

1 **Subnational tailoring of malaria interventions for strategic planning and prioritization:**  
2 **experience and perspectives of five malaria programs**

3

4 Short title: Perspectives of malaria programs on subnational tailoring of interventions

5

6 Letitia Onyango<sup>1</sup>, Ghislaine Ouédraogo-Ametchie<sup>1</sup>, Ifeoma Ozodiegwu<sup>1,2</sup>, Beatriz Galatas<sup>3</sup>,  
7 Jaline Gerardin<sup>1\*</sup>

8

9 <sup>1</sup>Institute for Global Health and Department of Preventive Medicine, Northwestern University  
10 Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago USA

11 <sup>2</sup>Department of Health Informatics and Data Science, Loyola University Parkinson School of  
12 Health Sciences and Public Health, Chicago USA (current address)

13 <sup>3</sup>Global Malaria Programme, World Health Organization, Geneva Switzerland

14

15 \*To whom correspondence should be addressed. Email: [jgerardin@northwestern.edu](mailto:jgerardin@northwestern.edu)

16

17

## 18 **ABSTRACT**

19

20 In the context of high malaria burden and insufficient resources, several national malaria  
21 programs (NMPs) used subnational tailoring (SNT) as a tool for evidence-informed decision-  
22 making on their national malaria strategic plans and funding requests. The SNT process  
23 included the formation of an SNT team, determination of criteria for targeting interventions, data  
24 assembly and review, stratification, application of targeting criteria to determine preliminary  
25 plans, mathematical modeling, finalization of intervention plans, and monitoring and evaluation  
26 of the eventual implemented plan, all under the leadership of the NMP. Analysis steps of SNT  
27 were supported by the World Health Organization (WHO) and other partners. As SNT was a  
28 new approach, this study used semi-structured interviews to understand the perspectives and  
29 experiences of personnel from five NMPs (Burkina Faso, Ghana, Guinea, Nigeria, and Togo)  
30 that undertook SNT between 2019 and 2023. Participants reported that SNT outputs were used  
31 to inform national strategic plans and prioritized plans, that the process incentivized  
32 improvements in data collection and data quality, and that NMPs were strongly motivated to  
33 grow their capacity to conduct more steps of the SNT analysis process internally. Major  
34 challenges included the lack of resources available to implement the full strategic plans as well  
35 as challenges with data quality and alignment of stakeholders. Participants reported a moderate  
36 to strong sense of ownership over the process and were eager to extend, adapt, and reuse the  
37 SNT process in the future. Among countries supported by WHO, SNT was well-accepted and  
38 allowed NMPs to successfully use evidence to inform their decision-making, advocate for  
39 themselves, and mobilize resources.

40

41

## 42 **INTRODUCTION**

43

44 After concerted efforts to increase access to vector control, chemoprevention, and prompt  
45 diagnosis and treatment [1], malaria incidence worldwide declined by 27% between 2000 and  
46 2015 [2]. However, progress slowed after 2015. The World Malaria Reports of 2017 and 2018  
47 showed that global progress towards the 2020 targets set out in the World Health Organization's  
48 (WHO) Global Technical Strategy for Malaria was unlikely to be achieved [3,4].

49

50 Stalled progress was driven by trends in countries with high malaria burden, including the 11  
51 countries (Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ghana, Mali,  
52 Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, and India) that accounted  
53 for 70% of the global estimated case burden and 71% of the estimated deaths. In the WHO  
54 African Region, malaria case incidence and malaria mortality have remained flat since 2018 [5].  
55 Many factors contribute to rising or stable malaria incidence in high-burden countries, including  
56 the underlying intensity of malaria transmission, socio-demographic and epidemiologic risk  
57 factors, poor access to care, and sub-optimal malaria intervention coverage [4].

58

59 In November 2018, WHO and the RBM Partnership to End Malaria launched the High Burden to  
60 High Impact (HBHI) response to get the highest burden countries back on track to achieve the  
61 2025 milestones set out in WHO's Global Technical Strategy for malaria [6]. The HBHI

62 approach had four key response elements: political will to reduce malaria deaths; strategic  
63 information to drive impact; better guidance, policies, and strategies; and a coordinated national  
64 malaria response. Between 2018 and 2020, the HBHI approach was implemented in the 10  
65 highest-burden African countries [7,8].

66

67 The purpose of HBHI response element 2 – use of strategic information to drive impact – was to  
68 address the need by national malaria programs (NMPs) and technical partners for context-  
69 specific analysis. Under HBHI response element 2, local data and quantitative methods are  
70 used to identify challenges for progress against malaria and develop appropriate responses to  
71 achieve impact.

