DCVMN INTERNATIONAL
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
06 April 2020

Participants: Sai D Prasad (SDP), Patrick Tippoo (PT), Lingjiang Yang (LY), Weidan Huang (WH), Adriansjah Azahri (AA), Tiago Rocca (TR), Fernando Lobos (FL), Suresh Jadhav (SJ), Sonia Pagliusi (SP), Laura Viviani (LV), Benoit Hayman (BH), Maureen Dennehy (MDe). Excused: Akira Homma, Mahima Datla. TC Started at 12. noon Geneva time finished at 2.00 pm

Welcome and excuses received.

Before discussing the proposed agenda topics, PT suggested to reflect on two points raised at the Grant Advisory Committee TC, held on Friday 3rd April: a) query from Ray Prasad on the implementation of the McK strategic plan to increase secretariat capacity; b) query from David Kaslow, PATH, seeking DCVMN position/response to the COVID situation, as occasion for the Network to align and help in COVID vaccine development and supply. SDP stated that DCVMN can ensure supply for both, available vaccines and covid vaccines. Each company is discussing with UNICEF and other stakeholders on how to handle contracts disruptions, if any. He suggested drafting a statement on continuous supply, reiterating the DCVMN statement to SAGE and post it on our website. Regarding COVID, some members are active in Covid vaccine development and can offer capabilities for manufacture of successful vaccine roll-out, while DCVMN can play a facilitator role in sharing public information. SDP suggested creating space on website as platform to share key information on public domain, with links to members’ statements on access. SP suggested to keep open statements about industry helping on Covid, similar to IFPMA, as associations’ role is not to reorganize supply for companies. PT highlighted the need for DCVMN to be present at this dialogue. SJ added that many organizations have contacted every manufacturer – DCVMN, LATHAM, Gates, CEPI, PATH, BARDA, etc. all asking the same questions. ACTION: Secretariat to draft statement to be sent to UNICEF/PAHO/IVI/CEPI/WellcomeTrust/Gates/BARDA on willingness to facilitate R&D, and sharing available capabilities for vaccines supply. Distinguish what each manufacturer do and what the Network does. SDP to formally contact CEPI, as DCVMN President, to contribute and keep us informed. Leave to companies to provide specific information themselves, drawing the line that only manufacturers can provide specific information on R&D strategies.

1. Endorsement of the Annual Report 2019 (for decision): all EC members endorsed the annual report and recommended its approval by the general assembly. DECISION: finalize report for members’ approval.

2. AGM 2020 (for advice): there are risks that in October not all members be able to travel internationally; thus AGM organization may warrant an extended deadline for decision. PT suggested considering the implications, for partners and for governance, of not having a face-to face meeting. Find alternative mechanisms to be offered. FL added that partners are generous DCVMN supporters and may be involved in the discussion/decision, if no event is offered. Theme and dates are fine, if the meeting happens, and agenda priority topics should be drafted for either a f2f or a virtual meeting, similar to SAGE. SP mentioned that J.Hendricks contacted her twice by phone to follow up on the proposal of DCVMN history book, but mentioned that the proposed project is no longer possible due to travel ban. PT added that a DCVMN history should be written up by a professional, to add value to the members. ACTION: draft key agenda topics and complete development of the final agenda topics. ADVICE: Maintain the current dates and location for AGM. AGM format (in person vs Virtual) to be decide by end of May.

3. Proposal for scientific collaboration with Humane Society International through a MOU (for decision): LV mentioned that HSI (https://www.hsi.org/) is one of largest organizations on animal welfare engaged in reduce use of animals also in vaccine production, specifically batch release testing, as one opportunity.
They also work in cosmetics, chemicals, pesticides. HSI started working on this topic with Gates Foundation support to understand stakeholders needs, regulators, industries, international organisations, ICH, WHO dealing with guidelines and regulations. DCVMN has a 3Rs working group and offers interesting opportunities for synergies. We heard in the AC telecon that it is very likely that DCVMN will receive NIIIMBL grant to work on wP-containing vaccines for batch release testing, as scientific project going forward 18 months. This MOU could complement and to disseminate information to NRAs, while it has no financial implications. LY asked if the MOU implies a commitment to focus more on 3Rs and if there would be any follow up. LV answered that the MOU is not binding, and there is no further agreement in the horizon. PT mentioned to be comfortable to proceed. Non-binding, simply a statement of intent as it fits within our strategic mandate. EC members expressed no objection to the MOU. **DECISION:** approve the MOU with HIS. **ACTION:** sign and circulate to the 3Rs WG for information. Other two MOUs have been signed with CoRE/NUS and with ISS, for specific training in regulatory affairs and for scientific advice on the PSPT project, both were approved by the AC and are within the budget for these activities.

