

# AMP The Alliance for Malaria Prevention

Expanding the ownership and use of mosquito nets

## Mission Report – Zambia

### AMP Technical Assistance

<b>Mission Dates:</b>	October 16 – October 30, 2019
<b>Locations:</b>	Lusaka, Zambia
<b>Consultant:</b>	Alain Daudrumez, Miko Thomas
<b>Date of Report:</b>	29 November 2019
<b>Subject of Report:</b>	Zambia UC LLIN Campaign – 2020/2021

---

### Campaign summary

Target population	8,713,071 (Macroplanning)
Scale of campaign	All villages not covered by IRS. Information not yet available.
Total number of ITNs	5,324,655 (Macroplanning)
Number of standard LLINs (quantity by funder)	2,128,000. Made up of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1.7m nets procured for 2020 (PMI);</li> <li>• 0.4m nets to be procured for 2021 (PMI).</li> </ul>
Number of PBO ITNs (quantity by funder)	3,196,655 Please note that a request has been made from AMF for these PBO nets, but a final decision is still pending.
Number of other type of ITNs (quantity by funder)	Nil
Date planned for microplanning	To be determined
Date planned for household registration	To be determined
Date planned for ITN distribution	August 2020. Exact dates to be determined.

### Background

The Zambia National Malaria Elimination Centre (NMEC) is currently planning the implementation of its 2020/2021 ITN mass distribution campaign, with support from the Global Fund and the

President's Malaria Initiative (PMI). The last mass ITN distribution in Zambia was in 2017, where over 10 million standard LLINs were procured and distributed country wide with the support of the Global Fund, Against Malaria Foundation (AMF) and PMI.

The NMEC is implementing several malaria interventions in Zambia, including large-scale Indoor Residual Spraying (IRS). In 2020, the mass ITN distribution campaign will target populations that have not benefitted from IRS. 3,474,106 households (representing approximately 15,008,137 persons) are being targeted for IRS in 2020. The remaining 8,713,071 estimated populations will be targeted for mass ITN distribution. This represents an ITN requirement of 5,324,655 (including a 10% buffer).<sup>1</sup>

The NMEC have secured the procurement of approximately 2.1 million standard LLINs from PMI and is in negotiations with AMF for the procurement of the remaining nets (given insecticide resistance in the country, a request has been made for PBO nets). The GF is funding the non-net costs of the campaign.

This is the first time that the NMEC in Zambia has requested TA support from AMP.

Various factors differentiate this campaign from previous mass ITN campaigns, including:

- The 2020 campaign is being co-deployed with IRS services. The targeting strategy for IRS and ITN services is stratified based on villages within zones. This means that some villages within zones will benefit from ITNs and others from IRS, which will require more detailed planning for logistics and SBCC, as well as potentially higher operational costs due to the loss of the "economy of scale" with the co-deployment approach.
- The 2020 campaign could be a multi-product campaign, with both PBOs and standard LLINs being distributed.
- This is the first time that Zambia has requested technical assistance from AMP, which means that some methodologies and strategies as recommended by AMP would be new to the team.

### **Objectives of the mission – General**

The priorities of the TA mission are to work with the NMEC to discuss lessons learned from previous campaigns, modifications that are necessary for the 2020 campaign given lessons learnt in 2017, and to develop the draft macroplanning documents for the campaign (campaign plan of action, logistics plan of action, SBCC plan of action, risk assessment and mitigation, timeline and budget).

### **Objectives of the mission – Specific**

Specific deliverables from the TA include:

1. Outline of 2020 mass campaign plan of action, including methodology for household

---

<sup>1</sup> Quantification is based on 2017 HH registration figures with growth projections.

- registration, recommendations for accurate identification of households and measures to resolve identified challenges
2. Mass campaign timeline capturing technical, logistics, communication and M&E components of the campaign
  3. Listing of options for more effective and efficient household registration to move forward discussions with key partners
  4. An outline of SBCC plan including target audiences, channels, tools and messages
  5. An outline of logistics plan of action and supporting annexes (macro transport and storage plans, etc.)
  6. Campaign risk mitigation plan
  7. Draft logistics training package based on decisions regarding the supply chain (TBD)

### **Mission roll out**

- 16 October: Meetings held with NMEC and some subcommittee members to discuss status of macroplanning, mission roll out, and available documents for review.
- 21 October to 23 October: Working sessions with NMEC to develop macro level budget. While working on macro level budget, discussing issues and challenges from 2017 campaign, as well as possible new challenges given co-deployment of interventions.
- 28 October: Continued working sessions with NMEC in the finalisation of macro level budget.
- 29 October: (1) Working session held with SBCC subcommittee to brainstorm on SBCC activities for 2020 campaign; (2) Working session with a few members of the logistics subcommittee to initiate a first draft of the logistics plan of action (LPoA).
- 30 October: (AM) Last working session on campaign macro-budget; (PM) Mission debriefing.

