

1 **Improving the last mile delivery of vaccines through an informed push model:**  
2 **experiences, opportunities and costs based on an implementation study in a rural**  
3 **district in Uganda**

4 Authors: Pamela Bakkabulindi<sup>1,2</sup>, Solomon T Wafula<sup>1</sup>, Anthony Ssebagereka<sup>1</sup>, Rogers  
5 Sekibira<sup>3</sup>, Aloysius Mutebi<sup>1</sup>, Jimmy Ameny<sup>4</sup>, Christabel Abewe<sup>5</sup>, John Bosco Isunju<sup>1</sup>

6 **Author affiliation:**

7 <sup>1</sup>School of Public Health, Makerere University College of Health Sciences, Kampala,  
8 Uganda

9 <sup>2</sup>Health Support Initiatives, Uganda

10 <sup>3</sup>Landsat ICT solutions, Uganda

11 <sup>4</sup>Ministry of Health, Uganda

12 <sup>5</sup>University of Cape Town, School of Public Health & Family Medicine, Health Economics  
13 Division, South Africa

14 **Corresponding author**

15 Pamela Bakkabulindi

16 Email: bakkapam@gmail.com

17 Institutions of affiliation

18 <sup>1</sup>School of Public Health, Makerere University College of Health Sciences, Kampala,  
19 Uganda

20 <sup>2</sup>Health Support Initiatives, Uganda

21 **Keywords:** Immunization supply chain systems, last mile, cold chain, vaccine preventable

22 **NOTE:** This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.  
diseases, vaccine shortages, cost analysis, Uganda, low-income countries, Africa

## 24 **Abstract**

25 **Background:** Many developing countries struggle to attain equitable, timely and efficient  
26 availability of potent vaccines at the health facility level. In Uganda, several challenges  
27 prevent the reliable distribution of vaccines from the district vaccine store to the health  
28 facility level (last mile). The currently practiced mixed push and pull system mode of  
29 vaccine delivery is unpredictable, unreliable, and often presents issues of poor vaccine  
30 management, vaccine stock-outs and missed opportunities for vaccination.

31 The overall aim of the study was to improve the efficiency of the last mile delivery of  
32 vaccines by implementing an informed push model of vaccine delivery. Specifically, the  
33 study aimed to; improve vaccine lead time; standardise cold chain management practices  
34 during vaccine transportation; and cost the implementation of the informed push model.

35 **Methods:** Mixed-methods approach to evaluate the impact of the informed push model  
36 on the last mile delivery of vaccines in Gomba district, Uganda was used. Quantitative  
37 and qualitative data was collected at baseline and endline. Quantitative data was  
38 collected on the mode, frequency, lead time and costs of vaccine delivery; vaccine stock  
39 status, and cold chain maintenance of vaccines during transportation using semi-  
40 structured interview survey, while the experiences and challenges were explored  
41 qualitatively using a guide. Analysis of quantitative data used descriptive statistics and  
42 that of costing data used an ingredients approach. Qualitative data using was analysed  
43 using a thematic framework.

44 **Results:** The findings showed that the informed push system improved the efficiency and  
45 quality of vaccine delivery at the last mile in Gomba district. The average lead time of  
46 vaccine delivery was reduced from 14 days at baseline to 5 days by endline. The number

47 of health facilities reporting timely receipt of vaccines increased from 36.8% at baseline  
48 to 100% by endline. Facilities reporting temperature monitoring of vaccines during transit  
49 improved from 26.3% at baseline to 100% by endline. Number of health facilities  
50 experiencing stock outs reduced from 79% at baseline to 36.8% by endline. The monthly  
51 costs incurred by health facilities in vaccine pick up at baseline were \$ 170.8. The monthly  
52 costs for the informed push model were \$445.9 (\$ 0.06 per child reached) and more two  
53 and half times more than baseline costs of \$170.8 incurred by health facilities during pick-  
54 up of vaccines from the district vaccine store.

55 **Conclusion:** The study concluded that informed push model is a financially feasible  
56 strategy that could be efficient in improving the vaccine supply chain at the last mile by  
57 reducing lead time delivery of vaccines, improving vaccine cold chain management,  
58 reducing vaccine stock outs. We recommend the integration of this model into the  
59 national immunization program and its subsequent adoption by all districts in Uganda.

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

## 67 **Background**

68 Immunisation is one of the leading cost-effective public health interventions, saving at  
69 least two to three million lives each year [1-3]. Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) faces a  
70 disproportionately high burden of vaccine-preventable diseases which cause over 2.4  
71 million deaths among children annually due to limited access to life-saving vaccines. [4].

72 Many vaccines can now be obtained at low costs and in mass quantities thanks to  
73 cutting-edge technology built on many years of research and development and the help  
74 of international organisations [2,5]. Over the last decade in developing countries, there  
75 have been heightened efforts from UNICEF, Gavi and local governments that have  
76 increased vaccine purchases to protect the population from vaccine preventable diseases  
77 [6].

78 Unlike common medicinal drugs, vaccines are highly sensitive to temperature changes  
79 and thus need to be maintained at appropriate temperature ranges, outside of which,  
80 they lose potency [7].

81 Globally, the Expanded Programs on Immunization (EPI) rely on well-functioning  
82 immunization supply chains systems to ensure that potent vaccines reach the end user  
83 in an equitable, timely, and efficient manner [8]. An efficient immunization supply chain  
84 remains a critical element in ensuring access to primary health-care services [9]. The  
85 ultimate goal and measure of any successful immunization supply chain system is the  
86 increased visibility and availability of potent vaccines at the last mile health facility level.  
87 This goal still remains hard to attain for many developing countries [10].

88

89 Two factors are critical to a functional end-to-end immunization supply chain and logistics  
90 systems; a reliable transport system and maintenance of cold chain status of vaccines  
91 during storage and transportation [11]. Firstly, a reliable transportation system ensures  
92 that vaccines reach the end user in time. Lessons can be learnt from multi-national  
93 companies such as Coca-Cola, Johnson & Johnson that have demonstrated their  
94 dependability of a reliable transport system for the delivery of goods to the last user [12].  
95 Secondly, a well-maintained cold chain system remains one of the chief cornerstones of  
96 a successful vaccination program and not just a high vaccination coverage. Without good  
97 cold chain system, a high vaccination coverage is null and without effect [13]. From  
98 production to use, vaccines need to be maintained within a certain temperature range  
99 [7]. The recommended temperature range are +2°C to + 8°C for refrigerator vaccines,  
100 15°C to - 25°C for freezer vaccines, and -50°C - 80°C for ultra-low temperature vaccines  
101 [11].

102 Like many SSA countries, Uganda struggles to attain the required immunization coverage  
103 due to inefficient supply chain systems that often lead to vaccine shortages, missed  
104 opportunities for vaccination and resultant vaccine preventable disease outbreaks [6,14].  
105 Indeed, disease outbreaks are largely due to gaps in the herd immunity, which are a  
106 consequence of the under-vaccination of the susceptible population [6]. Under-  
107 vaccination can result from situations of poor vaccine supply chain systems where  
108 vaccines do not reach the target population, stock-out of vaccines or available vaccines  
109 that were damaged due to exposure to inappropriate temperatures during  
110 transportation [6]. As new vaccines are developed and made available to immunization


111 programs expand, there is a dire and critical need to reduce vaccine wastage, improve  
112 efficiencies, reliability, and agility to the immunization supply chain system [15].  
113 Experiences from the recent COVID-19 pandemic have demonstrated a critical need for  
114 resilient immunization supply chain systems.

115 The Ugandan EPI is largely a vertical program that is situated within the Ministry of Health  
116 [16] and has the mandate to provide safe, potent, and effective vaccines for all children  
117 and women of childbearing age so as to reduce morbidity, mortality, and disability due  
118 to vaccine-preventable diseases [17]. Since 2012, the key functions of vaccine forecasting,  
119 and procurement became shared responsibilities between the EPI and National Medical  
120 Stores (NMS). However, other roles including storage at the national level and distribution  
121 to all district vaccine stores countrywide were given to NMS to capitalize on their larger  
122 storage and transportation infrastructure. At the district level, the district cold chain  
123 technicians (DCCT) assume responsibility for cold chain equipment maintenance as the  
124 primary role though they also support proper vaccine storage and handling and in some  
125 cases distribution of vaccines directly to the health facilities.