72

73 Since 2019, many countries have used elements of HBHI response element 2 to review their  
74 national malaria strategic plans (NMSPs) and submit funding requests to the Global Fund to  
75 Fight Aids, Tuberculosis and Malaria. Under the lead of NMPs, and in partnership with WHO  
76 and analysis partners, the following areas of work were implemented to improve the use of  
77 strategic information and achieve maximum impact in their NMSPs and funding requests:

78

- 79 • **Establishment of national malaria data repositories:** NMPs worked with their  
80 country's health management and information system to establish functioning national  
81 malaria data repositories with program tracking dashboards.
- 82 • **Implementation of progress reviews** consisting of country-level malaria situation  
83 analysis and review of malaria programs to understand progress and bottlenecks.
- 84 • **Subnational tailoring of interventions (SNT)** to develop final strategic and prioritized  
85 plans with more efficient targeting of resources.

86

87 The SNT process recommended by WHO includes these steps:

- 88 1) **Assembly of an SNT team** led by the NMP, consisting of local, regional, and/or global  
89 partners in addition to the NMP itself.
- 90 2) **Determination of criteria** to be used to target interventions under consideration in the  
91 national strategic plan.
- 92 3) **Collection of relevant data and stratification of indicators** required for decision-  
93 making, including epidemiological stratification and stratification of determinants of  
94 malaria transmission.
- 95 4) **Geographical targeting of interventions** based on the defined criteria, stratification  
96 maps, and any relevant operational constraints, to prepare targeted intervention mixes  
97 for NMSPs and prioritized plans for funding requests.
- 98 5) **Mathematical modeling** to evaluate the potential impact of different intervention mix  
99 scenarios posed by the NMP in the previous step.
- 100 6) **Consensus reached on the final strategic intervention mix** per subnational area and  
101 **costing** of the national strategic plan.
- 102 7) **Prioritization of interventions** to maximize impact if resources are insufficient to fully  
103 cover the NMSP. Steps 2 to 6 are repeated using the costed strategic plan as the basis  
104 and considering aspects such as operational feasibility, equity, acceptability, and/or cost-  
105 effectiveness.

106 8) **Monitoring and evaluation** of the impact of the operationally costed plan to optimize its  
107 effectiveness and ensure maximum impact will be reached.

108  
109 In 2019-2021 (Phase 1), all 10 original African highest-burden countries and several additional  
110 ones, including Guinea, conducted SNT as part of their HBHI response element 2 activities to  
111 finalize their NMSPs and applications to the Global Fund. Technical portions of the SNT  
112 analysis were led by WHO in nearly all countries and supported by various external analytical  
113 groups, as NMPs in Phase 1 were less familiar with stratification and the use of mathematical  
114 modeling to inform decision-making.

115  
116 In 2022-2023 (Phase 2), at least 28 countries used some or all elements of SNT analysis to  
117 inform their strategic planning and/or applications to the Global Fund or to Gavi, the Vaccine  
118 Alliance. During Phase 2, most but not all countries coordinated their SNT activities with support  
119 from WHO. Technical portions of SNT were executed directly by the country, WHO, or other  
120 external analysis partners, depending on the country. In countries where WHO was not  
121 engaged in Phase 2, the steps of the SNT process sometimes deviated from the  
122 abovementioned steps.

123  
124 This study uses the term “analysis partner” to refer to an external group that executes analytical  
125 steps of the SNT process. In some instances, particularly during Phase 1, WHO participated as  
126 an analysis partner, but this was separate to its role as a coordinator of the SNT process. In-  
127 person meetings were held with all Phase 1 countries in 2019 to launch and implement the SNT  
128 steps. However, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, most engagements between NMPs and  
129 partners became fully remote at the end of Phase 1, and engagements remained nearly always  
130 remote during Phase 2.

131  
132 The implementation of SNT brought with it substantial innovation and change to the previous  
133 processes used by most countries for decision-making. While the technical outputs of  
134 applications of SNT or SNT-like analyses have already been documented [8–16], understanding  
135 the NMP experience with the SNT process is necessary to identify successful elements,  
136 remaining gaps, and approaches that need adjustment.

137  
138 This study evaluates the perceptions of NMPs toward the SNT analysis activities that they  
139 undertook in Phase 1 and/or Phase 2, focusing on NMPs’ motivations for initiating SNT; how  
140 SNT outputs were used; challenges with the process and use of outputs, including challenges  
141 with partners; sense of ownership of the process; and future plans for SNT.

142

143

## 144 **METHODS**

145

### 146 ***Study design***

147

148 This study used a qualitative approach based on semi-structured interviews with a purposive  
149 sample of participants. Given the nuances of the themes of the study, the multi-phased aspects

150 SNT implementation, and the impact of country dynamics of SNT initiation and progression, an  
151 interview approach offered participants the opportunity to speak in-depth about their  
152 experiences and paint a robust picture of SNT implementation in their countries. Semi-  
153 structured interviews provided the flexibility for participants to discuss their experiences with  
154 SNT in terms of their country context and roles, while focusing on aspects of SNT  
155 implementation closest to their experience. This enabled an inductive approach to analysis, and  
156 a deeper exploration of how NMP expectations and relationships with analysis partners affected  
157 observed results.