### **Challenges**

It is important to note the following:

- There were three public holidays during the in-country mission;
- Some key members of the team (namely, SBCC officer at the NMEC and the NMEC finance team members) were not available during the in-country mission.

The above factors meant that our time with NMEC staff was quite limited during our in-country mission. The TA providers had to prioritise the mission deliverables and thus focused on:

- Developing macro level budget;
- Developing draft campaign plan of action;
- Developing an outline of a SBCC plan of action and budget;
- Holding a brainstorming session with SBCC subcommittee to help them think of various SBCC activities to be planned for;
- Developing draft logistics plan of action;
- Providing the NMEC and partners with examples of the following documents that they can use to fully develop their macroplans:
  - Detailed campaign timelines;
  - Risk assessment and mitigation plan template.

In addition, it is important to note that there lacked continuity in the NMEC and partners' personnel who participated in the working sessions with AMP providers. There also was a lack of participation from decision-making personnel who were caught up with other work or were out of Lusaka. This restricted the ability of the whole team to make effective decisions on items which has an impact on the campaign plan of action and budget. As an example, no formal decisions were made on the use of ICT4D, or whether vouchers would be used or not.

While in country, negotiations were still ongoing with AMF for the procurement of the gap in nets. AMF has specific requirements for data management, digitisation and reporting. This is a critical component of completing the campaign plan of action, and given that a final decision had not been received from AMF, the campaign plan of action remains incomplete as of this date. In addition, given that the NMEC has requested PBO nets from AMF to address resistance issues in country, the campaign could potentially become a multi-product campaign. Multi-products campaign have various implications (logistics, SBCC etc) which need to be addressed in the campaign plan of action and other macroplanning documents, including the risk assessment and mitigation framework. These components have been highlighted in the draft campaign plan of action as needing to be addressed.

### Key considerations / recommendations

Campaign area	Consideration	Recommendation	Responsible	Timelines
<b>Macroplanning</b>	Stratification strategy for the co deployment of IRS and ITN is showing a high cost per net, given that a small quantity of ITNs will be distributed over a large geographical area.	Consider harmonisation of IRS and ITN activities to reduce costs. This might be challenging given the different implementation timelines for the two activities.	NMEC and partners	As soon as possible
<b>Macroplanning</b>	Macro quantification is based on 2017 HH registration data (with projected growth). These figures were previously triangulated to ensure accuracy. But these figures are significantly (6 million) more than the COS population figures. While the COS figures are	Zambia, like many countries, is struggling with the ITN quantification in terms of ensuring sufficient nets based on previous campaign experiences and non-alignment of those needs with census figures and projections. Hannah Koenker is currently collecting data to try to do	NMEC	As soon as possible

	<p>known to be inaccurate, not all parties (especially international parties) are aware of this. Consequently, the reasons why the NMEC are quantifying based on 2017 HH registration figures instead of COS figures, are not clear to international parties.</p>	<p>comparisons on what is happening between macro, micro and household registration phases with the population. The objective of this work is to test the hypothesis that population divided by 1.8 is sufficient to meet needs. It is recommended that NMEC participates in this work. This will allow Zambia to 1) strongly demonstrate the need to use 2017 HH registration figure, and 2) provide a platform for Zambia NMEC to further participate in the international movement for ITN distribution.</p>		
<b>Macro Budget</b>	<p>The campaign budget has been developed with support from several members of the NMEC, as well as with PMI and WFP presence on several occasions. However, it was noted that personnel with decision-making roles and responsibilities, as well as finance personnel, were often unavailable for this exercise.</p>	<p>NMEC team (including management team) should sit together and review macro level budget to ensure that (1) all assumptions and unit costs are correct, and (2) all components of activities are duly incorporated into the budget (e.g. data management for HHR and distribution, costing for all tools and materials for logistics, HHR and distribution, etc). Decisions taken with AMF around the digitization will have budget implications that will need to be taken into account once the contract is signed.</p>	<p>NMEC and partners (with distance support from AMP)</p>	<p>Prior to finalisation of macroplans</p>
<b>Data management / ICT</b>	<p>No decisions have been made in regards to the strategy for the</p>	<p>NMEC to explore feasibility of the following scenarios:</p>	<p>NMEC (with support from AMP)</p>	<p>Prior to finalisation of macroplans</p>