126 Although Uganda has made considerable improvements in her vaccine supply chain,  
127 there is still room to improve her vaccine delivery at the last mile (from the district vaccine  
128 store to health facility level). Several bottlenecks are reported to prevent the reliable  
129 distribution of vaccines and immunization supplies at the last mile [16]. In the current  
130 Uganda vaccine delivery model (Fig1), the National Medical Stores executes the delivery  
131 of vaccines up to the district vaccine store (DVS). From the DVS to health facilities is a mix  
132 of push and pull system, with the pull system (health facilities picking their stock) being  
133 the dominant one where approximately 85% of the health facilities collecting vaccines

134 from the DVS [16] which ad hoc collection system often results in inconsistent availability  
 135 of vaccines at the DVS and the health facility level [16].

136



137  
 138 Fig 1: Current vaccine delivery model

139 The currently practiced mixed system of push and pull vaccine delivery model is  
 140 unpredictable, unreliable and often presents issues of poor vaccine management,  
 141 vaccine stock-outs and missed opportunities for vaccination at the health facilities. The  
 142 district has no visible role on the equitable distribution of vaccines to each health facility.  
 143 Therefore, the district is unable to accurately forecast and quantify its vaccine needs and  
 144 only must be dependent on the health facility forecasts. Also, the supervision of vaccine  
 145 management of vaccine management by the DCCT at the health facilities is hardly done  
 146 [16]. A key financing gap cited at the district level is the lack of funds to transport vaccines  
 147 from the district vaccine store to health facilities [17].

148 There is paucity in information on the intricacies, opportunities and costs involved in the  
149 last mile delivery of vaccines in Uganda. There is a need to establish the number of days  
150 required to distribute vaccines, the experiences of cold chain maintenance during  
151 transportation of vaccines and the costs involved in the last mile vaccine delivery of  
152 vaccines. The overall aim of the study was to improve the efficiency of the last mile  
153 delivery of vaccines by implementing an informed push model of vaccine delivery.  
154 Specifically, the study aimed to; improve vaccine lead time; standardise cold chain  
155 management practices during vaccine transportation; and cost the implementation of the  
156 informed push model.

## 157 **Methods**

### 158 **Study setting**

159 The study was implemented in a rural district called Gomba, located in the central region  
160 of Uganda, 95km from the capital district, Kampala. The study was conducted between  
161 February and August 2022. As of 2020, Gomba district had a population of 169,518  
162 people; 34,243 children under-five years; 19 health facilities offering vaccination services;  
163 Measles Containing Vaccine (MCV) coverage of 55%; Bacillus Calmette-Guerin (BCG)  
164 vaccine coverage of 65%; and had experienced 2 measles outbreaks in that same year.

165 Uganda's health care system has four levels: hospitals and health centres II, III, and IV.  
166 Hospitals are higher-level facilities with consultant physicians and specialized services.  
167 Health centres II, III, and IV are lower-level facilities (or primary health care) that provide  
168 basic services at parish, sub-county, and county levels, respectively. For instance, health  
169 centre IIs offer outpatients consultations, health centre IIIs offer some inpatient care and



170 some laboratory services, and health centre IVs offer caesarean deliveries and blood  
171 transfusion services [18]. However, all these facilities offer immunization services.


172

### 173 **Study design**

174 The study consisted of pre and post cross-sectional study design that employed  
175 quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection. After collection of data at  
176 baseline, we implemented an informed push model of vaccine delivery in all the health  
177 facilities (19) offering vaccination services in Gomba district.

### 178 **Description of the informed push model intervention.**

179 The informed push model (IPM) intervention was implemented in all the 19 government  
180 health facilities providing immunisation services in Gomba district from March to May  
181 2022. With this intervention, the vaccines were delivered monthly from the District  
182 Vaccine Store (DVS) to all the 19 immunizing health facilities (Fig 2).



183  
184 Fig 2: Informed Push Model

185 The IPM model differs from an ordinary push model in that it includes an element of first  
 186 obtaining information on vaccine stock status from the EPI health worker before delivery  
 187 of the vaccines. During the implementation of the IPM, the DCCT conducted the following  
 188 tasks: 1) Contacting all the 19 health facilities to determine and confirm the status of their  
 189 vaccine stock; 2) Designing a distribution plan and strategy of vaccine delivery and  
 190 thereafter moving according to this planned schedule to each health facility; 3)  
 191 Maintaining the cold chain of vaccines by use of conditioned icepacks; 4) Monitoring and  
 192 record the temperature of vaccines at specified intervals (at start of journey and at the  
 193 point of delivery at a health facility). In this study, during transportation of vaccines, the  
 194 acceptable temperature range was considered +2°C to + 8°C and any temperatures  
 195 outside this range had to be flagged to the study investigators; 5) Recording of the routes  
 196 used, fuel consumed, and kilometres travelled; 6) Documenting the lead time delivery of

197 vaccines which is described as the number of days taken to deliver vaccines to all health  
198 facilities in each month.

199 For the intervention period, funds were given monthly for a period of 3 months to cover  
200 costs for 1) fuel for transportation of vaccines; 2) safari day allowances for the vaccine  
201 delivery team of 3 people who were DCCT, District cold chain assistant (DCCA), and driver;  
202 3) car maintenance costs and, 4) airtime for communication and coordination with the  
203 health facility teams. There was no need for vehicle hire as there was an existent district  
204 owned vehicle tagged for immunization activities.

205

206

## 207 **Data collection**

208 Experienced research assistants were trained for 5 days to administer the quantitative  
209 survey questionnaire and qualitative guide. Quantitative and qualitative data was  
210 collected before (February 2022) and after (August 2022) the implementation of the study  
211 interventions. The study targeted a total of 20 respondents who included one DCCT  
212 based at the district level and 19 EPI health workers based at the health facility level for  
213 both the survey and qualitative interviews.

214 Quantitative survey data was collected using a pre-tested structured questionnaire.

215 Questions included sociodemographic characteristics; vaccine management training;  
216 mode of vaccine delivery; vaccine delivery schedules; lead time delivery of vaccines;  
217 vaccine ordering; vaccine stock-outs; functional cold chain equipment; cold chain

218 management during vaccine transportation; and costs involved in vaccine delivery/pick  
219 up.

220 The qualitative guide included questions on the processes and experiences on; vaccine  
221 delivery/pickup; management of cold chain during vaccine delivery/pickup; vaccine stock-  
222 outs; costs involved in vaccine pick-up/delivery; challenges and opportunities for last mile  
223 vaccine delivery.

## 224 **Outcomes measures**

225 The primary outcomes for the study were lead time delivery of vaccines; the costs  
226 incurred to deliver vaccines to every health facility and maintenance of vaccine cold chain  
227 temperature.

228 The secondary outcomes included frequency of vaccine stock-outs; functionality of health  
229 facility cold chain equipment; the preferred mode of vaccine delivery; the number of of  
230 health workers mentored on vaccine forecasting and management.

## 231 **Data management and analysis**

### 232 **Quantitative data**

233 Quantitative data was collected using the Kobo tool (Kobo Inc., Boston, MA, USA) and  
234 exported to Excel. Then data was reviewed for completeness, coded, and later analysed  
235 using Stata 15 (Stata Crop., College Station, TX, USA). Frequencies, means, and standard  
236 deviation were used to summarize the data. The analysis was stratified by pre (February  
237 2022) and post intervention (August 2022). Due to the small sample size of respondents,  
238 comparisons were based on change in frequencies.