158

### 159 ***Study population and participant recruitment***

160

161 Study participants were recruited between September 2022 and July 2023 from NMPs in  
162 countries that had undergone an SNT exercise in Phase 1 and/or 2 with technical support from  
163 WHO and had implemented at least steps 1-6 of the SNT process described above. NMPs  
164 included were Burkina Faso, Ghana, Guinea, and Nigeria, that used SNT in 2019-2021 (Phase  
165 1) and in 2022-2023 (Phase 2); and Togo, whose first SNT experience was in Phase 2.

166

167 NMP managers were contacted by email from WHO inviting participation in the study. NMP  
168 managers who expressed interest were subsequently contacted by the Northwestern University  
169 research team (LO or GAO), and NMP managers nominated potential NMP representatives for  
170 interviews. Interviewers (LO and GAO) did not have prior relationships with participants. The  
171 study team drafted letters outlining the parameters of the study and a link to provide online  
172 consent via Qualtrics. Study participants were informed that interviewers were neutral and  
173 separate from the WHO SNT team or analysis partner teams. After participants completed their  
174 online consent, interviewers then led to recruitment follow-up, which included emails and text  
175 messages to schedule the interview. The consent form is provided in Supplemental File 1.

176

177 All NMP representatives nominated by their NMP manager were contacted by the study team,  
178 and all responsive representatives were interviewed. Two or three representatives were  
179 interviewed from each NMP, resulting in a total of 12 participants. NMP representatives included  
180 the NMP manager, the SNT focal person within the NMCP, and/or data manager, depending on  
181 the country. All study participants had direct involvement in the SNT analysis process and  
182 attended meetings with WHO and analysis partners during SNT. Participants led the  
183 coordination of SNT activities including strategic plan development, data management, and  
184 communication with analysis partners. Given the purposive nature of the sample and limited  
185 number of individuals within each NMP working on SNT, two to three participants at each site  
186 were sufficient for achieving saturation.

187

### 188 ***Data collection***

189

190 Interviewers developed the initial interview guide in consultation with an evaluation team  
191 member from WHO with experience supporting SNT. The interview guide was piloted with  
192 volunteers who were experienced with SNT implementation in the study countries but outside  
193 the evaluation team, including another WHO member and two previous NMP managers. Pilot

194 interviews were recorded, transcribed, and closely reviewed to identify redundancies and  
195 improve question clarity. The final interview guide is provided in Supplemental File 2.

196  
197 At the beginning of each interview, interviewers reviewed the consent language contained in the  
198 written consent document. Participants were informed that their responses were confidential,  
199 including from WHO members of the study team; that narrative results would be reported at the  
200 country level; and that any quotes would be completely anonymized. Interviews were conducted  
201 in person (5) or virtually (7), in English or French, by LO or GAO. Interviews took place between  
202 June 2023 and October 2023 and lasted between 45 and 60 minutes. For in-person interviews,  
203 interviewers traveled to conferences and workshops where participants indicated they would be  
204 present. Virtual interviews were conducted over Zoom. All interviews were audio recorded and  
205 supplemented with written notes. Interviewers sought verbal consent from participants to record  
206 the interviews.

207  
208 Interview recordings were transcribed and quality-assessed against the original audio.  
209 Transcriptions of French interviews were translated into English, and translations were reviewed  
210 next to the original French by a bilingual member of the research team.

## 211 212 **Data analysis**

213  
214 The study team developed an initial coding architecture based on research questions. The study  
215 team then chose three transcripts to review, using an interpretive phenomenological analysis  
216 approach [17], to identify additional codes and ensure that participant experiences were  
217 centered throughout. This approach enabled the research team to assess how participants  
218 defined their experiences with SNT and their relationships with analysis partners.

219  
220 LO and JG analyzed the remaining transcripts and adapted the codebook until all phenomena  
221 were sufficiently represented. The codebook was finalized after two transcripts from each  
222 country were complete, resulting in a final codebook with both deductive and inductive codes.  
223 Given the small sample size, all coding and thematic analysis was completed in Excel, resulting  
224 in two workbooks: one focused on country-level dynamics and another outlining cross-country  
225 themes in alignment with research questions.

## 226 227 **Ethical review**

228  
229 This study was reviewed and approved by Northwestern University's Institutional Review Board  
230 (project STU00215997). The World Health Organization Research Ethics Review Committee  
231 granted this study an ERC exemption (project HBHI-SOC). Participants provided written and  
232 oral informed consent to participate.

## 233 234 235 **RESULTS**

### 236 237 **Initiating the SNT analysis process**

238  
239 Participants cited multiple motivations for their NMP's initiation of and participation in the SNT  
240 process. NMPs that engaged in multiple rounds of SNT reported that during Phase 1, they were  
241 primarily driven by a push from funders and WHO. Participants in two countries said that the  
242 push from the Global Fund to refine their strategic plans with stratification was an important  
243 factor in initiating the SNT process. For other countries, HBHI designation in Phase 1 drove the  
244 political will to explore alternative approaches, including SNT, to malaria control and elimination.