	collection of data for HH registration and distribution. The process used in 2017 campaign proved laborious and caused delays in distribution.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The use of ICT4D to undertake HH registration. i.e. the use of mobile phones instead of paper-based methods; or</li> <li>2) The use of data officers to transfer the HH registration data into electronic format at the health facility catchment areas.</li> </ol>		
<b>Co-deployment strategy</b>	As the co-deployment strategy for IRS and ITN is broken down to village level within zones, there are risks that HHs are missed, and do not receive either of the interventions. In addition, the list of villages that have received IRS in 2019 (and thus will not be targeted for ITN distribution in 2020) is currently not finalised.	<p>It is recommended that NMEC ensures a strong microplanning process at the district level. This is necessary as District Health Management Teams are better placed to identify areas and villages that have not been targeted for IRS in 2020.</p> <p>It is further recommended that a joint microplanning workshop be conducted for both ITN distribution and IRS. This will help 1) reduce overall costs of the interventions, and 2) minimise the risks of villages receiving both interventions and 3) minimise the risk that certain villages miss out on either one of the interventions.</p>	NMEC (with support from AMP)	Microplanning (recommended 4 to 6 months before planned distribution)
<b>Timeline</b>	The timeline was difficult to establish for the 2020	An example of a detailed timeline has been shared with the	NMEC	Continuous

	<p>campaign due to limited time with NMEC / partner staff and major decisions (such as procurement of the full quantity of nets) not yet taken which continue to move the timeline further out given time for ITN production and delivery to the country.</p> <p>Detailed timelines are a critical part of the macroplanning process, (as well as helping to establish activity implementations). The timelines should be developed as it will help the NMEC to ensure that critical campaign activities / steps to implement activities, have not been missed, as well as to put pressure on partners to take final decisions and avoid further potential delays.</p>	<p>NMEC team. The NMEC should use this example to further develop their timelines.</p>		
<b>Risk assessment and mitigation</b>	<p>Given the limited time available during this mission, a risk assessment and mitigation plan was not developed with the NMEC team. There are several possible risks for the 2020 campaign. Examples include: the risk of ITN spilling over into IRS villages, the risk of not covering the gaps in ITNs....</p>	<p>An example of a Risk Assessment and Mitigation Plan was shared with the team. The campaign team should work at developing its own plan based on this model and then including this as part of the macro planning package, as well as part of the microplanning workshops to incorporate risks identified by health personnel at the implementation level.</p>	NMEC	Prior to microplanning

<b>SBCC</b>	AMP TA providers only had opportunity to have one working sessions with SBCC subcommittee. The subcommittee has not had the chance to meet and work on developing a strategy and plan of action for SBCC activities for the campaign.	SBCC subcommittee should meet and hold working sessions to develop an effective strategy and plan of action for the 2020 campaign. This is very important given some important factors such as 1) co-deployment of IRS and ITN, 2) multi product campaign.	SBCC subcommittee (with support from AMP)	Prior to finalisation of macroplans
<b>SBCC</b>	<p>Given insecticide resistance found in the country, NMEC is looking to distribute both PBOs and standard LLINs, in addition to large-scale IRS. There are risks that incorrect or misleading information on the different types of nets (as well as insecticide resistance) is disseminated via the media or other channels. This could lead to rumours about net efficacy which can easily spread.</p> <p>In addition, given that standard LLINs are still being distributed through routine distribution channels (EPI and ANC), there is a risk of rumours being spread that "sub-standard" nets are being provided to pregnant women.</p>	<p>The spreading of rumours regarding new or different net types, as well as the efficacy of standard LLINs, should be considered in the risk assessment and mitigation plan. A strategy should be developed to deal with rumours about the efficacy of standard LLINs, and how corrective information will be disseminated to communities. It is important to also ensure that the strategy quells any rumours that the NMEC and partners may not have been honest with community members.</p>	NMEC	As soon as possible
<b>SBCC</b>	Given that nets were distributed three years ago, households may still have existing	Include information about net repurposing and net misuse (existing practices) in the list of	SBCC subcommittee with support from AMP.	Before microplanning process