239 The analysis of the costing data used an incremental ingredients approach [19,20] where  
240 each resource input was identified, quantified, and valued by multiplying the quantity of  
241 inputs by their unit prices. A provider's perspective was considered, and the cost analysis  
242 is presented by two cost centres: the costs incurred by health facilities as they pick  
243 vaccines and (b) the costs incurred by the district vaccine store for delivery of vaccines.

244 Given that an incremental costing was conducted, the study did not consider already  
245 sunken indirect health system costs such as human resources, buildings, purchase of  
246 capital equipment, volunteer time, and other opportunity costs. Therefore, the resource  
247 inputs considered for the incremental cost analysis were those additional resources that  
248 would be required to facilitate the push model for vaccine supply chaining including  
249 transport, fuel, vehicle hire, repairs and maintenance costs, and communication costs.

250 Cost data was captured in Uganda shillings and later expressed in US Dollars (USD). The  
251 exchange rate at the time of the study was 1 USD being equivalent to 3,700 Uganda  
252 shillings as of year 2022. Sensitivity analyses were carried out to assess the extent to  
253 which uncertainty in some variables affected the study results.

#### 254 **Qualitative data**

255 For qualitative data, audio tape recordings were all together transcribed verbatim into  
256 English by the same research assistants who conducted the interviews, while preserving  
257 the local language concepts. In keeping with this methodology, the transcripts were read  
258 and re-read to obtain a good understanding of the data. A thematic framework was  
259 identifying by writing memos in form of short phrases, ideas or concepts arising from the  
260 data in the margins of the text [21]. These were then organized according to specific

261 categories. This was followed by highlighting and sorting out quotes and making  
262 comparisons within and between cases. The quotes were then lifted from their original  
263 context and re-arranged under the newly developed themes [21]. Finally, the data was  
264 interpreted based on internal consistency, frequency and extensiveness of responses,  
265 specificity of responses and trends or concepts that cut across the various discussions.  
266 The analyzed data was then presented in text form.

### 267 **Ethical considerations**

268 The study was approved by Makerere University School of Public Health Higher degrees,  
269 Research and Ethics committee (SPH-2021-138: A) and the Uganda National Council of  
270 Science and Technology (HS2183ES). Permission to carry out the study was received from  
271 Gomba district leaders. Written consent was obtained from each respondent.

### 272 **Results**

273 The study intervention was conducted for all nineteen health facilities offering  
274 immunisation services in Gomba district. As seen in table 1, the majority of the  
275 respondents were EPI focal persons (42.1%) who were enrolled nurses by profession.  
276 Most of the respondents (73.7%) had been trained on vaccine management in the past  
277 five years. The health facilities visited were mostly of level III (47.4%) and level II (47.4%).  
278 Many of the health facilities (26.3%) were within the 21-30 kilometre and notably two  
279 health facilities (10.5%) were within the farthest distance of 71-80 kilometres. Most of the  
280 health facilities (89.5%) were government owned (table 1).

281 Table 1: Sociodemographic characteristics of respondents in Gomba district, Uganda

<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>Number of Participants N = 19</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b><i>Designation of respondents</i></b>		
EPI Focal Person	8	42.1
Health Facility In-Charge	6	31.6
Others* <sup>1</sup>	5	26.3
<b><i>Profession of respondents</i></b>		
Enrolled Nurse	8	42.1
Midwife	4	21.1
Nursing assistant	3	15.8
Registered Nurse	2	10.5
Other* <sup>2</sup>	2	10.5
<b><i>Ever received any training on vaccine management practices in the past 5 years</i></b>		
Yes	14	73.7
No	5	26.3
<b><i>Years in service provision of health workers, mean (SD)</i></b>		
In general health service	10.74 (6.67)	
In immunization service	9.37 (6.94)	
<b><i>Type of Health Facility</i></b>		
Health Centre II	9	47.4
Health Centre III	9	47.4
Health Centre IV	1	5.3
<b><i>Health facility ownership</i></b>		
Government	17	89.5
Private	2	10.5
<b><i>Distance of the health facilities from the district</i></b>		
0-10 kilometers	1	5.3
11-20 kilometers	3	15.8
21-30 kilometers	5	26.3
31-40 kilometers	4	21.1
51-60 kilometers	2	10.5
61-70 kilometers	2	10.5
71-80 kilometers	2	10.5
* <sup>1</sup> Others included Health assistant, enrolled nurse, enrolled midwife, vaccinator and laboratory assistant		
* <sup>2</sup> Others included Health assistant and laboratory assistant		

282

283 **Mode and frequency of vaccine delivery**

284 As seen in table 2, at baseline, a mix of push and pull mode of vaccine delivery existed  
 285 with pull mode being the dominant one (79%) with only 7/19 (36.8%) facilities reporting a  
 286 push model. However, the IPM model was implemented during the intervention and all  
 287 19 facilities (100%) reported a push model at endline.

288 Table 2. Mode and frequency of delivery of vaccines in Gomba district, Uganda

	<b>N (%)</b>	<b>N (%)</b>
<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Endline</b>
<b><i>Mode of delivery of vaccines to the health facilities</i></b>		
Health Facility Picks from district	15 (79.0)	0 (0.0)
District delivers to Health Facility	7 (36.8)	19 (100)
Health Facility picks from another Health Facility	5 (26.3)	0 (0.0)
<b><i>Person involved in pick-up of vaccines from District vaccine store</i></b>		
Health Facility In-charge	10 (52.63)	0 (0.0)
EPI Focal person	10 (52.63)	0 (0.0)
Other* <sup>1</sup>	5 (26.32)	0 (0.0)
DCCT		19 (100)
<b><i>Mode of transport used to pick vaccines from the district vaccine store</i></b>		
Hired Motorcycle	10 (52.6)	0 (0.0)
District Vehicle	5 (26.3)	19 (100)
District motorcycle	1 (5.3)	0 (0.0)
Walking	1 (5.3)	0 (0.0)
Other* <sup>2</sup>	2 (10.5)	0 (0.0)
<b><i>Preferred mode of vaccine delivery</i></b>		
District delivers to health facility	15 (79.0)	18 (94.7)
Health facility picks from the district vaccine store	3 (15.8)	1 (5.3)
Both	1 (5.3)	
<b><i>Frequency of delivery of vaccines from the district vaccine store to Health facility</i></b>		
Weekly	2 (10.5)	0 (0.0)
Monthly	12 (63.2)	19 (100)
Every two months	1 (5.3)	0 (0.0)
Other* <sup>3</sup>	4 (21.1)	0 (0.0)
* <sup>1</sup> Other included motorcycle rider; neighbor at the health facility; a health worker from another health facility; any health worker present at the health facility		
* <sup>2</sup> Other included a bicycle and use of public transport means (taxi)		



*\*3Other included get vaccines from a health centre IV due to lack of functional fridge; In a quarter we receive vaccines two times; Picks from another facility when there's a need; Picks from another health facility*

289

290 At baseline, the health facility in-charges (52.63%) and/or EPI focal persons (52.63%) were  
291 involved in vaccine pick-up. However, we note unqualified persons (26.3%) picking  
292 vaccines such as motorcycle riders. By endline, the DCCT was the one delivering vaccines  
293 to all the 19 immunizing health facilities as per the IPM (table 2).

294 The reported commonest mode of transport used to pick vaccines from the district  
295 vaccine store at baseline were hired motorcycles (52.6%) as compared to the district  
296 vehicle (100%) at endline (table 2).

297 At baseline only 12 (63.2%) facilities reported receiving vaccines at a monthly frequency,  
298 and this changed to all the 19 (100%) facilities being supplied monthly with IPM.

299 Majority of health workers at baseline and endline (79.0% and 94.7% respectively)  
300 preferred the district to deliver vaccines (table 2).