245  
246 Armed with knowledge and experience from Phase 1, NMPs reported more self-driven  
247 motivations in Phase 2. NMPs were more focused on how the SNT analysis process could  
248 enable them to develop better strategic plans, identify priority areas for specific interventions,  
249 and stretch operational budgets. Participants cited a growth in confidence and successful  
250 partnerships with analysis partners in Phase 1 as additional motivators during Phase 2:

251  
252 *We had a first phase where we were recommended by our Global Fund partner to*  
253 *stratify our activities and identify the most relevant ones. [...] That's when we really got in*  
254 *touch with modeling. And then there's a second phase which was just recently when we*  
255 *wrote our strategic plan and applied for funding from the Global Fund. Since we had*  
256 *completed the first phase, which enabled us to see the usefulness of modeling, we*  
257 *thought it would be appropriate to use stratification. [...] I think the time we were most*  
258 *confident when we knew what we were doing, was the second time. Because we had*  
259 *some idea about modeling. We were leading the process this time. And we were more*  
260 *informed. (Participant 7)*

261  
262 During both phases, internal discussions, strategic plan performance reviews, and the 2018  
263 World Malaria Report catalyzed NMPs to reconsider their previous approaches and to integrate  
264 stratification into national strategic plans and funding applications. In the face of dwindling  
265 resources for malaria interventions, participants recognized the limitations of previous "one size  
266 fits all" approaches and the need to strategize resource allocation to improve intervention  
267 effectiveness and have a bigger impact on malaria burden or to progress toward elimination:

268  
269 *We said to ourselves: we're tired of doing the same things everywhere at the same time,*  
270 *because everything we do is the same in every district. And we really said to ourselves,*  
271 *we need to look and see if there are districts that are in pre-elimination or moderate*  
272 *transmission, for example, that we can push towards pre-elimination or elimination. [...]*  
273 *We need to direct resources to where they're needed. That way, we can really boost our*  
274 *objectives. Because today, resources are becoming increasingly scarce. (Participant 11)*

275  
276 When asked about their expectations of the SNT process, participants expressed that they  
277 expected to be able to understand their malaria burden at the district level and make  
278 intervention plans appropriate to each district, thereby increasing the overall impact of the  
279 country's malaria strategy:

280

281 *Our expectation was to be able to show the situation by district. This will enable us to*  
282 *see what action we can take in this district and what efforts we can make in other*  
283 *districts. So, just to be able to really target interventions to increase their impact.*  
284 (Participant 12)

285  
286 *My expectations were, foremost, to be able to make choices based on the different*  
287 *forecasts considering the interventions that we were going to put in place. (Participant 1)*  
288

289 Some participants were concerned with whether analysis outputs would generate feasible  
290 recommendations or meet NMP needs, but were open to trying the process:

291  
292 *Our expectation was that, okay, let's see what they want to do because it was a new*  
293 *concept to everyone. And we felt with the level of control the country had with bed nets,*  
294 *let's see how, even with the bed nets, we would be able to stratify what kind of bed nets*  
295 *go everywhere. (Participant 8)*  
296

297

298

### 298 **Use of SNT outputs**

299

300 Participants in all countries provided examples of how SNT outputs supported internal efforts to  
301 revise strategic plans, prioritize interventions, and implement more thorough malaria program  
302 reviews. Participants also discussed how SNT outputs enabled them to identify limitations in  
303 their data and advocate for NMP activities and priorities more effectively with stakeholders.  
304

305

### 305 *Motivating improvement of data availability and quality*

306

307 The SNT experience motivated participants from all NMPs to improve data quality and  
308 availability. All participants recognized the importance of high-quality data for decision-making:  
309

310

311 *It's important that before you embark [and] pull data for decision making, analysis and*  
312 *modeling and subnational tailoring, you must have the data. So, it's important to improve*  
313 *the quality of data that's available. And so, there's effort being put into that to ensure that*  
314 *we have data to make decisions [...] because you cannot work with nothing. (Participant*  
315 *10)*

316

317 Participants reported that the data mobilization phase was initially challenging, especially when  
318 NMPs relied on other Ministry of Health units for surveillance and health facility-level data.

319 Several participants described their NMP's use of the SNT process to identify limitations and  
320 inefficiencies in their data collection:

321

322 *For the SNT process, the backbone has always been garbage in, garbage out. [...] The*  
323 *main challenge has always been getting the good data, or the complete data, because*  
324 *our surveillance has less sensitivity in terms of getting the right data from the places*  
*where the services have been delivered. If we get the right data into the whole SNT*



325 *process, improve data quality, improve coverage of the data we get and get it at the right*  
326 *time, then it will now give us a better output of what we do. We could do better in getting*  
327 *the right data into the pool. (Participant 9)*

328  
329 Challenges with data quality and availability helped NMPs identify interdependencies with other  
330 ministries and subnational health offices, from whom it was occasionally challenging to acquire  
331 timely data. For example, NMPs incorporating insecticide resistance data needed additional  
332 input from the Ministry of Agriculture, while NMPs incorporating health facility visit data relied on  
333 health facilities for up-to-date data. These challenges resulted in delayed timelines for SNT  
334 implementation:

335  
336 *There were some data that the team required but was not readily available. Particularly*  
337 *data on vector species distribution. And largely the entomology surveillance data. We*  
338 *didn't have all of that at [the program]. We had written to the Center for Medical*  
339 *Research where they were the ones implementing that on behalf of [the program], and*  
340 *we didn't get any response. [...] Definitely that also impacted the timeline. (Participant 8)*  
341

342 Participants reported that data quality reviews were a valuable learning experience in  
343 understanding how to leverage the full capabilities of SNT and mathematical modeling. Limited  
344 data quality and granularity affected NMPs' ability to get the most out of the SNT process at  
345 every stage, from stratification to mathematical modeling, and occasionally required certain  
346 compromises:

347  
348 *There was some data that we couldn't put into the model, even if it was important*  
349 *because the quality wasn't reliable. I'll just take the example of the data on estimated*  
350 *[incidence]. We had to add the population's ability to use health facilities in the event of*  
351 *fever because to be tested, you must go to a health facility. This indicator was so bad*  
352 *that every time we included it, it biased all the results. So we didn't include it in the*  
353 *[incidence] estimate, even though it was important. (Participant 7)*  
354

355 Participants reported that NMPs responded to data availability and quality challenges  
356 encountered during SNT by defining NMSP priorities for data quality improvement, developing  
357 national malaria data repositories, implementing new data documentation policies, among other  
358 activities.

### 359 *Strategic planning*

360  
361  
362 All participants reported that SNT outputs were used in strategic planning, prioritization, or both.

363  
364 *Everything we do now is based on stratification. For each intervention in different*  
365 *regions, results were based on stratification. Therefore, the stratification results have*  
366 *been inserted in the current revised strategic plan. For example, we know that [in each*  
367 *region] this is what is done, based on the stratification results. (Participant 2)*  
368

369 *Every time we initiated some activity, we tried to justify it by referring to the*  
370 *recommendations in this [SNT] report as we implemented it. (Participant 7)*

371  
372 Several participants reported that SNT enabled the identification of areas eligible for receiving  
373 seasonal malaria chemoprevention (SMC) that were not previously receiving SMC. SNT also  
374 identified SMC-eligible areas that should be receiving additional cycles of SMC based on the  
375 length of their transmission season and allowed NMPs to explore the possible impact of  
376 expanding SMC to children above the age of 5. When asked about the impact of SNT on  
377 funding applications, one NMP reported that their use of SNT outputs enabled them to make  
378 bolder, data-informed funding requests for expanding SMC:

379  
380 *It [SNT] helped us because we were already discussing the number of [SMC] cycles with*  
381 *the Global Fund. We went with four. They accepted that. So we thought - are they going*  
382 *to accept that we go to five cycles? Because according to the rainfall data review, rainfall*  
383 *in the southern SMC zone exceeds four months. In some places, it's as much as six*  
384 *months. But if it's four cycles [of SMC], that means there are two months that aren't*  
385 *covered. With the stratification, there was evidence [that] showed that this is it. So*  
386 *nobody can say no, this isn't it. That made it easier for us. (Participant 12)*

387  
388 All participants reported using SNT to identify priority areas for distribution of second-generation  
389 long-lasting insecticide-treated nets (LLINs) through review of local data from coverage surveys,  
390 entomological surveillance, and insecticide resistance surveillance. For one NMP, the SNT  
391 process revealed that pyrethroid-only LLINs were likely still highly effective in some districts. For  
392 other NMPs, SNT analysis provided evidence in support of switching to second-generation  
393 LLINs:

394  
395 *We started using second-generation LLINs for certain regions, certain districts, and*  
396 *ordinary LLINs for certain regions because of the vectors' resistance to insecticides. The*  
397 *stratification process helped us to clarify all these factors. (Participant 2)*

398  
399 *Intervention prioritization and preparation of funding requests*

400  
401 Participants stated that SNT helped them better manage their resources and improve the  
402 effectiveness of their malaria strategies by targeting resources appropriately to priority areas,  
403 such as the deployment of a limited-availability malaria vaccine:

404  
405 *We were able to determine the priorities, which districts have the highest priority based*  
406 *on the burden. They are the districts we chose to vaccinate. (Participant 1)*

407  
408 *Before, we simply divided the country into three parts according to the seasonal*  
409 *landscape. [...] As a result [of SNT], our priorities were geared more towards where the*  
410 *stratification had enabled us to put our finger on the difficulties in these regions.*  
411 *(Participant 3)*

412

413 NMPs reported using the results of SNT when preparing their funding applications to the Global  
414 Fund to justify the epidemiological impact of, and the districts targeted with, their proposed  
415 interventions. In some cases, further prioritization was necessary to account for costs:

