Identification of PAMIs for cholera elimination

Transcript of online course

MODULE 4

PAMI Stakeholder validation

Slide 1

Welcome to Module 4 of the GTFCC online course on the identification of PAMIs for cholera elimination.

Slide 2

In this module, we will provide you some insights on how to organize a successful PAMI stakeholder validation.

Slide 3

After completing this module, you will be able to:

- Explain the objectives of the stakeholder validation;
- Describe how to prepare a PAMI validation workshop;
- Describe how to run a PAMI validation workshop;
- And, understand approaches to foster consensus on the list of PAMIs.

Slide 4

The PAMI stakeholder validation is an important moment for the identification of PAMIs for cholera elimination. This is when the vulnerability factors and measurable vulnerability indicators are endorsed, any remaining missing data are complemented and finally a vulnerability index threshold is selected.

The outcome of a successful stakeholder validation is the final list of PAMIs with strong buy-in from all parties.

To achieve the validation of PAMIs in a participative manner, it is recommended that the stakeholder validation be organized in the form of an on-site workshop.

Experience shows that a 3-day workshop is ideal to achieve stakeholder validation.

A key benefit of hosting the stakeholder validation as an onsite workshop is not only to foster participative discussions. Experience shows that onsite PAMI workshops also encourage collaboration across stakeholders which is essential for the successful continuation of the NCP process.

Slide 5

Critical to a successful PAMI validation workshop is a thorough preparation of this important event.

Slide 6

Careful preparation and anticipation are key success factors.

Plan ahead to identify relevant stakeholders to be invited, prepare the agenda. Make sure to send out invitations well in advance to maximize attendance. Make the necessary arrangements for the logistics of the workshop. Prepare the supporting material and the visuals that will be displayed at the workshop. Confirm and brief speakers and facilitators. Do not forget to appoint and to brief a chair, and make sure to identify and to brief note-takers.

Slide 7

When establishing the list of participants, make sure that the PAMI validation will be as multisectoral as possible. Consider inviting multiple sectors beyond the public health sector, such as WASH, finance, and so on. It is also advisable to invite representatives from different levels, ensuring that both the national level and subnational levels are represented.

Overall, make sure that all organizations and partners that play an active role in cholera elimination in your country are given a chance to be involved in the PAMI validation.

Slide 8

Here is an example of a possible agenda for a PAMI workshop. Of course, this is indicative and is only provided as a basis for customization.

The focus of the first day can be to set the scene, as all participants may not yet be familiar with PAMIs.

As background, updates on the cholera situation in your country can be presented covering the epidemiological situation, the strategies against cholera that have been implemented, along with the progress achieved and the challenges that have been faced. Cholera pillar-specific updates may also be very insightful.

Then, you can bring participants up to speed on PAMI identification by walking them through the PAMI identification method.

Lastly, present the outcomes of the first phase of PAMI identification, including the vulnerability factors selected and associated measurable indicators and data sources.

Bring up for discussion, not only the key findings of the first phase of PAMI identification, but also and as importantly their potential limitations.

Slide 9

The focus of the second day can be on discussing the list of PAMIs in a participative manner.

This includes finalizing calculations of the vulnerability index by complementing any remaining missing data based on a qualitative assessment building on participants' knowledge, and determining whether any weights should be applied to some vulnerability factors in the calculations.

To discuss how to set the vulnerability index threshold, different scenarios can be outlined in a plenary session. Then, these scenarios can be discussed in group sessions. Each group can then report in a plenary session on its thoughts and findings.

Slide 10

The third and last day of the workshop is the moment to reach an agreement among all participants on the final list of PAMIs and to get organized for next steps.

Building on outcomes from day 2, a consensus should be reached on the vulnerability index threshold.

The next steps to be organized are the preparation of the report on PAMI identification and of the request for a GTFCC PAMI review. For those, roles and responsibilities should be assigned, and timelines should be set.

Lastly, the way forward for NCP development should also be discussed.

Slide 11

As part of the preparation of the workshop, visuals and supporting material that will be displayed at the workshop should be prepared in advance.

At a minimum, this should include supporting material to discuss missing values, for example sheet R3 of the PAMI Excel tool as well as figures for setting the vulnerability index threshold, for example similar to sheet R2 of the PAMI Excel tool.

In addition, shapefiles should also be prepared in order to map PAMIs.

Slide 12

We will now go through a few tips to run a successful stakeholder validation.

Slide 13

The chair and the facilitators play a key role to keep a sound decision-making process on track. This means ensuring that decisions on PAMIs are grounded on data and take into account operational implications.

To keep a sound decision-making process on track, displaying the supporting material and the visuals prepared ahead of the workshop helps focus the attention and the discussions on data.

In addition, the chair and the facilitators should encourage participants not to bring up personal opinions or impressions but as much as possible documented facts.

Lastly, it is essential that the practical and operational dimensions of PAMI identification be carefully considered in the decision-making process, in particular the feasibility of the NCP.

Slide 14

Group sessions in break-out are useful tools for a participative and engaging process.

Group sessions give all participants greater opportunities to actively engage in the discussions compared to plenary sessions. In addition, group sessions can make the discussions more time effective by bringing together in a group, the participants who have convergent expertise and knowledge.

