finance the most effective tools

• Maintaining essential costs for campaigns and basic routine distribution is maximum scope in almost all GF requests

• It is well understood that these models can't sustain coverage sufficiently; but funding gaps are preventing further expansion/innovation

• ITN campaign operations being tweaked to find efficiencies

ITN funding gaps GC7

Initial gaps now funded: $165M
Remaining gaps: $310M

As of January '24 grant signing
Despite funding challenges, programmes are prioritizing effective nets

8-years of catalytic support

2024 – 2026
NextGen Market Shaping SI – Revolving Facility (Global Fund and partners including Gates, Vestergaard, BASF)

2022 – 2024
Net Transition Initiative (Global Fund and partners including BASF)

2018 – 2022
New Nets Project (Unitaid, Global Fund – IVCC and partners including BASF)

Proportions of Global Fund financed ITNs of different types – actuals for 2020 – 2023; funded net types for 2024 - 2026

WHO recommendation, based on LSHTM led studies in Tanzania and Benin
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Progress towards better nets in areas of pyrethroid resistance

- Countries in dark green - planning completely PBO and/or CFP Dual Al nets (or have no documented pyrethroid resistance)
- Countries in light green - planning a combination of pyrethroid-only, PBO and/or CFP Dual Al nets; less widespread pyrethroid resistance
- Countries in blue - planning a combination of pyrethroid-only, PBO and/or CFP Dual Al nets; widespread pyrethroid resistance
- Countries in yellow - planning pyrethroid-only nets; pyrethroid resistance
Efficacy versus coverage is being discussed in most programmes

- Modelling has become more widely and urgently used
- Can be a useful tool to examine how to avert most cases with the available funds – e.g. MINT (https://mint.dide.ic.ac.uk/) or support from various modelling partners (e.g. GMP, CHAI, SwissTPH, Northwestern University, PATH, University of Geneva, MAP)
- Some country models have shown CFP nets for fewer people, rather than pyrethroid-only nets for more people, is likely to avert more cases. Models are specific to the country context.
- Modelling tools are also being used to identify subnational areas to target with available ITNs/certain types for highest impact, if funding is insufficient for full effective coverage
IRS is scaling back but still plays a role

- IRS scaling back alongside a shift to more effective nets
- IRS activity ~half that of previous grant cycle; $20.4M gaps included as ‘unfunded quality demand’
- Programmes are prioritizing CFP Dual AI nets in areas of scaled back IRS, with associated monitoring
- Updated list of available products; Vectron a new important option

Monitoring and evaluation for vector control is prioritized, though scope and scale varies

- Entomological surveillance is being prioritized within grants, though to varied levels of scope
- Insecticide resistance monitoring is still a top priority for countries, and being used to inform insecticide selection
- More granular data collection would be ideal to support more robust sub national tailoring of VC, but financing is limited and consensus on how /how best to collect these data is still being built

https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/5857/psm_indoorresidualsprayirsgf_list_en.pdf
An. *stephensi* surveillance and response

- Plans to expand surveillance and – as needed – respond to the *stephensi* threat were highlighted in many funding requests
- Swiss TPH contracted to do a thematic review of current practices and gaps/needs around *An. stephensi* surveillance and control
  - focused on the Horn of Africa countries
  - found national plans had on the whole been updated to reflect this emerging threat, though financing and technical capacity to respond was variable
- A range of recommendations for consideration at national, regional and global levels are being disseminated
- Example of types of activities included in Global Fund investments for implementation in 2024-2026:
  - entomological surveillance
  - targeted management of mosquito breeding sites
  - capacity building on controlling *Anopheles stephensi* including training on surveillance and identification
  - IVM in urban areas

WHO GMP Threats map – detection of *An. stephensi*
2. Evaluation work
Evaluation work to help inform response to challenges and prepare for GC8

**Building understanding of potential resistance to new actives**
- CRID led grant in Cameroon and Burkina Faso

**Exploring factors affecting programme decision making around ITN deployment models**
- Tropical Health led grant

**Strengthen understanding of Dual AI net performance over time and in combination with other tools including IRS**
- LSHTM led grant RCT in Cote d'Ivoire
- PAMVERC led grant in Benin and Cdl
- KCMUCo led grant in Tanzania
- Rotarians led grant in PNG

**Modelling work to examine questions around coverage v efficacy, sub national tailoring of campaign frequencies**
- Imperial College London led grant
3. Other current issues

Umar Abdulhamid, delivering information during a door-to-door mosquito net distribution in Kano, Nigeria
The Global Fund/Andrew Esiebo/Panos
Increase in skepticism about ITNs as a tool – especially at high levels of government. Strengthening understanding of net use has been important – as below.

**Overall coverage is suboptimal**

- ITN net use is suboptimal and hasn’t improved since 2015
- Note that *Per capita* ITN funding rose to 2015 and has since fallen

**But - use of nets by those who have them is high**

- People who have nets, to large extent (>85%), use them
- Some subnational variation
- Access to nets is suboptimal: insufficient funding and volumes/frequency of distribution are the major contributors
ITNs are a) highly effective and b) known to be very well used.

Deploying more nets = higher net access = higher net use = higher malaria impact.

While *per capita* malaria funding increased to 2015 progress in net coverage and malaria impact increased. With stalling *per capita* funding, access, use and impact has stalled.

This does not mean the tool ‘is not working’ or has ‘done all it can’
Available financing has meant there have not been enough nets to maximize impact

Country plans should be tailored subnationally, addressing low access or low use where needed; or selecting tools that are more appropriate for the context.

This won’t always be nets; nets are a highly cost-effective tool but in some use-cases other tools may be appropriate

We still have a serious amount of milage to get out of nets in most high burden areas.
This is low hanging fruit for impactful and cost-effective use of available malaria funding.
Expanding tool box

- Working closely with partners including GAVI as malaria vaccine is introduced
- Urgent need for gov’t and population to understand the vaccine is needed IN ADDITION to the foundation of vector control and other interventions
- The potential of new vector control interventions in the near term is encouraging, we will work to support appropriate adoption
- Potential modified approaches also provide opportunities – e.g. higher throughput continuous distribution models for ITNs, which we encourage programmes to consider
- Evidence-base for decision-making between growing set of options is urgently needed

ITN quality and field performance

- New Quality Assurance Policy for Vector Control Products bring brought to our Board for consideration late April 2024
- Detailed operational guidance will depend on on-going discussions:
  - Remain in close discussion with WHO PQ about their future plans, in particular on post-market surveillance
  - i2i/CHAI ‘Raise the Floor’ work to develop guidance on ITN performance monitoring