

Defense Health Board

Infectious Diseases Control Subcommittee Update

Gregory A. Poland, MD Co-Vice-President, Defense Health Board Chair, Infectious Diseases Control Subcommittee

> Defense Health Board Meeting 18 August 2010



Membership

- Dr. Gregory Poland (Mayo Clinic)
- **Dr. Francis Ennis** (University of Massachusetts Medical School)
- Dr. Joseph Silva (University of California, Davis)
- Dr. Michael Oxman (University of California, San Diego)
- Dr. Edward Kaplan (University of Minnesota)
- Dr. Mark Miller (Fogarty Center, NIH)
- Dr. Walter Dowdle (Emory University)
- Dr. Pierce Gardner (Fogarty Center, NIH)
- **Dr. Clifford Lane** (NIH)
- Dr. John Clements (Tulane University)
- Dr. David Walker (UTMB)



Recent Activities

9 June 2010 Meeting: Agenda Topics

- Department of Defense (DoD) Novel 2009 H1N1 Summary
 - COL Wayne Hachey (OSD(HA))
- Question to the Board: Inclusion of Measles/Mumps/Rubella (MMR) Vaccine in Navy Accessions Screening and Immunization Program (ASIP)

- Dr. Robert Morrow, on behalf of CAPT Neal Naito (BUMED)

- DoD Immunization Programs for Smallpox, Anthrax, and Influenza and Military Vaccine Agency Operations (MILVAX)
 - COL Michael Krukar (MILVAX)



Recent Activities (Continued)

14 July 2010 Meeting: Agenda Topics

- Blood Look Back Program Information Brief
 - LTC Kenneth Davis (ABPO)
 - COL Frank Rentas (ASBP)
- Smallpox Vaccine (ACAM2000) and Anthrax Vaccine (AVA) Safety and Effectiveness: Follow-Up
 - COL Michael Krukar (MILVAX)
- Inclusion of MMR Vaccine in Navy ASIP: Follow-Up – CAPT Neal Naito (BUMED)
- U.S. Army Medical Research Institute for Infectious Diseases (USAMRIID) Special Immunizations Program (SIP): Follow-Up
 - Dr. Ellen Boudreau and Dr. Judy Pace-Templeton, on behalf of COL John Svorak (USAMRIID)



DoD Novel 2009 H1N1: Summary

- DoD outbreak response elements, including surveillance, detection, communication, and prevention efforts were handled in an exemplary manner
 - Evidenced by DoD's involvement in state allocation programs, vaccine distribution and immunization rates, safety monitoring activities
 - 90% of Active Duty vaccinated for H1N1
 - 96% of Active Duty vaccinated for seasonal influenza
 - Success of DoD communication initiatives
 - DoD Pandemic Influenza Watchboard
 - MILVAX Flash Info system



DoD Novel 2009 H1N1: Summary (Continued)

- Lessons learned regarding DoD's H1N1 efforts:
 - Risk communication is a top priority
 - More accurate definition of Service member prioritization is necessary
 - Greater emphasis should be placed on preventive medicine and preparedness exercises
 - Need for a universal, standardized immunization tracking system



Review of DoD Smallpox and Anthrax Immunization Policies

- Examined issues pertaining to:
 - Adverse events
 - Early detection
 - Current prophylaxis policies
 - Availability of alternative countermeasures
 - Threat evaluation
 - Continued need



Proposed Recommendations: DoD Smallpox Immunization Policy

- Suspend current DoD smallpox routine immunization program absent an immediate or credible threat
 - Burdens associated with unnecessary vaccination
 - Avert unnecessary costs in administering unwarranted vaccines
 - Minimizes need for multiple vaccines administered on routine basis
 - No clear benefit to date: no cases prevented; many AE's induced
 - Availability of alternative treatments: vaccinia immune globulin (VIG) and two antivirals, cidovir and an investigational drug
- However, special circumstances might exist where smallpox vaccine would be necessary and should continue (DoD to decide, i.e. SpecOp, etc.)



