Meeting report

Summary of meeting

The agenda of the meeting was divided in four objectives:

1. To review 2011 activities and products.
2. To receive updates from partners.
3. To identify key issues and priority questions for the 2012 work plan & agenda for the Work Stream at the VCWG Annual Meeting.
4. To discuss Financing & Resources.

The co-chairs led a group discussion on objectives (3) and (4). The general consensus was on issues focusing on the fragility of gains, new ways of financing and building the new evidence case on continuous distribution.

Introduction

Don de Savigny and Jayne Webster welcomed the participants and introduced the meeting’s objectives and agenda. Over the last months four consultants with the financial support of the NetWorks project of USAID/JHUCCP, SDC and WHO/EPI produced a series of best practices documents on continuous LLIN distribution. The consultants shared their drafts with the core group of the Continuous LLIN Distribution Systems work stream for their comments and feedback and upon finalization with the entire RBM VCWG membership for their consensus.

The continuous LLIN distribution best practices documents are:

1. Consensus Statement on Continuous Distribution Systems for Insecticide Treated Nets (Jo Lines and Matt Lynch).
5. Lessons in Brief: Malawi No 1. Accountable Partnership Singing from the Same Songbook & Knowing the Score (John Justino).

The steps during the next weeks are:
- The documents are now with the editor and graphic designer.
- French translation. Target date VCWG-7 meeting in Geneva.
- Lesson in brief: Tanzania Voucher Scheme
- In depth case study of Ghana/Tanzania-voucher. Comparison for Health Policy and Planning.
- Dissemination of the documents.

**Presentations**


Mary Kante summarized the purpose of the best practices documents on designing the showcase successes and highlighting lessons learned, as well as sharing experiences among countries. She discussed the process undertaken to develop the *Country-to-Country Guide for LLIN Keep-Up* document: literature search, identify priority countries and key contacts, developed discussion guide and built relations with country focal points, conducted interviews and gathered tools, documents from more than 14 countries, including 3-day in-country mission in DRC, referenced Kenya, Malawi, and Tanzania case study information available, review and feedback. She pointed out that this operational guide for decision-makers (i) encompassing development of norms and standards, coordination mechanisms, training, logistics, communication, supervision, and M&E, (ii) shares the collective experience of more than fourteen countries – numerous practical country examples, (iii) provides fifty-nine references and tools, which are referenced and included in an easily searched matrix which will be linked to the Excel matrix and accessible via the RBM VCWG website. She mentioned some critical issues observed from her experiences from the different countries: staff burden, supporting systems versus ‘sustainability’, ensuring continuous supply, HMIS versus ‘parallel’ systems and supervision, NMCP role.
The Lessons in Brief documents selected country case studies to showcase the range of strategies used to deliver LLINs continuously. Mary presented the Lessons in Brief: Malawi and Lessons in Brief: Kenya documents on behalf of John Justino and Kate Kolaczinski, accordingly. For both case studies country visits were contacted, meetings/interviews with stakeholders, information gathering, visits to clinics, warehouses, distribution sites and sales outlets. The key to success in Malawi is summarized in the accountable partnership:

- Many partners - one national scale strategy broad partnership.
- Clear national LLIN / ITN guidelines.
- Encouraging multiple distribution channels.
- Different net shapes and colors in different channels.

Malawi benefits from having partners with strong logistics and stock management capabilities.

The Kenya model is impressive in its:

- Supply chain management achievements.
- DoMC: Strong leadership partnered with open collaborative approach.
- Inclusion as part of MoH standard ANC/EPI package.
- Success in continuing to secure support from donors for a fairly expensive model.
- Contribution to maintenance of coverage.

The face-to-face meetings were essential for getting requested documents and information as well as MoH approval of end products.

In depth case study of Ghana/Tanzania voucher comparison for Health Policy and Planning by Jayne Webster and Don de Savigny

Jayne Webster described the need of an in-depth case study of the voucher schemes in Ghana and Tanzania in documenting and sharing the complex histories and contexts and in understanding the elements of sustained integration of continuous delivery. It is being achieved by comparing the two histories from a systems perspective and by documenting review, stakeholder meetings, in-depth interviews (Ghana). She illustrated the current status of the continuous delivery strategies in Ghana (many delivery strategies used, often the first country to try new strategies and a current focus on campaign delivery with no continuous delivery since late 2010) and in Tanzania (voucher scheme in operation for >10 years, consider the voucher scheme experiences within the context of other strategies for delivery of nets/ITNs within each country). The timeline of voucher and non-voucher ITN delivery strategy events in Ghana constructed and agreed as a factual account in a meeting with stakeholders (July 2011). The results will be published in the Health Policy and Planning journal in the 3rd quarter 2012.
Continuous distribution of LLINs: a guide to concepts and strategy by Jayne Webster on behalf of Kate Kolaczinski

Jane Webster presented on behalf of Kate Kolaczinski. The guide to concepts and strategy is a tool to help national programmes maintain high ownership of LLINs through development of continuous distribution strategy. The structure of this document is divided in three parts:

- Part 1: Background and introduction. Including: targets, how to use, rationale for continuous distribution.
- Part 2: Overview of continuous distribution mechanisms.
- Part 3: Step by Step guide to developing a continuous distribution strategy. NetCALC tool to be used alongside. Section includes guidance on where to find possible monitoring and evaluation and research needs as well as where to find support.