416

417 *Some activities, even if they were relevant according to [SNT], but considering the cost*  
418 *were put aside or were adjusted. [...] The latest generation of LLINs, we were only able*  
419 *to get them for one locality [in Phase 1] because it was impossible to include all the*  
420 *districts identified by stratification. [...] When the second stratification was done, which*  
421 *showed practically the same thing, the need for [second-generation LLINs], in the*  
422 *funding request we justified that we didn't want to have the previous mosquito net type,*  
423 *we wanted to have [second-generation LLINs] available at least in such-and-such*  
424 *districts in significant quantities. (Participant 7)*

425

426 *We also had the opportunity to apply for funding from the Global Fund. [SNT] helped us*  
427 *a lot because when we got there, we were able to think about it. We went for targeted*  
428 *interventions. Before, we didn't do that. [...] When we wanted to present the results of*  
429 *the funding request to the Global Fund, we put the modeling results. [...] We've shown*  
430 *that if we really have the money to implement all that, these are the lives we can save.*  
431 *[...] And thus when we presented the system, there was no question of [Global Fund]*  
432 *sincerely validating what we wanted to do. (Participant 11)*

433

434 *Engagement with funders and partners*

435

436 Some participants expressed that before undertaking SNT, their NMP was initially concerned  
437 about the acceptability of SNT results by their communities or partners:

438

439 *We were also a bit skeptical that when these analytical results eventually come back to*  
440 *the country, what will people do with those results? You know different funders have*  
441 *different [areas of] focus. It's possible that the result comes back, and people say, I'm*  
442 *not interested in the result. It is based on what the American people have signed with*  
443 *us that we do. (Participant 8)*

444

445 Despite pre-SNT concerns, participants in all countries described how SNT outputs were critical  
446 in streamlining funding applications, garnering buy-in from funders and communicating with  
447 country partners. In some countries, participants felt that the inclusion of SNT outputs in their  
448 funding application gave their NMP greater legitimacy:

449

450 *[SNT] gets stakeholders to buy into the seriousness of the program. I think one of the*  
451 *key things is how it encourages funders to understand that this program is really serious,*  
452 *and they really want to be efficient with the use of the resources. (Participant 4)*

453

454 Participants felt that this added layer of legitimacy helped them use SNT as an advocacy tool  
455 when communicating with funders, implementing partners, and other stakeholders. Participants  
456 reported having to often provide justification for their activities to NMP partners whose buy-in

457 was dependent on well-articulated plans and justifications. Participants expressed that SNT  
458 outputs like stratification maps and intervention impact predictions allowed them to develop  
459 language for communicating their goals with external stakeholders, including prospective  
460 donors, and implementing partners, and more effectively garner buy-in:

461  
462 *The most important lesson for me is that stratification has enabled me [...] to make a*  
463 *case to an authority. Even when you say that my incidence is twelve per 1000 [they will*  
464 *say] “I don’t see that.” But when you present the map and say - “Well, here we are,*  
465 *where we are today, we were like that, we were in the red. Now we’re in yellow, we want*  
466 *to go green” for example...So it’s easy to use that for them, to make a case, to explain.*  
467 *Do you see, then, that when you have figures like that, that you throw at people, it*  
468 *doesn’t say anything? That’s true. So, it’s really important. It’s a tool, it’s a tool for*  
469 *analysis. It’s also an advocacy tool. (Participant 11)*

470  
471 *It became very easy to communicate to partners about where and why I am deploying*  
472 *this intervention here. So that process was really paramount. We couldn’t have just said*  
473 *we have an elimination strategy without showing that we have gone through this*  
474 *process. (Participant 5)*

475  
476 *When we talked to the Global Fund about what we had planned, the fact that we had*  
477 *used this stratification and the mathematical projection meant that we could easily refer*  
478 *to this stratification to make ourselves better understood by the Global Fund in terms of*  
479 *the efficiency of the interventions we were proposing. (Participant 3)*

480  
481 *Early perceived impact of SNT-informed decision-making on malaria burden*  
482

483 Participants reported early results of how intervention plans designed with SNT reduced malaria  
484 burden and intervention implementation. Participants from one NMP reported that SNT outputs  
485 helped identify higher than expected burden in a specific region. The NMP chose to distribute  
486 second-generation LLINs in that area, resulting in significant reduction in prevalence:

487  
488 *When we distributed new generational nets in that year, the recent demographic and*  
489 *health survey showed a significant reduction in prevalence. [...] The only difference we*  
490 *had done or intervention we had put in there is a new generation of nets, that was based*  
491 *on the stratification and knowing that this place is high burden. So stratification and*  
492 *subnational tailoring is so important. (Participant 5)*

493  
494 Participants from another NMP reported that because of revised intervention targeting efforts  
495 after SNT, some districts moved from high transmission rates to moderate or low transmission  
496 rates. Participants from a third NMP described how SNT outputs helped to mobilize funding for  
497 increased SMC, resulting in a significant reduction in malaria deaths over the last few years.

