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IVIR Committee in 2014

• **Main responsibility**
  – Advise WHO on implementation research related to vaccines and immunization programs
  – Provide guidance on quantitative methods useful to vaccine research

• **Current functions**
  – Provide guidance on implementation research relevant to immunization policies and practices
    • Focus on agenda and priorities
  – Review implementation research and advise research groups
  – Review best practices related to methods for conducting and reporting on quantitative research

• **Membership**
  – All 15 seats* currently filled
    • Modelers, economists, epidemiologists, behavioural scientists, health systems experts, vaccine trial experts and EPI manager.

• **Meetings**
  – Ad-hoc meeting June and Annual meeting in September

* Call for nomination of 3 new members in modeling/economics to be announced
Strategic directions for WHO’s vaccine research

Assess and/or develop strategies/approaches to expand coverage and impact and improve delivery of vaccines

Generate and/or synthesize and appraise evidence for robust policy making

Contribute to development/availability of new or better vaccines/delivery systems to address remaining BoD
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WHO’s implementation research themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Minimize barriers and improve coverage of vaccines currently in use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Conduct impact evaluation of vaccines in use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Improve methods for monitoring of immunization programmes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Missed opportunities
- Reasons for non-vaccination
- Integration of care
- Non-specific effects of vaccines

WHO VPD burden and impact assessment framework
- Typhoid and pertussis burden assessments
- Vaccine impact including economic assessments of typhoid, pertussis, meningitis A, hepatitis B, HPV vaccines
- GVAP’s Decade of Vaccine Economics study

Coverage surveys
- GAVI Perspective
## IVIR-AC agenda topics 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimize barriers</th>
<th>Evaluate impact</th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missed opportunities</td>
<td>WHO VPD burden and impact assessment framework</td>
<td>Coverage surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for non-vaccination</td>
<td>Typhoid and pertussis burden assessments</td>
<td>GAVI Perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of care</td>
<td>Vaccine impact including economic assessments of typhoid, pertussis, meningitis A, hepatitis B, HPV vaccines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-specific effects of vaccines</td>
<td>GVAP’s Decade of Vaccine Economics study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations

• The fundamental question is **impact on overall immunization coverage**
  – impact assessments must be carried out to measure this outcome.

• Studies should include **documentation of reasons for missed opportunity, strategies to address them, and measurement of impact** (including on overall immunization coverage) with robust methodology.

• Studies should be **implemented rapidly in the African region** using an adapted version of the protocols and tools from the experiences in Latin America.
  – consultant will focus on this in collaboration with PAHO and the AFRO office to ensure adaptation.
IVIR-AC agenda topics 2014

**Minimize barriers**
- Missed opportunities
- Reasons for non-vaccination
- Integration of care
- Non-specific effects of vaccines

**Evaluate impact**
- WHO VPD burden and impact assessment framework
- Typhoid and pertussis burden assessments
- Vaccine impact including economic assessments of typhoid, pertussis, meningitis A, hepatitis B, HPV vaccines
- GVAP’s Decade of Vaccine Economics study

**Monitoring**
- Coverage surveys
- GAVI Perspective
# WHO burden and impact framework

## Is the proposed framework useful? What are the emerging gaps?

### Challenges

- Lack of consensus on methods and approaches of evidence generated
- Unproductive duplication of work/neglected areas of work
  - Inefficient use of both human and financial resources

### Recommendations

IVIR-AC supports framework as a **HUB**:

- Experts network: to share/discuss methods, collaborate
- Evidence sharing: VPD burden studies, reviews (EPI, impact etc), tools, capacity strengthening...
- Gap analysis: What has been done – currently on-going – needs to be done
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Minimize barriers

- Missed opportunities
- Reasons for non-vaccination
- Integration of care
- Non-specific effects of vaccines

Evaluate impact

- WHO VPD burden and impact assessment framework
- Typhoid and pertussis burden assessments
- Vaccine impact including economic assessments of typhoid, pertussis, meningitis A, hepatitis B, HPV vaccines
- GVAP’s Decade of Vaccine Economics study

Monitoring

- Coverage surveys
- GAVI Perspective
WHO Coverage survey
Are the revised methods useful to address existing shortcomings?