4. **CHAI collaborative proposal on new technologies adoption (for advice).** BH reported that CHAI approach DCVMN, as our mission and their priorities overlap, to explore collaborations in three areas: a) supply sustainability, b) innovation and development, and c) Vaccine Markets Database. CHAI would work on developing supplier sustainability models and share information on key areas of innovation. For a) and b) CHAI would offer interactive workshops with members at AGM or hosting webinars. All within non-binding, mutually beneficial collaborations. Last point was the Linksbridge Vaccine Markets Model Database on vaccine supply and demand modelling, accessible to members. SDP asked if Linksbridge Model database is already available, or only available through collaboration with CHAI and if there are any financial implications. BH mentioned that CHAI is working with some members on pilot introductions. Next step would be to share with all members, however the VMM database of Linksbridge would probably have a cost. WH mentioned that she is also in collaboration with CHAI for capability on COGS demand side, market strategy and analysis, focusing mostly on public markets. However, we need to be careful on price-sensitive topics that may not suit DCVMN as an association. SDP cautioned to consider what kind of organizations DCVMN should be partnering with, broadly classified into 4 categories: procurement (UNICEF/PAHO), funding (GAVI/CEPI/PATH), private sponsors (Partners), NGO technical space (Imperial, HSI, WHO). CHAI is nontechnical, despite COGS knowledge and supplier sustainability. EC needs to decide if to engage with this different kind of “expertise” as a new avenue of organization on the table. SP clarified that CHAI is a DCVMN resource member since a few years, and provides in-kind support at AGM – help with moderating panel discussions, preparations, and rapporteurs. They also offer consulting for members bilaterally. We have no transactions with CHAI. They are asking whether we would like to engage on the three specific projects: Sustainability framework, Innovation and Markets database. AA mentioned interactions with Biofarma on COGS, but feels is very sensitive, thus should be some caution. SP suggested COGS as a theoretical training methodology, to help manufacturers to calculate COGS, as part of sustainability and cost control. While helping manufacturers 1:1 at a deeper level should be separate of DCVMN collaboration. WH agree that they are reliable and do not disclose confidential information. SP sought feedback on the 2 questions: SDP cautioned on supplier sustainability, as it eventually comes to product pricing and how the business is managed. They do not seem to add more value to innovation. Linksbridge – difficult to evaluate today in absence of cost information. These proposals are not capacity building in quality and technical topics, rather get into financial and business aspects. PT asked to what extent do we see the areas identified by CHAI as key areas for us to advance with respect to the role we play as network and value to generate for members. Manufacturers with good
experience should advise the EC about what is relevant to DCVMN and what is not. SDP added that if it just repeats what others do, careful not to create more noise in the system, as CHAI does already work with several DCVMNs. They have access to all members of the network to engage bilaterally. The Network needs clarity whether to go into business based relationships, not quality or technical. **ACTION:** SP to inform CHAI of interest in keeping relationship as Resource Member, e.g. AGM participation. For sustainability part – if it is not sharing specific information on costs, it is agreeable. **ADVICE:** it is advised not to engage further in innovation, or Market Database modelling, as it may interfere with other organizations and not aligned with DCVMN mission to facilitate technical, scientific capacity building. For Linksbridge, we need the full picture of implications before advising.

5. **PATH grant transfer mechanism (for information):** Over February secretariat shared grant contract and grant report 2019 with PATH, as well as information/materials on DCVMN training programmes, regulatory and Pharmacovigilance. PATH discussed with GF bilaterally and agreed to work with DCVMN informally for 6 months, to evaluate the needs. So grant transfer may be implemented in 6 months. PT added that EC is aware of transition; no risks or issues to flag for now, details to be worked through in next months. SDP agreed that PATH is an excellent organization, still DCVMN must be careful to ensure all feedback and milestones are in the manner intended between DCVMN and the donor. Ensure there are no gaps in communication process. SP added that DCVMN to care not to lose identity and autonomy and become only a PATH grantee. Mechanism envisaged would be Partnership: share costs and responsibilities, etc. No-one should disseminate info that belongs to the other. A risk is that DCVMN could be dilute and loose own “personality”, autonomy, and capacity to fundraise on its own. WH advised to emphasize transparency if routing through PATH. SDP added that majority of GF grants were managed through PATH, but changed and now the majority of grants are managed by GF directly. SP cautioned that perhaps this is a new turn on how GF manage grants, perhaps trying not to have direct relationships with small grantees anymore, but use pass-through such as NIIMBL, RIGHT, GHIF, PATH, etc. For different goals, different mechanisms; e.g. for technical projects, no executive level relationships needed. NIIMBL is really technical project but product development may go through PATH, IVI, GHIF, etc. SJ added that GF appears to seek direct interaction with manufacturers, whether an intermediary agency is involved or not. SDP suggested to reflect on the future strategy if DCVMN wishes to engage more with intermediary organizations as “project managers”, while ensure full justice to DCVMN. Good proposals maybe supported by GF directly? Some we may have control, some not. Now GMRI in Boston is directly involved in funding product own development. WH mentioned the need to understand what value DCVMN can offer. Meanwhile, learn how CHAI and PATH operate. EC must understand this international funding arena dynamic. SP suggested to see how it evolves while not losing the DCVMN identity and direct communication channels with large organizations. Build the communication with organizations where we can add value.

6. **COI policy document and declaration of COI will be discussed next TC together with the strategic plan:** Next TC by end April.

Nyon, 07 April 2020
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