498  
499  
500 **Challenges with the SNT process and use of outputs**

501

502 Participants identified limitations in data quality (discussed above) and financial resources as  
503 the largest challenges they faced when undergoing the SNT process and using its outputs,  
504 respectively. Participants cited additional challenges related to coordinating SNT-related  
505 decisions with external stakeholders and working with analysis partners.

506

507 *Challenges with using SNT outputs*

508

509 Participants were not able to implement the entirety of their evidence-informed strategy due to  
510 resource constraints:

511

512 *It's funding that poses a problem every time[...] For example, we have indoor residual*  
513 *spraying which will not be implemented, we have prevention, SMC, which we would like*  
514 *to extend to nine-year-olds which will not be implemented because of lack of resources.*  
515 *(Participant 1)*

516

517 All NMPs reported that they were actively working to identify solutions to funding gaps that  
518 would allow them to expand interventions to all eligible populations and areas defined during the  
519 SNT process. For a few NMPs, implementation of indoor residual spraying (IRS) was especially  
520 challenged by the absence of resources and/or differing funder priorities:

521

522 *We can use IRS to reduce the number of cases, but we don't have the resources. [...]*   
523 *[The funder] said, well, they won't do the IRS, because in the first year they came to*  
524 *finance our gaps. They can't do the IRS when we have gaps for mosquito nets, we have*  
525 *gaps for medicines and so on. They prefer to finance our gaps and carry out feasibility*  
526 *studies for the IRS. [...] We've agreed that in 2024, we'll do the research. (Participant*  
527 *11)*

528

529 Some NMPs explored the implications of implementing recommended interventions at reduced  
530 capacity. In these cases, SNT helped NMPs understand to what extent implementing an  
531 intervention at reduced coverage would help them move towards the goals articulated in their  
532 strategic plan.

533

534 Some recommendations from SNT were challenging for NMPs to implement on their own.  
535 Participants from one NMP reported that recommendations to increase antenatal consultations  
536 and increase intermittent preventive treatment for malaria in pregnancy were only possible with  
537 funding to overhaul the health system, which did not feel feasible at the time.

538

539 *Challenges with in-country partner management*

540

541 NMPs were responsible for determining which internal and external stakeholders to involve in  
542 the SNT process. Many NMPs chose to establish technical working groups or steering  
543 committees for implementation, forming SNT teams which included international non-  
544 governmental organizations (NGOs), local NGOs, and in one case, a local university. NMPs

545 were also reliant on national statistics agencies, the Ministry of Health, and the Ministry of  
546 Agriculture to support data mobilization for SNT.

547  
548 Two NMPs reported challenges with partner coordination in relation to competing partner  
549 priorities. These participants reported tension between implementing partners, analysis  
550 partners, and the NMP with regard to SNT. For one NMP, implementers did not agree with the  
551 NMP's choice to change coverage in specific areas after review during SNT. For another NMP,  
552 disagreements about prevalence estimation led to tense discussions between the NMP,  
553 analysis partners, and implementing partners. In the face of these challenges, however,  
554 participants reported that the NMP maintained their autonomy through continued engagement  
555 and compromise and identified solutions that aligned with their priorities even when key  
556 stakeholders were not supportive of SNT:

557  
558 *Some of these stakeholders did not understand why we needed to do stratification. [...] There was a lot of pushback with some of the implementers saying, look, the reality on*  
559 *ground is this is not feasible at this time, it's still too premature to go this route. So*  
560 *there's still a lot of engagement and compromising here and there, things that need to*  
561 *see how everyone can be carried along and try to understand how we can do it better. A*  
562 *lot of back and forth. We did make them understand that that's the direction the program*  
563 *wants to go because we have funding constraints. [...] Some say we don't have sufficient*  
564 *data for now to begin to do things like that. But the message was passed. (Participant*  
565 *10)*  
566

567  
568 In addition to resistance from implementing partners, participants across all but one NMP  
569 reported challenges with the acceptability of outputs from interministerial and subnational health  
570 office partners. In these instances, subnational partners were initially resistant to  
571 recommendations emerging from SNT outputs. Participants attributed this resistance to poor  
572 communication about SNT from the national level to the subnational level, and a failure to  
573 involve subnational partners from the very beginning. In the absence of a collective  
574 understanding of why decisions were being made, subnational offices could feel alienated or  
575 unsupported:

576  
577 *Of the 21 [districts], only 16 are eligible for SMC. A normal human would be thinking,*  
578 *why are you excluding the other five? And the question is germane because when you*  
579 *begin to move towards the subnational level, things become more political than scientific*  
580 *or professional. They feel [that] because they didn't support the government, is that why*  
581 *you excluded them? Why don't you just allow the whole place to be eligible for*  
582 *something? (Participant 8)*  
583

584 As NMPs began to improve their communication about SNT data inputs and the role of SNT in  
585 improving operational efficiency, they experienced greater cooperation and acceptability of  
586 results. However, NMPs recognized that there is still a long way to go with improving  
587 interministerial and subnational coordination:  
588