Realities

• Immunization landscape as well as coverage survey more complex – risk of errors

• Data quality of coverage surveys
  – Sampling frame and method
  – Recording/data entry issues
  – Response error

• Revision of EPI guidelines
  – Decrease selection bias
  – Decrease reliance recall
  – Increase likelihood adequate power

Recommendations

• Revised method for coverage survey is appropriate but will require statistical expertise

• Need to improve quality of survey sampling

• Need for piloting the survey in hard to reach settings, rural and urban areas of Bangladesh and Zimbabwe
Impact
- WHO Burden and Impact Assessment Framework
- Pertussis
- Meningitis A
- Hep B
- DoVE
- HPV PRIME tool
- Typhoid

Barriers
- Non-Vaccination
- Integration of Care
- Missed Opportunities in Immunization
- Non-Specific Effects

Monitoring
- Coverage Surveys
- Gavi Perspectives

Framework development, fill knowledge gaps, form subgroups
- IVIR-AC Pertussis Subgroup
- Erratum to Lancet publication on burden estimates
- IVIR-AC Non-Vaccination Subgroup
- IVIR-AC Integration Subgroup pilot GAPD Zambia project
- Consultant identified as soon as possible to work with PAHO and AFRO on MOI
- IVIR-AC NSE Subgroup
- Pilot surveys in hard to reach settings (Zimbabwe & Bangladesh)
Thank you
Back up slides IVIR-AC October 2014
Comprehensive WHO VPD burden and impact assessment framework

Is the proposed framework useful? What are the emerging gaps by information presented?

Recommendations

- IVIR-AC: reviewing evidence, identifying gaps, biases and limitations, assessing research methodology, commenting on analytic approaches, correctly utilizing models,
- Sub-groups: identify any clear gaps and both value-added and unnecessary duplications of work to better direct future modeling and vaccination program work.
- Institutional capacity is needed while funding from various partners is streamlined according to the proposed framework.
- Encourage partners in the immunization field and other interested parties to contribute to the framework and to utilize it.
## WHO Framework on Vaccine Preventable Disease Burden and Impact Work Including Broader Economic Impact of Vaccines (BEIV)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Model Recommended</th>
<th>VPD Burden</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Tools, Manuals, &amp; Guidelines</th>
<th>Validation &amp; Learning</th>
<th>Capacity Strengthening</th>
<th>Independent Review Groups</th>
<th>Focal Points</th>
<th>BEIV Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATIC/DYNAMIC</td>
<td>PNEUMOCOCCAL DISEASE</td>
<td>Scott et al.</td>
<td>ProVac TriVac LiST OneHealth WHO Costing Tool adapted C4P</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>PAHO ProVac, IWG NUS (SEA)</td>
<td>CHERG AJ Van Hoek N Sundaram N Chaiyakunapruk</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>herd immunity</td>
<td>HIB DISEASE</td>
<td>Scott et al.</td>
<td>ProVac TriVac LiST OneHealth WHO Costing tool adapted C4P</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>PAHO ProVac</td>
<td>CHERG AJ van Hoek</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serotype replacement</td>
<td>ROTAVIRUS DISEASE</td>
<td>Soares et al.</td>
<td>ProVac TriVac LiST OneHealth WHO Costing tool adapted C4P</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>PAHO ProVac, IWG PRIME project</td>
<td>CHERG</td>
<td>Vietnam EPI Review Fiscal Consequences Vietnam &amp; Ghana</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CERVICAL CANCER</td>
<td>D’addario et al.</td>
<td>WHO PRIME ProVac CerviVac HSPH Tools HPV Costing tool WHO C4P, CxCa Costing tool WHO/CDC C4P</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>PAHO ProVac, IWG PRIME project</td>
<td>M Jit A Riewpaiboon A Newall A Levin</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INFLUENZA DISEASE</td>
<td>Jefferson et al.</td>
<td>ProVac</td>
<td>Field guides Influenza CE guide Influenza COI guide WHO/CDC FLUTOOL costing tool</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>PAHO ProVac</td>
<td>N Chaiyakunapruk A Newall A Levin A Reiwpaiboon M VanKerkhove</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Model Recommended</td>
<td>Tetanus</td>
<td>Diphtheria</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td>Rubella</td>
<td>BEIV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATIC</td>
<td></td>
<td>STATIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VPD Burden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEONATAL TETANUS DISEASE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muller et al.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools, Manuals, &amp; Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Validation &amp; Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Strengthening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Review Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHERG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focal Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam EPI Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEIV Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam EPI Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPIC/NCDs Generational accounting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEIV literature review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEIV framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pertussis impact modeling
What are the best approaches to address policy questions addressed by SAGE regarding pertussis vaccines?

Recommendations

• Models seem to be appropriate in terms of structure to better understand both schedule optimization and how HIC experiences can inform resurgence in LMICs

• Key problem is availability and quality of data – need for better surveillance in all countries

• IVIR-AC sub group will help identify specific data needs for parameterization of various models
WHO Pertussis burden modeling

Does the proposed provide reliable burden of pertussis estimates?