	<p>nets (both new and old nets) which they will not know what to do with. Consequently, these old nets could 1) contribute to environmental waste, or 2) be misused for fishing.</p>	<p>information to be collected by the DHMT in advance of the microplanning workshops to provide an idea of the problem in each district and adapt messages accordingly. Ensure that key utilisation and repurposing messages are developed as part of SBCC activities and are disseminated pre, during and post distribution through key channels, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Radio spots;</li> <li>• Community health workers;</li> <li>• Community leaders.</li> </ul>		
<b>Quantification / Special populations</b>	<p>As at December 2018, Zambia was hosting more than 49,879 refugees. No decision has been made as yet, on whether refugee camps will be targeted for the 2020 campaign. Given the gap in ITN needs, it was discussed that refugees may already have received nets through UNHCR, and would thus not be targeted in the 2020 campaign.</p>	<p>NMEC to follow up with UNHCR to determine whether refugees living in camps have already received nets, and the extent to which they have been covered.</p>	NMEC	<p>As soon as possible, to allow for completion of macroplans.</p>
<b>M&amp;E</b>	<p>Given short timeline of in-country missions, the AMP TA providers did not have the opportunity to support the M&amp;E subcommittee in the development of its plan of action. It is important that an M&amp;E plan of action is</p>	<p>AMP to share an example of M&amp;E plan of action with M&amp;E subcommittee. As also discussed, AMP will facilitate a conference call with the M&amp;E manager of NMCP in Pakistan (Pakistan has just finished its distribution), for a</p>	AMP TA providers	

	developed and is annexed (or incorporated into) to the campaign plan of action. This should include a detailed M&E budget.	sharing of information on M&E in ITN campaign settings.		
<b>Logistics</b>	It was decided during the TA mission that nets would be delivered by suppliers to <u>provincial warehouses</u> (and not directly to districts). This is to avoid “lateral adjustments” between districts as happened in Luapula province during the last campaign.	So far, 1.7 M PMI nets have been ordered (another 0.4 M are still to be ordered to complete the 2.1 M PMI commitment). These nets are destined to 3 (of 10) provinces, with a 4 <sup>th</sup> province that could not be entirely covered. Suppliers will soon need to know how many nets are destined to each province in order to stuff the containers accordingly. NMEC must urgently review the quantification for each province (in the Excel “Master” file) and resolve the current discrepancies noted.	NMEC and partners	As soon as possible
<b>Logistics</b>	There was not much time available during the mission to fully develop a first draft of the logistics plan of action (LPoA). During one working session on logistics, an example of LPoA was presented to the group to explain the structure and content of the document. Discussions then focussed mainly on the logistics strategy to adopt for 2020.	Since the end of the in-country mission, a first draft of the LPoA was developed by the AMP TA provider and sent to the Zambia team for their review and input. This first draft includes a “Master” file (in Excel) with the current macro-quantification by provinces and districts, as well as storage and transport requirements. The Zambia team must review the quantification in the “Macro-Positioning Plan” worksheet in order (1) to resolve the issue of 8 districts with	NMEC and partners	As soon as possible to allow for completion of macroplans.

		“negative” figures, and (2) to align the target population figures with those included in the budget and the campaign PoA.		
<b>Logistics</b>	Given insecticide resistance found in the country, NMEC is looking to distribute both PBOs and standard LLINs. Should there be any PBOs left over from the campaign, these might be incorporated into routine distributions, where both standard LLINs and PBOs are being distributed to pregnant women and children under five.	If leftover PBOs from the campaign, remain with health facilities and are incorporated into routine distribution, then separate accountability (e.g. tracking and reporting) systems should be put in place, differentiating between standard LLINs and PBOs.	NMEC	Before finalisation of macroplanning documents.

### Next steps / Future planning

- All to follow up on next steps in the table above. Because of the various “unknowns” (such as whether AMF will cover the gap in nets), it has been difficult for AMP TA providers to set specific dates for tasks to be completed – PLEASE ensure that the NMEC team completes their detailed timelines, and set completion dates for the tasks above accordingly. Please ensure that the information is shared with the AMP team so we can work to your timelines and provide support as possible as decisions are taken, and planning moves forward.
- Engage with partners and donors to find funding for gap in ITN needs. Please note that AMP is happy to be part of any correspondence (including conference calls) with potential donors, if the NMEC and partners feel that AMP support will be beneficial.
- Engagement meetings to ensure that IRS data (including the number, names and locations of villages) is finalised and readily available for microplanning workshops.
- Subcommittees (SBCC and M&E) to draft their plan of actions. These can be shared with AMP for review and comments if useful.
- AMP to share the following examples with NMEC:
  - Training agendas;
  - Training materials;
  - Microplanning brief and templates.

**Conclusion:**

The AMP TA providers would like to thank the following parties / persons:

- NMEC Zambia and partners (including PMI and WFP). We recognise and appreciate your work and collaboration which has facilitated our mission.
- The RBM Partnership to End Malaria (in particular Olga Anghelici) and IFRC for their continuous administrative support.