### 301 ***Finances and stock out challenges influence the dynamics involved in delivery dynamics***

302 Qualitative interviews also pointed out some difficulties with modes of vaccine delivery  
303 and how this was due to limited finances and consequently caused understocking or  
304 sometimes overstocking as remarked by the district cold chain technician and one EPI  
305 focal person:

306 *" Before implementation of the study, most health facilities picked vaccines from the district*  
307 *vaccine store at their convenience. This was mainly because there were no available financial*

308 *resources to be used for delivery of vaccines." When health facilities pick vaccines, there is*  
309 *tendency for them to take more than they need which leads to overstocking on their part and*  
310 *understocking for the health facilities that pick last." **KII, District Cold Chain Technician,***  
311 ***Gomba district.***

312 *"The reason why we pick vaccines from the district store is because the district does not deliver*  
313 *them to the facility, so instead of staying without vaccines, one must spend money on*  
314 *transportation to ensure that vaccines are obtained". **KII-12, Health worker, Gomba district.***

315 ***Informed push delivery a one stop solution to various challenges at the health facility***  
316 ***level***

317 Respondents also thought IPM may solved challenges of understocking in some facilities  
318 and overstocking in other facilities as it is common with earlier mixed push and pull  
319 system.

320 *"From my experience, it is better for the cold chain technician to distribute vaccines because*  
321 *then it allows for efficient distribution as I would first quantify and confirm the vaccine needs*  
322 *of a health facility before distribution. I was even able to re-distribute vaccines between*  
323 *facilities which prevented over/under stocking. I was also able to identify cold chain challenges*  
324 *and solve those I could there and then at the health facility." **KII, District Cold Chain***  
325 ***Technician, Gomba district.***

326 *"The best mode of vaccine delivery is when the district delivers to the health facility. This is*  
327 *because most of the time it is cost effective because the distance from the health center to the*  
328 *district is a long distance that means you have to use much transport and you again have to*  
329 *facilitate the person who is going to pick the vaccine so it is less expensive when the district*

330 *delivers, it would cost less when the district supplies all facilities rather than everyone going*  
331 *there to pick". **KII-4, Health worker, Gomba district.***

332 Health workers complained of the inconveniences that are associated with vaccine pick-  
333 up which sometimes results in not being able to attend to patients / clients. One  
334 respondent remarked as follows *"Picking of vaccines is inconveniencing for the health*  
335 *workers and patients. For example, a health facility at the level of health center II has three*  
336 *staff so when one leaves then workload increases for the two who have remained at the*  
337 *facility". **KII-9, Health worker, Gomba district.***

338 *"Vaccine pick up is difficult for us. First of all, our health facility is in a remote location, and it*  
339 *is far from where you find a taxi costs three dollars and again the transport to here is in a taxi*  
340 *is not readily available and is only in the evening, so you end up walking that distance at night".*  
341 **KII-5, Health worker, Gomba district.**

342 *"When the district brings, we are sure that the vaccines will be received in good condition. We*  
343 *also save on transport and reduce on the waiting time for mothers because then the health*  
344 *worker does not have her duties to pick vaccines". **KII-2, Health worker, Gomba.***

### 345 **Vaccine delivery lead-time**

346 When asked the actual number of days in each month recommended for vaccine delivery  
347 also known as the lead time, they reported incorrectly 22 days at baseline and correctly  
348 within 5 days at endline (table 3).

349 Table 3: Lead time delivery of vaccines in Gomba district, Uganda

	<b>N (%)</b>	<b>N (%)</b>
--	--------------	--------------

Characteristics	Baseline	Endline
<b>Awareness of vaccine delivery schedules from National medical stores to district vaccine store</b>		
Yes	2 (10.5)	1 (5.3)
No	17 (89.5)	18 (94.7)
<b>Knowledge on the recommended days within which vaccines should be received at the health facilities upon delivery to the district vaccine store</b>		
Yes	3 (15.8)	2 (10.5)
No	16 (84.2)	17 (89.5)
<b>Timely receipt of vaccines at the health facility</b>		
On Time	7 (36.8)	19 (100)
Not on Time	12 (63.2)	0 (0.0)
<b>The stated number of days in a month recommended for vaccine delivery (lead time), mean (SD)</b>	22.00 (32.97)	5.00 (00.00)
<b>Days taken to deliver vaccines to all health facilities as stated by the district cold chain technician, mean (SD)</b>	14 (00.00)	5.00 (00.00)

350

351 Qualitative findings also corroborated this *"Before implementation of the study, it would*  
352 *take an entire month for the health facilities to pick vaccines from the district vaccine store as*  
353 *and when they had the time or felt it convenient". Given that funds were readily available*  
354 *during the implementation, we took 5 days to distribute vaccines to all health facilities." **KII,***  
355 ***District Cold Chain Technician, Gomba district.***

356 The lead time delivery of vaccines improved from 14 days at baseline to 5 days at endline.  
357 Similarly, timely receipt of vaccines at the health facilities improved from 36.8% at  
358 baseline to 100% by endline (table 3).

359 Health worker knowledge of the correct days for lead time delivery of vaccines improved  
360 from incorrect reported 22 days at baseline to correct 5 days at endline (table 3).

361 As seen in table 3, by baseline and endline, most of the respondents (89.5% and 94.7%  
362 respectively) were still not aware of the vaccine delivery schedules from the national  
363 stores to the district vaccines stores.

364 This information is collaborated by the qualitative interviews:

365 *"No, we are not aware of the vaccine delivery times, though sometimes we are informed but at*  
366 *times we just go there not knowing the vaccine delivery schedule for national medical stores".*

367 ***KII-1, Health worker, Gomba.***

368 *"The challenge is we are not informed about the delivery of vaccines by national medical stores*  
369 *because if we knew then we would go there at the right time, but unfortunately, we always go*  
370 *to the district vaccine store when the vaccines are already finished". **KII-7, Health worker,***  
371 ***Gomba.***

### 372 **Cold chain and Vaccine management**

373 Notably at baseline, only 5 (26.3%) of respondents reported that they were monitoring  
374 temperature of vaccines during transportation. However, during implementation of the  
375 study, the DCCT was mandated to monitor temperature twice (at the start and end of the  
376 journey) of the vaccines during vaccine transportation. This is reflected in the endline  
377 results as all the respondents (100%) attested that temperature monitoring for vaccines  
378 was conducted during their transportation (table 4).

379 Table 4: Cold Chain and Vaccine Management processes in Gomba district, Uganda,

	<b>N (%)</b>	<b>N (%)</b>
<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Endline</b>

<b>Availability of cold chain storage equipment at health facility</b>		
Yes	17 (89.5)	19 (100)
No	2 (10.5)	0.0 (0)
<b>Functionality of the available cold chain equipment</b>		
Yes	14 (73.7)	19 (100)
No	3 (15.8)	0.0 (0)
<b>Type of available functional cold Chain equipment</b>		
Fridge	17 (89.5)	19 (100)
Vaccine carriers	8 (42.1)	14 (73.4)
Fridge tag	5 (26.3)	11 (57.9)
Cold boxes	2 (10.5)	4 (21.1)
Freezers	1 (5.3)	4 (21.1)
Other* <sup>1</sup>	1 (5.3)	2 (10.5)
<b>Type of cold chain equipment used for storage of vaccines during transportation</b>		
Vaccine Carrier	19 (100)	0 (0.0)
Cold box	0 (0.0)	19 (100)
<b>Type of icepacks used during vaccine transportation</b>		
Frozen icepacks	13 (68.4)	0 (0.0)
Conditioned icepacks	6 (31.6)	19 (100)
<b>Temperature monitoring during vaccine transportation from the district vaccine to health facilities</b>		
Yes	5 (26.3)	19 (100)
No	14 (73.7)	
<b>Type of temperature monitoring tool used during vaccine transportation for those that carried out monitoring</b>		
Thermometer	3 (15.8)	0 (0.0)
Fridge tag	2 (10.5)	19 (100)
<b>Frequency of monitoring temperature during transportation of vaccines from district vaccine store</b>		
Not monitored	11 (57.9)	0 (0.0)
Once	3 (15.8)	0 (0.0)
Twice	2 (10.5)	19 (100)
Do not know	3 (15.8)	0 (0.0)
<b>Issues with vaccines received</b>		
Yes	3 (15.8)	2 (10.5)
No	16 (84.2)	17 (89.5)
<b>Type of issues with vaccines received</b>		

