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Where MMV Access & Delivery focuses their attention…and which products are ready to go with child-friendly treatment

Registration

1. Eurartesim™
   - sigma-tau

2. Pyramax®
   - Shin Poong/University of Iowa

Phase IV

3. Coartem®-D
   - Novartis

4. ASAQ Winthrop
   - sanofi aventis/DNDi

Flavored dispersible formulation for children 5-35kgs

Tablet is soluble in water (no flavor masking)

1. Dihydroartemisinin piperaquine (DHA-PQP)
2. Pyronaridine artesunate
3. Artemether lumefantrine
4. Artesunate amodiaquine
Why are we anxious for better post-launch effectiveness evidence?

Do paediatric drug formulations of artemisinin combination therapies improve the treatment of children with malaria? A systematic review and meta-analysis

Florian Kurth, * Sabine Béard, * Ayola A Adegnika, Oumar Gaye, Peter G Kremsner, Michael Ramharter

So far no adequately powered direct comparison of the effectiveness of paediatric versus tablet formulations has been published. It should be a research priority to establish whether children will ultimately benefit from paediatric ACTs that are easier to give and therefore improving their effectiveness and reducing the rate of hospital admissions.
The overarching concern...

What if MMV and partners and other PDPs develop better medicines for children…. And no one:

• Notices!

• Cares!

• Thinks it makes a difference!
Uptake curve – 1st year A-L* dispersible

Global ACT use ~160MN tx in 2009. children <25kg = 60% of demand

*artemether lumefantrine
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In the first six months after launch of artemether-lumefantrine dispersible, we perceived that:

- Some country level technical working groups were slow to respond
- Procurement rules slow to change
- Policy-making “machinery” moving on its own timeline, independent of new breakthroughs

**MMV, with a research partner (Dalberg) and using conceptual guidance from WHO-EMP, decided to examine the levers of policy change using this new child-friendly medicine as a probe**
Research Summary

We wanted:

1. to gather country perspectives and information about the process of policy adoption for new malaria medicines with a specific focus on paediatric formulations

2. to review required steps for policy adoption at national and higher level

3. to identify bottlenecks in the policy adoption process, and make recommendations on ways to address them

4. to draw comparisons between countries, share lessons learned as well as share transferable best practices

5. To develop recommendations for strategic interventions
## Methodology and Approach - Country selection Criteria

### Country short list

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Malaria Burden</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>AL recommended 1st line treatment</th>
<th>Coartem D adopted</th>
<th>Local Industry</th>
<th>ACT availability</th>
<th>Relative malaria funding</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Market*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal**</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda**</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Tbd.</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia**</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Alternative countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Malaria Burden</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>AL recommended 1st line treatment</th>
<th>Coartem D adopted</th>
<th>Local Industry</th>
<th>ACT availability</th>
<th>Relative malaria funding</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Market*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Countries in short list vary along segmentation variables
- Alternative countries suggested for potential fine-tuning of list

*First hypotheses, further research required
** Good contacts either through MMV or Dalberg
Source: World Development Indicators, Kenyan Export Processing Zones Authority, ACTwatch, World Malaria Report 2008 and 2009
Paediatric policy decision making process review conducted in 5 countries

- Desk reviews
- Interviews with key stakeholders during country visits
Six-step framework developed with WHO to guide country level analysis to identify bottlenecks

Focus of our study

Policy adoption

- Regulation
- Financing availability
- Procurement and Distribution
- Health System Implementation
- Awareness / Use
What were the key findings and bottlenecks?
On paper, policy adoption processes follow similar steps

1. Technical Working Group (TWG) with broad membership provides technical inputs to policy deliberations

2. Recommendation are made to the responsible government institution—Usually the Ministry of Health (MOH)

3. Different processes for ‘minor’ and ‘major’ changes
   • Minor - Ministry reviews and adopt policy directly through a ministerial instruction
   • Major - Process vetted at cabinet level or through an equivalent process in country

4. After policy change decision, Essential Medicine List (EML) and Standard Treatment Guidelines (STG) are updated as required (depending on nature of the change)
But the implementation looks different . . .

1. Stakeholders informed about existence of alternative medicines?

2. Appropriate efficacy and resistance data available for current and alternative medicines?

3. Policy process clear?

4. Financial resources for medicines available?

5. Health system implementation secured?
Stakeholders informed about the existence of alternative medicines?

- Information rarely moves beyond the key recipient
- Strength of national level partnership critical to facilitate information sharing

**Communications plans for product introduction must:**
- reach national and international stakeholders and involve them in further disseminating messages
Appropriate efficacy and resistance data available for current and alternative medicines?

- Low: Country 3, Country 2
- Medium: Country 1
- High: Country 4, Country 5

- No systematic resistance monitoring
- Lack of effectiveness data to trigger policy change

Certainly:

- Need for regular efficacy monitoring and testing potential alternatives
- Need for effectiveness studies to justify switch from one ACT to another
For some countries inadequately institutionalized (processes and SOPs); for others very slow process

• Ensure strong technical support to establish processes
Financial resources for medicines?

- Depends on Global Fund (grant performance and proposals)
- Ensure strong technical support for proposal development / implementation process
Level of health systems organization?

- **Low**
  - Country 1
  - Country 3

- **Medium**

- **High**
  - Country 2
  - Country 4
  - Country 5

**Complicating factors:**
- A high level of decentralization
- Business process re-engineering
- Predominance of the private sector

- Need to strengthen linkages between federal, state and local authorities
- Prioritize strengthening technical capacity in the Ministries of Health
- Engage the private sector in IEC/BCC to develop relevant and participatory campaigns for consumers
Conclusions

• Timely Policy Revisions in response to availability of better medicines for children is a multi-pronged challenge

• One-size-fit-all approaches to engaging country policy making processes will not work

• Despite country-level differences, there are recurring themes common to all countries we studied:
  • Communicate early with policy makers and implementers about the need for paediatric medicines and new options to meet this need
    • Challenge is finding the right voice-pieces to engage the necessary stakeholders
  • Comparative Effectiveness Data should anchor this policy dialogue
  • More timely policy review processes are needed in most countries.
    • Need to distinguish between printing a policy or guideline vs. getting TWGs activated to work more routinely and systematically
  • Exogenous factors, e.g. donor financing and HSS activities, can impinge on the ability to revise policies on a timely basis.
• Product development partnerships can help by “shining a light” on current processes and engaging in “process improvement” around policy change and adoption of new medicines?

• Are there good avenues to work these issues (e.g. RBM SRNs in the case of malaria, or Global fund procurement guidelines?)

• How can we maximize meaningful dissemination of information?

• Are we coordinated enough in generating requisite evidence to drive policy change for the right reasons?
  • Country level stakeholders need more evidence beyond proof of equivalence (POE)
  • Real life effectiveness and proof of value (POV) studies are needed….BUT do we have standards /guidance for doing these type of studies?
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