Recommendations

• New global pertussis model has significant limitations
  – solicitation exercise was too broad
  – age groups too wide
  – very wide range of potential estimates for model parameters

• Convene sub-group potential way forward to revise presented model in combination with the new data available since 2012
Meningitis impact assessment
Is the proposed approach adequate to assess men A vaccination?

Recommendations
• Dynamic model presented is appropriate to understand long term impact of current men A campaigns
• Sensitivity and uncertainty of model assumptions
• Economic impact and benefits will be required to understand investments in prevention of serogroup A meningococcal meningitis
Impact evaluation of Hep B vaccines

Is the proposed approach adequate to assess men A vaccination?

Recommendations

• Dynamic model presented is appropriate to understand long term impact of current men A campaigns

• Sensitivity and uncertainty of model assumptions

• Economic impact and benefits will be required to understand investments in prevention of serogroup A meningococcal meningitis
Decade of Vaccine Economics

Is the proposed approach adequate? Do the individual model components meet the state of the art modeling requirements?

Recommendations

• DoVE study aims to provide global estimates of resources needed for accomplishing the objectives of GVAP

• As individual disease model components do not meet state-of-the-art modeling requirements, DoVE should not be used for:
  – Country level decision making
  – Comparison impact between vaccines

• Transparency and increase clarity needed regarding methods, assumptions used and extrapolations of the different model components
HPV Cost-effectiveness (PRIME)

Is PRIME suitable to use as demonstration tool and to provide conservative estimates of the CE of vaccinating girls prior to sexual debut in LMICs? Is there opportunity to develop PRIME further?

Recommendations

• PRIME is suitable to as as demo tool to answer the simple question whether vaccinating pre-adolescent girls with HPV vaccines is CE.

• IVIR-AC questions whether PRIME provides conservative estimates:
  – 95% coverage level for 3-dose schedule
  – GLOBOCAN incidence not conservative in some settings
  – Relevance of CxCa screening program in some countries

• Useful to include budget impact analysis in PRIME
Typhoid disease burden, impact and economic assessment

Disease burden: Is the proposed approach robust?
Transmission models: what are the specific scenario on impact estimates that are required
Economic analysis: How best to capture variation in COI?

Recommendations

• IVIR-AC observed CFR for burden of disease due to publication bias and corrections for access to and utilization of care

• For transmission models heterogeneity should be considered since it may have implications for vaccine effectiveness while more uncertainty analysis is needed of various schedules

• For economic study stratification by group of countries and typhoid transmission/burden setting.
Reasons for non-vaccination

What kind of evaluation and methods are required to understand the root cause of non-vaccination?

Recommendations

– IVIR-AC promotes the use of community research studies linked to effective vaccine policy and media communications
– As there is a variety of disparate factors related to non-vaccination entirely different strategies are needed to improve coverage
– Establish research protocols and instruments considering when and how these may be used for implementation research
Recommendations

• The fundamental question for evaluating missed opportunities is the impact on overall immunization coverage, and thus impact assessments must be carried out to measure this outcome.

• Studies of missed opportunities should include documentation of reasons for the missed opportunity, strategies to address these reasons, and measurement of impact (including on overall immunization coverage) with robust methodology.

• Studies should be implemented rapidly in the African region using an adapted version of the protocols and tools from the experiences in Latin America.
  – consultant implement this in collaboration with PAHO and the AFRO office to ensure adaptation
Integration of care with other interventions

What are the priority questions to support the integration of delivery of vaccines with other health interventions?

Recommendations

- IVIR-AC identified the need for standardization of research tools and protocols locally applied, by antigen and schedule and determine how to translate the evidence on integration and community messaging.

- IVIR-AC cautioned that integration should be conducted such that quality of successful immunization programs are not compromised.
Non-specific effects of vaccines
research agenda

What are the priority questions to inform policy?

Recommendations

- IVIR-AC identified the need for development of standard protocols and implementation of high quality prospective studies (including RCTs where feasible) as observation studies are unlikely to provide conclusive evidence.

- Immunological analysis should become an essential part of future RCTs.

- Future NSE studies should also include morbidity outcomes.
Recommendations

• The revised method is the way forward, but that it requires statistical expertise to implement the survey in the field.

• Need for incorporating GPS technology to keep up with real time information and to improve the quality of survey sampling.

• To identify the unreached, IVIR-AC recognized the need for qualitative studies and piloting of surveys in hard to reach settings such as in rural and urban areas of Bangladesh and Zimbabwe.

• Concern of interpreting the new survey data in comparison with the data collected from previously used methods. Difficulties in monitoring progress and comparing cross-sectional data across methods and time must be addressed.