The document was introduced to Ghana, Kenya and Nigeria NMCP personnel and partners during a meeting in Nairobi. The teams used the guide to support development of draft continuous distributions strategies. The comments on the content and structure fed into final modification with positive feedback so far from countries that have used it to help inform planning (Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria).

A Collation of Global Funding Commitments for Sub-Saharan Africa, 2011-16 by Lucy Smith Paintain

Lucy Smith Paintain described the purpose of the review on collating available data on LLINs to be delivered through campaign or continuous mechanisms and comparing with predicted need for 2011-16, providing an informed ‘gap’ for continuous net distributions for communication at global level to assist in future planning. She reviewed all 57 funded GFATM proposals from Rounds 7-10 and the RCC (42 countries). The number of LLINs needed, funded and the remaining gap for the period 2011-16 was extracted into Excel. She disaggregated the data by campaign or continuous delivery mechanism (where possible) and included LLINs funded by GFATM and other sources. She compared the figures with those extracted from other net mapping projects, such as RBM country roadmaps for 2010 and 2011 and country-specific calculations of LLINs need using the NetWorks LLIN model. The key findings-individual country needs are:

- Absolute LLIN numbers needed and the remaining gap are sensitive to assumed coverage achieved in 2010.
- However, predicted annual population coverage using funded LLINs from GFATM proposals is independent of this assumption:
  - No. LLINs & median LLIN lifespan overlaid on to population & HH size to determine annual coverage of at risk population.
- Based on data from GFATM proposals:
  - 21 countries (44.7%) will reach 100% LLIN coverage in at least one year of 2011-16.
31 countries (66.0%) will reach 80% LLIN coverage; amongst these, median 3 years >80%.
11 countries (23.4%) will NOT reach 80% coverage between 2011-16; 5 countries without any data.

She summarised her findings:
- ~295m LLINs distributed between 2008-10, ~360m already funded for 2011-16.
- Between these two time periods, % LLINs allocated for delivery through continuous channels increased from 21.6% to 41.5%.
- Available data on committed funding for LLINs and planned distributions indicates a number of countries will not achieve 80% universal coverage target by 2016.
- Based on modelling predictions, there is a gap of approx 185 million LLINs for continuous distribution over 2011-16 to maintain universal coverage of 80% for all 47 countries in sub-Saharan Africa.
- With increasing emphasis on improved mechanisms of continuous keep-up, will need to be flexibility in how LLINs with already committed funding are allocated across years and delivery mechanisms.

NetWorks Year 3 by Matt Lynch

Matt Lynch described the different themes of the NetWork project (Net Integrity, Continuous Distribution, Campaigns, Net Use and Capacity Building) and the components (Policy, Distribution, BCC/Net Use, Operations Research). NetWork project funds part of the work related to Continuous LLIN Distribution Systems and Durability of LLINs in the Field work streams under Net Integrity (Policy and Operations Research).

The main products on continuous distribution for 2012 are:

**Policy**
- NetCALC Training of Trainers
- Private Sector
- Dissemination of VCWG products

**Distribution**
- Mini NetCALC Assessments
- Full Country Assessments + Pilots (Ghana & other?)

The plans for continuous distribution for 2012 include:
- Analyzing and reporting results of pilots.
- Preparing policy recommendations/Best Practices where justified.
- Conducting follow-up pilots/operations research on key issues identified in 2012; including:
  - Pull system(s)
  - Private sector participation
  - Others TBD
Main issues discussed:

- The cancelling of GFATM round 11 and how we can try to help to protect funding for LLINs to sustain the gains achieved over the last few years was a major theme of the discussion.
- One step is to collate and synthesise data on the impact of increased delivery of LLINs during the last few years with increased funding available. And conversely to project the possible losses in these gains with reduced funding and therefore less access to and use of LLINs.
- ‘Soft’ story on problems with funding generated and released between Christmas and New Year time, e.g. in Fox News.
- In order to protect the gains achieved and ensure that essential programs are maintained, the Global Fund Board has decided to take immediate and exceptional action by establishing a Transitional Funding Mechanism and revising the application and approval process for renewals.
- Lucy Smith Paintain will create the graphs of the 11 countries which did not achieve sufficient coverage (according to coverage predicted by NetWorks LLIN model for 2011–16). The graphs present a comparison of predicted LLIN needs to achieve and maintain 80% coverage with predicted actual coverage achievable by funded LLIN in four example countries, 2011–16. The countries are: Sierra Leone, Namibia, Sudan South, Congo (DRC), Sudan North, Guinea, Cape Verde, Ethiopia, Niger, Zambia, Ghana.
- Data on how much it costs to do continuous distribution are needed.
- What is the role of the private sector? Private sector retailer chain to distribution of nets and can stock ‘public nets’. Private sector is more organized than was before and contribute 5-10% on coverage (NetCALC predictions).
- We have to reconsider the way the nets are distributed in the rural and urban areas (percentage of coverage, e.g. 40% in urban and 70% in rural areas). The DHS data do not distinguish between urban and peri-urban areas.
- Trace back information and lessons learnt from community deliveries and from the strategic framework RBM plans 2000. Consider carefully what we learnt since then.
- Touch base with WHO on documents that might not be referenced in the best practice documents produced by the work stream. Hannah Koenker will follow up and any missed references will be included in the draft version of the documents.
- Sustainability and multiple channels are needed.
- The preferences in color and shape (conical versus vectorial) affect the price of a net. Bestnet will share their study on color preference.
- There is no promotion of innovation, when having minimum standards.
- The distribution depends on vertical process.
- Targeted time of distribution depend on density of community.
Continuous distribution of nets can save on time and replace nets when needed. Care and repair of the nets is important. Develop a pull system that does not depend on you.

If insecticide resistance is established in an area, untreated nets without holes should be in use.

The dissemination of the best practice documents was discussed and agreed to add in the existing list the following:

- Consensus statement: DFID, GF, TDR, ALMA, special envoy, AMP, Japan.
- GF review: UNICEF, PMI, World Bank, individual partners, in-country meetings. NetWorks VOICE team will extract a 2-page advocacy document based on the GF review. The excel files to be linked in the RBM web page.
- Strategic guide: to be turned in a journal article. To be used in the AMP trainings, SRN and WHO meetings before MOC visits start in PMI teams.
- Country to country guide: World Bank, in EARN and WARN meetings.

Priorities for discussion at the annual meeting and for consolidating a 2012 workplan were summarized as:

1) An Editorial from the CD workstream interpreting the fragile gains in LLIN coverage to be completed by March 2012.
2) To consider new financing possibilities.
3) New private sector engagement and consideration of having a ‘business case meeting’.
4) What is the new evidence case – pulling together evidence based studies on achievements, bottlenecks etc.

**Close of meeting**

The meeting was closed by Don de Savigny and Jayne Webster who thanked those present and concluded that comments raised will be the basis of the discussions for the next meeting planned in February.

**Date of next meeting**

8th February 2012, IFRC Geneva, Switzerland.
### Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Chairperson/Guests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30 – 8:35</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
<td>Macdonald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:35 – 8:40</td>
<td>Introductions</td>
<td></td>
<td>de Savigny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:40 – 8:45</td>
<td>Meeting Objectives and Agenda</td>
<td>Webster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45 – 9:00</td>
<td>Review of previous year’s activities and products</td>
<td>Country-to-Country Guide for Implementers of LLIN Keep</td>
<td>Kante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 – 9:10</td>
<td>Lessons in Brief-Malawi</td>
<td>Kante/Justino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:10 – 9:20</td>
<td>Lessons in Brief-Kenya</td>
<td>Kante/Kolaczinski</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:20 – 9:30</td>
<td>Case studies Ghana/Tanzania-voucher comparison</td>
<td>Webster/de Savigny</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 – 9:45</td>
<td>A Guide to Concepts and Planning</td>
<td>Webster/Kolaczinski</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45 – 10:00</td>
<td>A Collation of Global Funding Commitments for 2011-16</td>
<td>Paintain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 – 10:15</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 – 10:30</td>
<td>Morning break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 – 10:40</td>
<td>Update from Partners on Continuous Distribution Work Plans</td>
<td>Lines/Mnzava</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:40 – 10:50</td>
<td>NetWorks</td>
<td>Lynch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:50 – 11:00</td>
<td>Population Services International (PSI)</td>
<td>Spiers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 – 11:15</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15 – 13:00</td>
<td>Brainstorming</td>
<td>Lynch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15 – 13:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Koenker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15 – 13:00</td>
<td>Open discussion on identification of key issues and priority questions which need to be addressed to move the continuous distribution field forward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00 – 13:45</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:45 – 14:30</td>
<td>Resource mapping</td>
<td>de Savigny</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:45 – 14:30</td>
<td>Open discussion on identification of current and potential sources of support to address and provide evidence on the priority issues identified</td>
<td>Boutsika</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30 – 15:00</td>
<td>Summary and Conclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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