UNDERSTANDING VACCINATION COVERAGE DATA QUALITY INCENTIVES FINAL PRESENTATION

Mohamed Albirair, Samantha LeDuc, Jeremy Beckford, Rena Patel Sep 8th, 2020



START CENTER STRATEGIC ANALYSIS, RESEARCH & TRAINING CENTER

PROJECT TEAM



Mohamed Albirair, MBBS, MPH PhD Student, Global Health Project Manager



Samantha LeDuc, MPH PhD Student, Epidemiology Research Assistant



Jeremy Beckford, MPH PhD Student, Epidemiology Research Assistant



Rena Patel, MD, MPH Global Health Faculty Lead



AGENDA

- START & Project Overview
- Methodology
- Main Findings: Conceptual Framework
- Main Findings: Successful Interventions
- Evidence Database
- Case Studies
- Synthesis and Conclusion





START OVERVIEW

START OVERVIEW



Leverages leading content expertise from across the University of Washington



Provides high quality research and analytic support to the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and global and public health decision-makers



Provides structured mentorship and training to University of Washington graduate research assistants



PROJECT OVERVIEW

BACKGROUND

POOR HEALTH DATA QUALITY

- Intervention coverage data reports go through several levels before they are routed to ministries of health
- Data falsification can either be intentional distortion (data falsification) or errors (e.g., shortcuts to speed up job tasks)
- Data falsification may be <u>donor driven</u>, as donors incentivize "good-looking data"
- <u>Technology aspects</u> may be relevant but lesser priority





KEY PROJECT OBJECTIVES



To understand what interventions have been <u>successful</u> in improving the <u>accuracy</u> of health campaign coverage



To understand what **<u>facilitators</u>** possibly contributed to the success of improved accuracy



To understand what **<u>barriers</u>** existed for the case studies and were overcome in improving health data accuracy



METHODOLOGY

DATA SOURCES

1. LITERATURE REVIEW

36/91 articles' focus included data quality

2. EXPERT INTERVIEWS

Project Name	Organization	Experts
Polio Data Program Improvements	Gorman Consulting	Trina GormanLauren Schwartz
Salud Mesoamerica Initiative (SMI)	Inter-American Development Bank (IAB)	 Dr. Emma Iriarte Maria Paola Zuniga Brenes Diego Rios-Zeruche
Vaccinator Tracking System (VTS)	eHealth Africa	Iheanyichukwu UzomaAbubakar shehu
Better Immunization Data (BID)	PATH	Fred Njobvu



MAIN FINDINGS: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

REDEFINING DATA QUALITY, USABILITY AND UTILIZATION



Relevancy, efficiency, completeness, timeliness, integrity, and consistency

Bloland and MacNeil 2019, https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-6709-1



CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

PERFORMANCE OF ROUTINE INFORMATION SYSTEM MANAGEMENT (PRISM)

Technical determinants





MAIN FINDINGS: SUCCESSFUL INTERVENTIONS

SUCCESSFUL INTERVENTIONS CATEGORIES



CASE STUDIES

SALUD MESOAMERICA INITIATIVE (SMI)



Established in 2011. Primarily working across southern Mexico and Central America. It is a publicprivate partnership administered by the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB).



MISSION

Mission: To improve maternal, neonatal, and child health outcomes among the most under served communities in seven Central American countries and the state of Chiapas in Mexico.

APPROACH

SMI utilizes a results-based aid mechanism which sets performance indicators with governments to align with country-specific priorities.



FOCUS

SMI places a significant focus on strengthening the health system through building capacity and providing technical assistance for partnering countries.



SALUD MESOAMERICA INITIATIVE (SMI)



VACCINATOR TRACKING SYSTEM (VTS)

eHEALTH AFRICA



HISTORY

Established in 2009. Primarily working across West Africa and currently execute projects in many countries, including Chad, Cameroon, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Nigeria, and others.

MISSION

To build stronger health systems through the design and implementation of data-driven solutions.

APPROACH

Supports interventions through a broad spectrum: pre-, during-, and post-intervention.



Vaccinator Tracking System (VTS) incorporates components from the 3 determinants of successful interventions



VACCINATOR TRACKING SYSTEM (VTS)



BETTER IMMUNIZATION DATA (BID) INITIATIVE



HISTORY

Launched in 2013, BID was led by PATH and the governments of Tanzania and Zambia with support from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

MISSION

The BID Initiative is grounded in the belief that better data, plus better decisions, will lead to better health outcomes.

APPROACH

BID has identified practical, country-owned, country-led solutions to improve immunization service delivery—and potentially other health areas, as well.

FOCUS

To design, test, and roll out a holistic suite of interventions to address their most critical routine immunization service delivery problems through improved data collection, quality, and use.



BETTER IMMUNIZATION DATA (BID) INITIATIVE



Werner et al., 2019 – <u>https://doi.org/10.9745/GHSP-D-19-0</u>0024

SYNTHESIS AND CONCLUSION

SYNTHESIS (1/2)

DATA FALSIFICATION

- Data falsification exists, but it is more attributable to poor data systems and poor data use rather than due to funding incentives.
- Different interventions currently implemented are designed to mitigate data falsification.
- No evidence about the prevalence or magnitude of data falsification.

BARRIERS AND FACILITATORS

- Limited data regarding the respective magnitude of each.
- Most commonly reported barriers: "inadequate reporting systems" and "inaccurate data".
- Key facilitators: "strong leadership and political support" and "adequate resources".

IMPACT OF INTERVENTIONS

- The most prominent perceived outcome is *staff enthusiasm* and *sense of ownership*.
- A subset of studies reported on the impact of the different interventions.



SYNTHESIS (2/2)

IMPACT OF INTERVENTIONS

Perceptions of data quality among facility in-charges and immunization nurses in Tanga Region, Tanzania Ability to identify low DPT3 coverage areas, defaulters, and vaccine stock levels among facility health care workers, baseline versus midline, Southern Province, Zambia

7% (6)

16% (14)

78% (69)

Midline

3% (3)

29% (26)

13% (12)

54% (48)

Baseline

12% (11)

4% (4)

83% (74)

Midline

2%(2)

26% (23)

18% (16)

54% (48)

Baseline

9% (8)

27% (24)

64% (57)

Midline

Don't know / no response

Could identify but no action

Could identify and took action

Not able to identify



CONCLUSION



warranted

THANK YOU