Vaccines with vaccine vial monitor changes	2 (10.5)	1 (5.3)
Poor bundling	1 (5.2)	1 (5.3)
<b>Health worker knowledge of reading and interpreting VVM changes</b>		
Yes	19 (100)	19 (100)
<b>Health worker checking for VVM changes at the point of receipt of vaccines</b>		
Yes	18 (94.7)	16 (84.2) (16)
No	1 (5.3)	3 (15.8)

\*1 Other included icepacks

380

381

382

383 More people indicated, they didn't monitor temperature prior to implementation of IPM:

384 *"To be honest, I do not monitor for temperature when I go to pick vaccines from the district*  
 385 *vaccine store."* **KII-17, Health worker, Gomba.**

386 *"I won't lie to you that we do it. Because we use a taxi or motorcycle to pick vaccines from the*  
 387 *district vaccine store to the health facility. So, with that mode of transport, you can't monitor*  
 388 *the temperature."* **KII-2, Health worker, Gomba.**

389 *"To be honest, before implementation, during the vaccine delivery, I would measure the*  
 390 *temperatures but not record them anywhere. But during implementation, I was mandated to*  
 391 *record the temperatures before, during and on arrival at the health facilities, this was big*  
 392 *lesson for me."* **KII, District Cold Chain Technician, Gomba district.**

393 The availability of cold chain equipment for storage of vaccines improved from 89.5% at  
 394 baseline to 100% at endline (table 4). Similarly, the functionality of this equipment

395 improved from 73.7% at baseline to 100% at endline. This is because the DCCT was able  
396 to repair broken down fridges during the monthly delivery of the vaccines (table 4).

397 At baseline, most of the respondents (68.5%) incorrectly reported using frozen icepacks  
398 (placed within vaccine carriers) during vaccine transportation. With the DCCT being able  
399 to observe the right practices, this was corrected and by endline, all the respondents  
400 (100%) reported that use of conditioned icepacks during vaccine transportation (table 4).

401 The number of respondents reporting cold chain issues with vaccines received decreased  
402 from 15.8% (3/19) at baseline to 10.5% (2/19). The commonest issue reported was  
403 changes in the vaccine vial monitor (VVM). In addition, all the health workers knew how  
404 to read and interpret the vaccine vial monitor (VVM) changes and more than 80% of the  
405 respondents checked for VVM changes upon receipt of vaccines at baseline and endline  
406 (table 4).

407 Key informants highlighted some advantages of the IPM approach. One respondent  
408 remarked as follows:

409 *"The push system or when the district delivers vaccine had so many advantages. We were able*  
410 *to identify faulty fridges and have them repaired in a short time. We were able to distribute*  
411 *vaccines according to the rightful need. We were able to train the health workers in*  
412 *quantification, cold chain maintenance and record keeping. At some point, we even re-*  
413 *distributed vaccines to ensure a good stock balance. We noticed an improvement in the*  
414 *number of children immunized during the 3 months of implementation.'* **KII, District Cold**  
415 **Chain Technician, Gomba district.**



416 When asked about the earlier strategy for vaccine delivery at baseline, respondents  
 417 highlighted the difficulty in maintenance of the cold chain during transit and yet this had  
 418 detrimental practice could affect the vaccine potency. One respondent stated as follows:  
 419 “...., in my opinion, there is no proper cold chain maintenance when we pick vaccines  
 420 from the district store. One can go with icepacks in the vaccine carriers. But by the time  
 421 we get at the district store, they have melted with hardly any cold temperature. So, am  
 422 not sure that col chain is maintained as we transport these vaccines” **KII-5, Health worker,**  
 423 **Gomba.**

424 **Vaccine stock status**

425 All the respondents at both baseline and endline reported the availability of the issuing  
 426 and ordering tool (table 5). The number of health facilities reporting that they did not  
 427 receive vaccines as ordered reduced from 57.9% at baseline to 26.3% at endline. Similarly,  
 428 the number of health facilities experiencing vaccine stock outs also reduced from 79% at  
 429 baseline to 36.8% at endline following implementation of IPM.

430 Table 5: Vaccine Stock status, Gomba district, Uganda

	<b>N (%)</b>	<b>N (%)</b>
<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>Baselin e</b>	<b>Endline</b>
<b>Availability of issuing and ordering tool at health facility</b>		
Yes	19 (100)	19 (100)
<b>Health worker Knowledge on use of the issuing and ordering tool</b>		
Yes	19 (100)	19 (100)
<b>Health Facility receiving vaccines as ordered</b>		
Yes	8 (42.1)	14 (73.7)
No	11 (57.9)	5 (26.3)

<b>Health facility experiencing stock out of vaccines</b>		
Yes	15 (79.0)	7 (36.8)
No	4 (21.1)	12 (63.2)
<b>Instances of under-fulfilled orders received by health facility</b>		
Yes	12 (63.2)	6 (31.6)
No	7 (36.8)	13 (68.4)

431

432 *As seen in table 5, all the respondents at both baseline and endline reported the availability of*  
 433 *the issuing and ordering tool at the health facility. However, at baseline, more than half of*  
 434 *respondents (57.9%) reported that their health facilities did not receive vaccines as ordered*  
 435 *which picture improved at endline as only 26.3% reported not receiving vaccines as ordered.*

436 Similar disparities between number of vaccines ordered and supplied was highlighted  
 437 qualitatively at baseline as indicated as follows:

438 *"We usually do not receive the same quantity of vaccines as ordered for. Sometimes I reach*  
 439 *district vaccine store and find that some vaccines are out of stock, and I end up taking less*  
 440 *quantities than what is needed". **KII-8, Health worker, Gomba***

441 "Other times on arrival at the district vaccine store, I find most vaccines are taken and are  
 442 finished so I take what is left." **KII-13, Health worker, Gomba**

#### 443 **Costs incurred during vaccine delivery**

##### 444 Summary of Cost Analysis Results

445 The costs incurred by the health facilities as they picked vaccines from the DVS at baseline  
 446 were \$170.8 as compared to those incurred by the district as they delivered vaccines to

447 health facilities which were \$324. At endline, the health facilities did not incur any costs  
448 while the district incurred \$ 445.9 (table 6).

449 Table 6: Summary of costs incurred by health facilities and the district in vaccine delivery

Resource Input	Costs incurred by Health Facilities in USD		Costs incurred by District in USD	
	Baseline	Endline	Baseline	Endline
Transport/Fuel	170.8	0	324	270
Repairs & maintenance	0	0	0	81
Safari Day Allowance	0	0	0	81
Communication	0	0	0	14
<b>Total</b>	<b>170.8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>324</b>	<b>445.9</b>

450

451

452 **Baseline costs incurred by health facilities for Vaccine Pick-up**


453 At baseline, the combined costs incurred for pick-up of vaccines from the DVS for all the  
454 19 health facilities were \$170.81. \$ 21.62 was the highest amount paid by a health facility  
455 and the lowest being \$3.24 (table 7).

Table 7: Baseline monthly average costs incurred by health facilities for vaccine pick-up

Costs	Amount (USD)
Total cost for all 19 health facilities combined	170.8
Median cost	8.1
Inter Quartile Range (IQR)	5.4
Average costs	9
Highest cost	22
Lowest cost	3

456

457 The major areas of expenditure were transport (53%) and or fuel (42%). In addition, a  
458 significant 32% under 'other cost' included cost areas for hiring of motorcycles,  
459 motorcycle repairs, lunch, and airtime for communication. The respondents indicated  
460 that the primary health care funds (89%) were the major source of funds for vaccine pick-  
461 up. However, 21% of the respondents reported using out-of-pocket funds for vaccine  
462 pick-up from multiple choice questions asked (Fig 3).