Groups can be formed by regions; this is helpful for example to complement missing data based on local knowledge for specific geographic units with remaining missing data; this may also facilitate discussions on local context and specific challenges.

Alternatively, groups can also be formed by cholera prevention and control pillar. This is helpful for example to discuss technical and practical considerations.

For group sessions to be effective and fully beneficial, it is essential that each group be briefed on the objective of the session and be provided with an outline to structure the discussions such as guiding questions.

In addition, a facilitator, a note-taker, and a rapporteur should be designated in each group.

Slide 15

Throughout the workshop, discussions, decisions, and justifications for the decisions should be documented for traceability of the decision-making process.

Note takers play a key role in ensuring comprehensive record keeping.

In addition, during the workshop, note takers also support the chair and facilitators by flagging any decisions made without sufficient justifications. They also keep track of any unresolved discussions and make sure that they get addressed and solved.

Note takers are encouraged to use the sheet R4 of the PAMI Excel tool to record discussions on specific geographic units. To that end, they may add columns in sheet R4 as needed.

Slide 16

Decisions on PAMIs are always made by consensus. We will walk you through the approaches that can facilitate consensus building.

Slide 17

Reaching a consensus means that all participants are overall onboard with the decisions.

At the workshop, a consensus should be reached on four main dimensions:
- The relevance of vulnerability factors selected and associated measurable indicators and data sources;
- Whether weights should be given to vulnerability factors in the calculation of the index;
- The presence or absence of vulnerability factors in geographic units with remaining missing data;

- The vulnerability index threshold.

As a general principle, consensus building is facilitated by objective decision-making grounded on data and operational considerations. This helps keep the decision-making process on track, setting aside personal opinions or impressions as well as unrealistic aspirations.

Slide 18

The list of vulnerability factors considered relevant in the country-specific context, together with their measurable vulnerability indicator and associated data source should be endorsed by consensus.

A consensus should be reached on the rationale for not considering any vulnerability factor from the GTFCC indicative list of generic vulnerability factors.

A consensus should also be reached on the rationale for considering in the analysis any additional vulnerability factor not included in the indicative list.

The definitions of measurable vulnerability indicators and associated data sources should also be reviewed and adapted as needed for endorsement.

Slide 19

If applicable, the justifications for giving more weight to any vulnerability factor in the calculation of the vulnerability index should be validated by consensus.

By default, all vulnerability factors have an equal weight.

If it is proposed to give more weight to any vulnerability factor, this should be justified by tangible arguments. The corresponding justifications should be discussed and endorsed by consensus.

Slide 20

If there are a few remaining missing data, they are filled by consensus at the workshop, building on local knowledge and multisectoral expertise.

Filling missing data at the workshop is only considered if missing data is for a few geographic units. If there are significant missing data, this should be addressed prior to the stakeholder validation. For a reminder about how to address significant missing data do not hesitate to go back to Module 2 of this course.

Consensus on the presence or absence of vulnerability factors should be reached for all geographic units with remaining missing data. As a result, there should be no more remaining missing data in the dataset.

Slide 21

To build consensus on the vulnerability index threshold, different scenarios for setting the vulnerability index threshold can be discussed at the workshop.

The expected feasibility of the NCP is assessed depending on the selected threshold taking into account the number and the percentage of geographic units that would be PAMIs as well as the population in PAMIs.

Deciding on the threshold value focuses on finding the lowest vulnerability index threshold still allowing feasibility of multisectoral interventions in PAMIs.

Slide 22

As we wrap up this module, here are the important points to remember.

Consensus building on the list of PAMIs is driven by the data and by operational considerations.

Justifications for all decisions should be documented for traceability of the decision-making process.

The collaborative and participative discussions at the stakeholder validation represent a key opportunity to maximize buy-in and multisectoral engagement in the NCP.

Slide 23

Before moving on to the next module, we encourage you to take a short quiz. There are three questions in this quiz.

Slide 24

Question 1. What is an expected benefit of having consensus from all parties on the final list of PAMIs?

a) It ensures that all personal opinions are duly considered.

b) It maximizes stakeholder engagement in the future NCP.

c) It reduces the need for follow up training sessions.

Slide 25

The correct answer is b. Consensus from all parties on the final list of PAMIs maximizes stakeholder engagement in the future NCP.

Slide 26

Question 2. Why group sessions might be useful at a stakeholder validation workshop?

a) To extend the duration of the workshop.

b) To channel convergent expertise and knowledge for more effective discussions.

c) To limit the number of participants.

d) To create closer bounds between participants.

Slide 27

The correct answer is b. Group sessions are a useful tool at the stakeholder validation to help bring together convergent expertise and knowledge in order to have more effective discussions.

Slide 28

Question 3. This is the last question. When setting the vulnerability index threshold, which key factor should guide the decision making?

a) Statistical modelling of the risk of reemergence of cholera outbreaks.

b) Practical and operational implications regarding the feasibility of implementing multisectoral interventions in PAMIs.

c) The historical significance of the geographic units considering cholera history in the country over past decades.

Slide 29

The correct answer is b. The key factor that should guide the decision making on the vulnerability index threshold are practical and operational implications regarding the feasibility of implementing multisectoral interventions in PAMIs.

Slide 30

We have now completed this module.