



INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE
OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES

Gaps and Priorities in U.S. Contributions to Global Disease Challenges: What has the U.S. done well and not as well?

HIV Prevention Programming

Stefano M. Bertozzi, MD, PhD
Instituto Nacional de Salud Pública
Cuernavaca, México
July 7, 2008
IOM Working Group Meeting



Challenges

- ❑ HIV prevention planning still largely deficient after 25+ years
 - 2.5 million new infections/year, 33 million people with HIV
 - Incidence has plateaued, but prevalence may not for another 25 or more years and the number of people on treatment well after the prevalence peak
- ❑ Currently available evidence easily ignored
 - E.g. harm reduction, abstinence-only programs
- ❑ Insufficient data:
 - Epidemiology
 - Intervention/program effectiveness
 - Intervention costs/coverage
- ❑ Requires addressing sex and drugs



INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE
OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES

Major Findings

- Incontrovertible effectiveness of:
 - safe injection practices, blood screening, PMTCT, condoms (when used), circumcision (for heterosexual men), harm reduction for IDU
- Multiple examples of effective prevention of sexual transmission among key populations (e.g. MSM, FSW)
 - Common elements: multiple, reinforcing interventions (“combination prevention”); high levels of coverage (tipping point?); community involvement
- Poor data base regarding:
 - general population behavioral interventions: VCT, IEC, school education, CSM
 - costs of interventions
- No data base regarding structural interventions



INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE
OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES

U.S. Contribution

PROs

- U.S. has contributed enormously to HIV treatment and prevention through PEPFAR & Global Fund
- U.S. pillar of R&D for treatment, vaccines, microbicides

CONS

- “Emergency” response not appropriate after 25 years
 - long term approach needed that addresses:
 - drivers, behaviors & transmission probability
 - and builds the human & physical infrastructure needed to adequately cover all epidemiologically relevant populations
- Inefficient use of funds
 - rigid earmarks,
 - single intervention approaches (e.g. abstinence only),
 - under-funding of effective interventions for key populations,
 - many missed evaluation opportunities,
 - reluctance to use generic drugs,
 - excessive reliance on short-term TA from USA as opposed to building local capacity, etc.



Gaps in Knowledge

- Insufficient data:
 - Expected incidence patterns → effective targeting
 - Intervention effectiveness → effective programming
 - Intervention costs/coverage → effective management
 - Marginal program effectiveness → optimal funding levels
- Insufficient knowledge:
 - Biomedical: vaccines, microbicides, circumcision for MSM
 - Behavioral: mass mobilization interventions for high prevalence settings; better tailored interventions for key populations
 - Structural: how does one change the drivers?
 - Managerial/operational
 - [Treatment: adherence strategies, cost reduction strategies]
- However, imperfect information today no excuse for inaction



INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE
OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES

Recommendations

- Continue to invest in vaccines & microbicide development
- Develop new technologies to measure HIV incidence and software/tools to model epidemic behavior
- Innovate & experiment with new behavioral and structural prevention approaches
- LEARN WHILE DOING -- incorporate impact evaluations throughout programs with uncertain effectiveness
- Invest in education, not just training -- generate excess capacity to analyze/plan, to implement, to manage, & to evaluate
- Tie funding to performance
 - fund via the most efficient mechanism (e.g. WB, GF, bilateral)
 - fund the most efficient implementors, whether US-based or not; private, governmental or NGO; without pointless shackles (e.g. prostitution pledges)

Strengthening Health Systems

- Most HIV prevention occurs outside of the formal health system → little effect
 - Strengthening human and infrastructure capacity can contribute to system strengthening
 - Current short-term training/poaching approaches can have the opposite effect.
 - Far more important for care & treatment
 - Massive increases in funding appear to be strengthening health systems
 - but the same conclusion applies regarding human resources



sbertozzi@insp.mx