463

464 Fig 3: Graph showing source of funds for vaccine pick-up at baseline

465 Qualitative interviews also provided perspective on source of funds as seen *below*:

466 *"The source of funds for transport to pick vaccines is a charge we put to the clients. We get the*  
467 *money from mothers who come for immunization. Mothers are charged \$ 0.3 each time they*  
468 *come for immunization so it's the money we use for transport costs during vaccine pick-up".*

469 ***KII-6, Health worker, Gomba.***

470 **Costs incurred by district to deliver vaccines to all health facilities during**  
471 **implementation of IPM**

472 Prior to the study implementation, there were no consistent district budgeted costs for  
473 vaccine delivery. However, the average baseline costs were \$ 324 and these catered for  
474 only fuel costs for delivery of vaccines. The push model required the district cold chain  
475 team to deliver vaccines to all the 19 immunising health facilities using the district car that  
476 was allocated to the EPI department. There were three personnel involved in vaccine  
477 delivery including the DCCT, DCCA and driver who were given as daily allowance. The total  
478 monthly costs expended for vaccine delivery were \$ 445.9 (Table 8). When we considered  
479 the total number of children under one-year in Gomba district (7,290), the \$ 445.9 total  
480 cost for vaccine delivery under the IPM model translates into a unit cost of \$0.06 to reach  
481 each infant with vaccination services.

Table 8: Monthly costs incurred by district to deliver in vaccines during implementation

<b>Cost item</b>	<b>Unit cost in USD</b>	<b>Quantity</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Total in USD</b>
Safari Day allowance	5.4	3	5	81.1
Fuel in liters	5.4	40	5	270.3
Communication	5.4	1	1	13.5
Car maintenance	5.4	1	1	81.1
<b>Total</b>				<b>445.9</b>

482

483 A total of 5 days was used to deliver vaccines to all health facilities following a pre-defined  
484 route. On average 1200 kilometres were travelled within the 5 days of the months'  
485 delivery and approximately 200 litres of fuel were consumed. Therefore, 6 litres of fuel

486 were required for each kilometre moved in distance. The costs budgeted and incurred  
487 included safari day allowance, fuel, communication, and car maintenance costs.

488 As noted, a few financial challenges were highlighted prior to IPM as follows:

489 *"The main challenge with vaccine delivery is lack of funds and consistence in flow of funding*  
490 *because when you have this time and don't have in the next then you can't deliver without*  
491 *funds. The main issue is funds, once you have the funds the rest are easy to work with". **KII,***  
492 ***District Cold Chain Technician, Gomba district.***

493

#### 494 **Discussion**

495 This is the first known implementation study in Uganda that has assessed a costed  
496 informed push vaccine delivery model with its potential benefits in improving the last  
497 mile delivery of vaccines. The results of this study can be used for planning and evidence-  
498 based response actions. In our study we considered, several components that can the  
499 improve efficiency of the last mile delivery system including timely delivery of vaccines,  
500 maintenance of cold chain system, and costing of the last mile logistic system.

501 Our findings show that the lead time delivery of vaccines from the DVS to all immunizing  
502 health facilities is 5 days in each month and yet before, health facilities could take on  
503 average two weeks to pick vaccines from the district vaccine store. Evidence from this  
504 study suggest that when health facilities picked vaccines, there was no real time  
505 temperature monitoring done during transportation and therefore no known visible  
506 active cold chain maintenance performed which gravely compromised on the potency of

507 vaccines. However, during the IPM intervention, with a use of a trained cold chain  
508 technician, cold chain maintenance was enforced and therefore vaccines delivered in  
509 their rightful conditions. In addition, there was reduction on vaccine stock-outs as health  
510 facilities received vaccines that they were able to consume after proper quantification as  
511 opposed to before when they got vaccines in an ad hoc manner. This study demonstrated  
512 varying costs for vaccine pick-up which oftentimes were either out-of-pocket expenses  
513 incurred by health workers or costs that were eventually charged to caregivers before  
514 receipt of immunization services. Moreso, pick-up of vaccines by health workers would  
515 impinge on their time for delivering immunisation services which would lead to missed  
516 opportunities for vaccination. The monthly cost of vaccine delivery to all health facilities  
517 incurred was \$445.9 versus combined average \$170.8 incurred by all the 19 health  
518 facilities for vaccine pick-up. However, the numerous tangible and intangible benefits  
519 when the DCCT delivered vaccines to health facilities indisputably outweighs the total  
520 costs incurred for vaccine delivery.

### 521 **Vaccine delivery model**

522 Our results showed that 79% and 95% of health workers at baseline and endline  
523 respectively preferred push model. This finding confirms that health workers prefer to  
524 stay at their respective facilities and execute their mandate of delivering healthcare  
525 services at the service delivery point rather than having to routinely travel to collect  
526 vaccines from the DVS, also recognizing that majority of the health facilities within this  
527 setting are struggling with understaffing and patient overload challenges [22]. This takes  
528 the pressure off the health worker involved in picking vaccines from the DVS. The

529 constraints related to low staffing levels at the health facilities is not alien and has been  
530 widely documented by several scholars which affects access to vaccination services [23].

531 These results are similar to study conducted in Nigeria that showed a push vaccine  
532 delivery model saved one to six hours of the health care workers' time spent on vaccine  
533 logistics (collection and distribution) each week. This enabled healthcare workers to focus  
534 on delivering services to mothers and children with attendant reduction in clients' waiting  
535 time as well as enhanced job satisfaction [10].

536 Our study showed that 26% (5/19) 'others' category that picked vaccines included  
537 neighbours and motorcycle riders who represent an untrained, unqualified, and  
538 unequipped personnel unfit to handle and manage vaccines during transportation. Most  
539 common mode of transport used for transporting vaccines from the DVS to the health  
540 facilities were hired motorcycles (for more than half of the facilities). These motorcycles  
541 were a more preferred mode of transport because they are flexible, convenience and  
542 easily available means of transport regardless of the weather changes, versatile and  
543 relatively less costly than hiring or fuelling a car over the same comparative distance to  
544 be travelled. In many of the cases, rural areas are disadvantaged due to poor road  
545 networks, especially during rainy seasons [24]. However, there are certainly concerns  
546 about safety, maintenance of the cold chain for the vaccines, possible theft of vaccines or  
547 diversion to other parties. On the other hand, the vaccines could get destroyed in case  
548 the motorcycle gets an accident which are quite common in Uganda and are routinely  
549 fatal.



550 Vaccine handling and management is best handled by trained and equipped skilled  
551 worker who are able recognise and respond appropriately to temperature excursions [2].  
552 Studies have shown that, poor vaccine handling is often associated with technically  
553 incompetent stakeholders [13]. The success of the EPI program is tagged to potent  
554 vaccines which depend on good cold chain status, therefore, vaccine management is a  
555 critical step [11].

### 556 **Lead time**

557 Majority of respondents were not aware of the vaccine delivery schedule by National  
558 Medical stores at both baseline and endline. Our results showed that only 5% of the  
559 health workers knew the NMS vaccine delivery time schedules and only 11% knew the  
560 correct recommended number of days within which vaccines should be delivered to  
561 health facilities upon their receipt at the DVS. This is consistent with a study in Ghana  
562 which showed that out of the 21 respondents, 6 (29%) had heard of “vaccine supply  
563 period,” Of which, 2 (33.3%) knew the purpose of the supply period and could correctly  
564 tell the vaccine supply period for their facility store [25].

565 This suggests that more effort is still needed to bridge the gap the knowledge gap around  
566 microplanning and vaccine delivery schedules. It is also important to recognise that  
567 health workers at facility level need to have knowledge about the vaccine delivery  
568 schedule by national medical stores so that their immunization micro plans synchronize  
569 with the vaccine delivery schedules which can be helpful in avoiding vaccine stock-outs  
570 [26]. For example, in 2011, the Ministry of Health-Uganda acknowledged that vaccine

571 stock-outs were not due to shortages but rather attributed to persistent distribution  
572 problems within the districts [27].