Proposed Recommendations: DoD Smallpox Immunization Policy (Continued)

- Recommend configuration of antiviral and vaccine stockpiles to "ready level"
- Extend surveillance window beyond current FDA requirement of 5 years for follow-up of ACAM2000 recipients who incurred specific vaccine-related adverse events
 - Capture late-onset cases (ex. propensity for congestive heart failure following resolved myopericarditis)



Proposed Recommendations: DoD Anthrax Immunization Policy

- Current anthrax immunization policy should not be changed
 - Anthrax is a continuing and credible threat
 - Ease of agent acquisition and engineering for biowarfare capability
 - CDC has not reported any linkage of AVA to increased risk of life-threatening or permanently disabling adverse events in the short- or long-term
 - Effectiveness of AVA against anthrax
- Continue current safety monitoring and reporting of AVA-associated adverse events (VAERS, others)



Review of MMR Vaccine Inclusion under Navy ASIP

- Examined issues pertaining to:
 - Incidence of mumps among DoD Active Duty Service Members between 2000 and 2009
 - Serological data indicating immunity to measles and rubella among Armed Forces recruits
 - Percent Navy accessions receiving MMR vaccine
 - Cost estimates for MMR screening program and MMR vaccination program
 - Projected cost-savings if only MMR screening were to be conducted
 - Cost per dose of MMR vaccine
 - MMR vaccine side-effects and adverse events



Review of MMR Vaccine Inclusion under Navy ASIP (Continued)

- Three potential courses of action proposed for consideration:
 - Continue current Navy ASIP
 - Drop MMR vaccine from ASIP and resume mandatory universal MMR vaccination upon accession
 - Continue Navy ASIP at recruit training centers
 - Monitor mumps case incidence within the Services and broader community
 - Reinstitute mandatory universal MMR vaccination for recruits if mumps outbreaks occur either in recruit training sites or mumps cases incidence increases



Proposed Recommendations: Inclusion of MMR Vaccine in Navy ASIP

- Navy should continue current practice followed under ASIP of administering MMR vaccine to eligible recruits following serological screening
 - Vaccine recipients are recruits who are non-immune to measles and rubella (present immunization rate is 15%-20% of estimated 40,000 Navy accessions per year)
 - Unwarranted vaccinations would be averted
 - Significant resource and cost-savings
 - Cost per screening assay is \$5.00
 - Cost of MMR vaccine is between \$45 and \$60
- Close surveillance should be maintained
 - Any increase in mumps case incidence, or changes in the epidemiology, should be reported



USAMRIID SIP: Summary

- SIP was established to confer added protection to laboratory personnel engaged in research on countermeasures for select agents
 - Over 600 volunteers:
 - 60% from USAMRIID
 - 40% from other DoD, federal and non-government institutions
 - Licensed vaccines (Food and Drug Administration [FDA]approved) required under SIP
 - Investigational new drug (IND) vaccines used for both research and immunizing laboratory personnel:
 - Legacy vaccines developed by the Salk Institute from the 1960s to the1990s; recommended under SIP
- Major issues affecting the sustainment of the SIP include policy, availability, and ethical use considerations



SIP: Terms of Reference for DHB Examination

- Determine whether the SIP still serves an important role in the context of USAMRIID's overall biosafety and occupational health program
 - Advent of modern personal protective equipment (PPE) and other engineering controls
- Define the appropriate role of vaccination in protecting against laboratory-acquired infections
 - Determination regarding who should be vaccinated, if vaccinations still play an important role
- Determine the ethical issues associated with the SIP, if any, and how to address them
- Assess the value of the legacy IND vaccines for DoD and determine whether they should be maintained
 - Assuring future availability of any legacy vaccine found to be valuable for laboratory-acquired exposures and/or force health protection



USAMRIID SIP: Main Issues Reviewed by Subcommittee to Date

- List of licensed and IND vaccines administered
- Benefits and risks of IND vaccines, and to whom they are administered
- Program funding source and costs for sustainment
- Appropriateness of and compliance with existing biosafety precautions and practices, particularly for personnel who refuse (required) licensed vaccines or (voluntary) IND vaccines
- Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) and availability of alternative safety measures



USAMRIID SIP: Main Issues Reviewed by Subcommittee to Date (Continued)

- Vaccine immunological potency evaluations, manufacture and lot release dates, and remaining supply (at present rate of use)
- Vaccine storage, vial labeling, and integrity of vials and vial stoppers
- Safety and immunogenicity data
- Data on vaccine local and systemic side effects
- Number of possible organism exposures addressed in SIP
- Continuation and need of the SIP in the context of USAMRIID's overall biosafety and occupational health program



SIP: Subcommittee Current Plan of Action

- National Academies of Science (NAS) committee initiated a study of issues pertaining to the USAMRIID SIP on March 2010
 - Identify pathogens for which the availability of vaccines would be highly desirable
 - Examine technical issues related to expanding the USAMRIID SIP
 - Inform U.S. Government high level policy discussion regarding the role of vaccines in the context of Select Agent research
- A report expected within 9-12 months of start date
- DHB will delay comment; may address any residual, highly focused questions relating to the specific areas of its members' expertise following the release of the NAS report



DISCUSSION