573 Cold chain and vaccine management

574 The cold chain remains a highly vulnerable point for number of EPI programs in  
575 developing countries [28]. The core of vaccine cold chain is temperature monitoring [2].  
576 Since all vaccines need to be maintained within certain temperature ranges, the  
577 monitoring of vaccine temperatures becomes a must especially through transportation  
578 [2]. All Health workers reported reading VVMS upon receipt of vaccines at the health  
579 facility. These results are consistent with results from various vaccine assessments that  
580 show that health workers are knowledgeable about VVMs and their use in protection of  
581 vaccines from heat excursions [29]. However, VVMs only capture the heat exposure over  
582 time and not freezing conditions [2]. Indeed, studies have shown that Cold chain  
583 management weaknesses are often observed during transportation and storage of the  
584 vaccines [28].

585 Our study showed that only 6/19 (31.58%) health workers used conditioned icepacks  
586 during vaccine pick-up. These results are consistent with a study conducted in Ghana  
587 where only 23% of health workers had heard of the “conditioning” ice packs [25].

588 The DCCT is not only meant to deliver vaccines to the health facility, but also supports the  
589 vaccine supply chain system like quality assurance activities related to temperature  
590 monitoring to maintain cold chain, cross checking for good functionality of the cold chain  
591 equipment at a facility, mentorship of health workers in vaccine management, etc.  
592 Storage vaccine equipment was functional in majority of the facilities and they all facilities

593 had functional cold chain equipment at endline. Therefore, maintenance of vaccine cold  
594 chain across the facilities was well done, including use of vaccine carriers for storage  
595 when go to pick them from the DVS. It is important to recognise that monitoring of the  
596 cold chain performance is often limited by lack of performance management systems  
597 and are rarely done due to limited prioritization of cold chain assessments like  
598 temperature monitoring studies and funding [30]. However, the gaps in cold chain  
599 management are still evident in transportation of the vaccines from the DVS to the health  
600 facilities, with more than 30% of the respondents noting that their facilities do not use  
601 frozen ice packs during transportation of vaccines from DVS to health facilities. Such gaps  
602 in cold chain management of vaccines during transportation ought to be effectively  
603 addressed and managed to ensure vaccine safety, quality and integrity. Inadequate  
604 availability of cold boxes and frozen packs to maintain cold chain for vaccines is  
605 disadvantageous to the health sector since it attracts a loss of up to 55% of the medicines  
606 due to poor storage management of the vaccines [31].

#### 607 Vaccine stock-outs

608 Results from our study show that the number of health facilities experiencing vaccine  
609 stock-outs reduced from 79% (15/19) at baseline to 37% (7/19) at endline. These results  
610 are similar to a study conducted in Nigeria that showed a reduction of vaccine stock-outs  
611 from 43% to 0% after streamlining their last mile vaccine supply delivery to informed  
612 push model [10].

613 Vaccine stock-outs often lead to missed opportunities for vaccination, decrease number  
614 of children who could have been immunised and create a negative demand for

615 immunization [14]. Missed opportunities for vaccination for children that result from  
616 inequitable and poor supply chain systems negatively impact the vaccination coverage  
617 and can expose children to morbidity and mortality from vaccine preventable diseases  
618 which in the long run negatively impacts the economy of a country [14].

619 Costs

620 Our study revealed varying baseline costs incurred by health facilities for picking vaccines  
621 from the district vaccine store with a monthly total combined cost of \$ 170.8 for all the  
622 19 health facilities and a monthly median cost of \$ 8.1. However, it is important to note  
623 that this cost is underestimated as it doesn't include opportunity costs such as  
624 productivity lost when a health worker leaves their duty station to fetch the vaccines from  
625 the DVS. Furthermore, while the monthly median cost was quiet low (\$8.1), it is also  
626 important to highlight that in a context where resources are highly constrained, most  
627 facilities often struggled to mobilize the costs of transportation of vaccines and primarily  
628 relied on the grossly insufficient primary health care funds and out-of-pocket charges to  
629 patients. Collecting money from patients/caretakers to finance transportation of vaccines  
630 among others exposes them to financial ruin as they seek health care services as a result  
631 of increased out-of-pocket expenditure to meet medical and non-medical costs.

632 For the IPM, our study estimated the monthly cost for implementation of the push model  
633 at \$ 445.9 and this translates to an estimated quarterly and annual cost of \$ 1, 337.7 and  
634 \$ 5,350.8 respectively. The estimated monthly cost per child reached with vaccination  
635 services in Gomba district is \$ 0.06. This very low per child cost makes financial sense and  
636 a strong case for nation-wide scale up of the IPM.

637 Furthermore, the elevated costs of the push model (more than two and half times that  
638 of the combined costs of all health facilities at baseline to pick the vaccines), are  
639 countered by the immense benefits associated with the IPM such as timely delivery of  
640 vaccines, maintenance of vaccines in their right conditions, mentorships and ad hoc  
641 repairs of cold chain equipment and time saved for health workers to attend to  
642 immunisation activities.

643 There are studies that have used third party logistic companies to deliver the vaccines to  
644 the last mile often at high costs. A study in Cape Town (South Africa) found that  
645 outsourcing vaccine logistics to the private sector reduced delivery and inventory costs,  
646 improved adherence to temperature thresholds, reduced delivery delays, improved  
647 handling practises, and allowed greater volume flexibility [32].

648 It is arguable that the use of third company logistics to deliver vaccines to the last mile  
649 may be too expensive and not sustainable. Our research shows that a better and  
650 sustainable approach would be empowering the district cold chain teams to use the  
651 available cars designated for the EPI programs by to distribute vaccines in a timely and  
652 equitably manner while offering support supervision in vaccine management, conducting  
653 ad hoc cold chain maintenance of vaccine equipment at the health facilities, and ensuring  
654 health facilities have the right stocks of vaccines. The DCCT is able mentor health workers  
655 in EPI in stock management, vaccine forecasting whilst having visibility on functionality of  
656 cold chain equipment at the health facility level.

657 A robust last mile cold chain and supply chain system will require technical persons who  
658 are able to carry out multiple tasks such as repairs of cold chain equipment, mentorships,  
659 support supervision, vaccine management in addition to vaccine distribution.

660 There are some limitations in our study including the fact the patient costs were not  
661 included in the scope of this analysis. Moreover, the indirect costs already borne by the  
662 government such as health personnel, opportunity costs, and other capital costs were  
663 also not included in this analysis. Although the study is informative in terms of the  
664 potential to use IPM approach for vaccine delivery, the findings should be treated with  
665 caution because it was limited to one district and the cost of IPM may differ from district  
666 to district as it is affected by distances and terrains. The sample size of one district also  
667 limits this study's ability to generalize to other settings.

## 668 **Conclusion**

669 As per the authors' knowledge, the study described here is the first of its kind that has  
670 attempted to demonstrate an improved and costed last mile immunisation supply chain  
671 model that uses district based trained cold chain personnel. To address the challenges of  
672 an inefficient and poorly defined last mile vaccine logistics system, our study  
673 implemented and costed an informed push model of vaccine delivery from the district to  
674 all immunising health facilities. This streamlined vaccine supply chain system ensured  
675 vaccine quality, timeliness of vaccine delivery, reduced stock-outs, reduced the burden of  
676 HCWs in vaccine pick-up, ensured timely repairs of broken-down cold chain equipment,  
677 provided visibility of stock status of health facilities, provided a platform for onsite  
678 mentorship and other less tangible spill over benefits. The costings, successes and areas

679 of opportunities described herein can serve as a guide for other last mile vaccine systems  
680 in Uganda and other countries with similar contexts. The monthly costs associated with  
681 the IPM (\$445.9 and \$0.06 per child) make financial sense and a strong case for the model  
682 and this is further reinforced by the various benefits of last mile delivery. This benefit is  
683 critical in hard-to-reach areas that tend to have frequent vaccine stock-outs, missed  
684 opportunities for vaccination and generally poor vaccine coverages.

## 685 **Acknowledgement**

686 We wish to extend our appreciation to the institutions and individuals that contributed to  
687 the implementation of this research study, that is East Africa Community Regional Centre  
688 of Excellence for Vaccine Immunization, and Health Supply Chain Management,  
689 University of Rwanda; Makerere University School of Public Health; Health Support  
690 Initiatives, Uganda; Ministry of Health-EPI division; Uganda National Medical Stores;  
691 Gomba District Health team; in-charges and EPI health workers of Health Facilities in  
692 Gomba district; and the field data collection teams.

693

## 694 **References**

- 695 1. WHO (2023) Vaccines and immunization. In: Organization WH, editor. World Health  
696 Organization.
- 697 2. Kartoglu U, Ames H (2022) Ensuring quality and integrity of vaccines throughout the cold  
698 chain: the role of temperature monitoring. *Expert Review of Vaccines* 21: 799-810.
- 699 3. Zhang J, Xia Y, Liu X, Liu G (2023) Advanced Vaccine Design Strategies against SARS-CoV-2  
700 and Emerging Variants. *Bioengineering* 10: 148.
- 701 4. Rappuoli R, Black S, Bloom DE (2019) Vaccines and global health: In search of a sustainable  
702 model for vaccine development and delivery. *Science Translational Medicine* 11:  
703 eaaw2888.
- 704 5. Yang Y, Bidkhori H, Rajgopal J (2021) Optimizing vaccine distribution networks in low and  
705 middle-income countries. *Omega* 99: 102197.

- 706 6. Songane M (2018) Challenges for nationwide vaccine delivery in African countries.  
707 International journal of health economics and management 18: 197-219.
- 708 7. Lin Q, Zhao Q, Lev B (2020) Cold chain transportation decision in the vaccine supply chain.  
709 European Journal of Operational Research 283: 182-195.
- 710 8. Srivastava V, Ratna M, Ray A, Shukla S, Shrivastava V, et al. (2021) Strengthening the  
711 immunization supply chain: A time-to-supply based approach to cold chain network  
712 optimization & extension in Madhya Pradesh. Vaccine 39: 6660-6670.
- 713 9. Iwu CJ, Jaca A, Abdullahi LH, Ngcobo NJ, Wiysonge CS (2019) A scoping review of  
714 interventions for vaccine stock management in primary health-care facilities. Human  
715 vaccines & immunotherapeutics 15: 2666-2672.
- 716 10. Sarley D, Mahmud M, Idris J, Osunkiyesi M, Dibosa-Osador O, et al. (2017) Transforming  
717 vaccines supply chains in Nigeria. Vaccine 35: 2167-2174.
- 718 11. Mulatu S, Tesfa G, Dinku H (2020) Assessment of Factors Affecting Vaccine Cold Chain  
719 Management Practice in Bahir Dar City Health Institutions. American Journal of Life  
720 Sciences 8: 107-113.
- 721 12. Mwanaumo ET, Kabwe D, Mwanza BGM, Mwanaumo EMu Assessing the Last Mile delivery  
722 logistics of the Zambia Medicines and Medical Supplies Agency.
- 723 13. Pambudi NA, Sarifudin A, Gandidi IM, Romadhon R (2022) Vaccine cold chain management  
724 and cold storage technology to address the challenges of vaccination programs.  
725 Energy Reports 8: 955-972.
- 726 14. Kremer P, Haruna F, Sarpong RT, Agamah D, Billy J, et al. (2023) An impact assessment of  
727 the use of aerial logistics to improve access to vaccines in the Western-North Region  
728 of Ghana. Vaccine.
- 729 15. Prosser W, Spisak C, Hatch B, McCord J, Tien M, et al. (2021) Designing supply chains to  
730 meet the growing need of vaccines: evidence from four countries. Journal of  
731 pharmaceutical policy and practice 14: 1-10.
- 732 16. Luzze H, Badiane O, Ndiaye AS, Atuhaire B, Atuhebwe P, et al. (2017) Understanding the  
733 policy environment for immunization supply chains: Lessons learned from landscape  
734 analyses in Uganda and Senegal. Vaccine 35: 2141-2147.
- 735 17. PATH (2016) IMMUNIZATION SUPPLY CHAIN POLICY ENVIRONMENT IN UGANDA.
- 736 18. Mugambe RK, Yakubu H, Wafula ST, Ssekamatte T, Kasasa S, et al. (2021) Factors  
737 associated with health facility deliveries among mothers living in hospital catchment  
738 areas in Rukungiri and Kanungu districts, Uganda. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth 21: 329.
- 739 19. Levin HM, Belfield C (2015) Guiding the development and use of cost-effectiveness  
740 analysis in education. Journal of research on educational effectiveness 8: 400-418.
- 741 20. Levin HM, McEwan PJ (2001) Cost-effectiveness analysis: Methods and applications: Sage.
- 742 21. Vaismoradi M, Jones J, Turunen H, Snelgrove S (2016) Theme development in qualitative  
743 content analysis and thematic analysis.
- 744 22. Li AJ, Tabu C, Shendale S, Okoth PO, Sergon K, et al. (2020) Qualitative insights into reasons  
745 for missed opportunities for vaccination in Kenyan health facilities. PloS one 15:  
746 e0230783.
- 747 23. Nabirye J, Okwi LA, Nuwematsiko R, Kiwanuka G, Muneza F, et al. (2020) Health system  
748 factors influencing uptake of Human Papilloma Virus (HPV) vaccine among adolescent  
749 girls 9-15 years in Mbale District, Uganda. BMC public health 20: 1-11.
- 750 24. Bbaale E (2013) Factors influencing childhood immunization in Uganda. Journal of health,  
751 population, and nutrition 31: 118.




- 752 25. Osei E, Ibrahim M, Kofi Amenuvegbe G (2019) Effective vaccine management: The case of  
753 a rural district in Ghana. *Advances in Preventive Medicine* 2019.
- 754 26. Mafigiri DK, Iradukunda C, Atumanya C, Odie M, Mancuso A, et al. (2021) A qualitative  
755 study of the development and utilization of health facility-based immunization  
756 microplans in Uganda. *Health Research Policy and Systems* 19: 1-8.
- 757 27. Dowling P (2011) *Healthcare supply chains in developing countries: situational analysis*.  
758 Arlington, Va: USAID| DELIVER PROJECT.
- 759 28. Bogale HA, Amhare AF, Bogale AA (2019) Assessment of factors affecting vaccine cold  
760 chain management practice in public health institutions in east Gojam zone of Amhara  
761 region. *BMC public health* 19: 1-6.
- 762 29. Falcón VC, Porrás YVV, Altamirano CMG, Kartoglu U (2020) A vaccine cold chain  
763 temperature monitoring study in the United Mexican States. *Vaccine* 38: 5202-5211.
- 764 30. Ashok A, Brison M, LeTallec Y (2017) Improving cold chain systems: Challenges and  
765 solutions. *Vaccine* 35: 2217-2223.
- 766 31. Tumwine Y, Rajab K, Kutyabami P, Nyandwi JB, Asingizwe D (2023) Cold chain  
767 management practices of non-vaccine commodities in public health facilities of  
768 Rwenzori Region, Western Uganda. *Journal of Pharmaceutical Policy and Practice* 16:  
769 1-9.
- 770 32. Lydon P, Raubenheimer T, Arnot-Krüger M, Zaffran M (2015) Outsourcing vaccine logistics  
771 to the private sector: the evidence and lessons learned from the Western Cape  
772 Province in South-Africa. *Vaccine* 33: 3429-3434.

773

774

## 775 **Supporting Information**

776 SI Dataset



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.03.23298045>; this version posted November 6, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Fig 1: Current vaccine delivery model





Fig 2: Informed Push Model



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.03.23298045>; this version posted November 6, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Fig 3: Graph showing source of funds for vaccine pick-up at baseline