589 *It's important to empower the field staff. By focusing on that, it's already helping them to*  
590 *better understand the whole process that leads to the output of these data. If we don't,*  
591 *we can't have a similar understanding of the power and precision [of SNT]. (Participant*  
592 *3)*

593  
594 *In the beginning, [...] when we wanted to go to these targeted interventions, people*  
595 *didn't understand right away where we wanted to go. But when we really explained and*  
596 *showed the point of doing this, people were interested, and then we all got excited about*  
597 *achieving our goal. And that's why, when we had finished the results, we organized a*  
598 *national workshop where we invited all the regional directors, all the players in the*  
599 *country, where we presented all the stages of what we had done, and people were*  
600 *interested. (Participant 12)*

601  
602 *Challenges with analysis partners*  
603

604 In all countries, WHO provided overall guidance for stratification and data centralization. In two  
605 NMPs, the stratification and intervention targeting portions of the SNT analysis were  
606 implemented by an internal staff member, whereas in the other three NMPs, remote external  
607 analysis partners executed these tasks. All NMPs relied on external partners for mathematical  
608 modeling.

609  
610 Despite positive relationships with analysis partners, participants described several operational  
611 challenges with the logistics of partner management. Most participants felt that the time they  
612 initially allocated for SNT analysis was not enough, given partner commitments and concurrent  
613 activities within the NMP:

614  
615 *We were under pressure in terms of time, and that's when we were a bit worried. But in*  
616 *the end, they [analysis partners] were quite reactive and that enabled us to catch up. In*  
617 *fact, I think it's just a matter of communicating, and I know they didn't just have our job to*  
618 *do either, so it wasn't always easy for them to be available all the time. (Participant 3)*  
619

620 For most NMPs, communication with external partners was completely remote and  
621 compromised by poor connections and short meetings. Even though NMPs held internal  
622 discussions about SNT outputs after each analysis presentation, they felt it would have been  
623 more beneficial to have analysis partners participating in those conversations. Some  
624 participants felt that in-person collaboration or visits would have streamlined discussions,  
625 created more clarity about the analysis process, and enabled partners to learn more about the  
626 inner workings of the NMP that may affect SNT analysis:

627  
628 *The other thing that bothered us was that we couldn't work face-to-face. Everything was*  
629 *done virtually. Whereas if we'd been face-to-face, we might have benefited from other*  
630 *support. If the team had come to [country], they could have seen how our data collection*  
631 *system works. We could also learn a few lessons over there, to keep improving quality.*  
632 *We've worked hard on this whole process, we've worked remotely. [...] If we want to*

633 *improve, at least working face-to-face, it will allow the country to acquire other important*  
634 *elements as well. (Participant 12)*

635  
636 The two NMPs whose stratification was led by in-country staff did not indicate challenges with  
637 meeting length or partner communication in the same way.

638  
639 Participants reported particularly low clarity around the mathematical modeling portion of SNT.  
640 Participants expressed that although there was a growing interest in using modeling, their  
641 limited understanding of modeling made it difficult to engage with modeling outputs and their  
642 implications. Despite thorough and frequent conversations with analysis partners involved in  
643 mathematical modeling, most NMPs reported not understanding the modeling outputs:

644  
645 *No, in fact, we didn't understand the [mathematical] modeling. We know the*  
646 *interventions that were explained to us. If we're going to do interventions with coverage*  
647 *at such and such a level, that's what we can estimate; but if the coverage remains*  
648 *standard, here's what we can save, that we can reduce the gap. And so on. These are*  
649 *the results we've been told. But how were these results generated? Well, we didn't*  
650 *understand that. (Participant 11)*

651  
652 One NMP was particularly skeptical of mathematical modeling and vigilant in keeping a close  
653 watch on what went into the models:

654  
655 *We have always been a bit skeptical about [mathematical] modeling because modeling*  
656 *is basically based on what you put in, then you get the results. We are careful in the*  
657 *initial phases about what was being put in. We have to basically be close with them in*  
658 *the final stages of the modeling so that we are sure of what will come out of the*  
659 *modeling. Otherwise later we may have issues. (Participant 4)*

660  
661 Several participants mentioned that working with an in-country partner with a strong  
662 understanding of mathematical modeling would have provided more clarity and opportunities for  
663 detailed explanations of modeling outputs. Two NMPs felt that it would be helpful to have  
664 documentation that described each step of the mathematical modeling process in a way that  
665 was accessible to the NMP. Participants across all NMPs were optimistic that their  
666 understanding of modeling outputs would grow with time, similar to their growing understanding  
667 of other SNT outputs.

668  
669  
670 **Ownership**

671  
672 Participants were asked directly about their sense of ownership of the SNT analysis process  
673 and to provide examples of how their autonomy was supported or challenged throughout the  
674 process. Their responses resulted in NMP-defined themes of ownership that included general  
675 ownership of the overall process, autonomy over the use of technical outputs, and NMP  
676 capacity to advocate for themselves in the face of disagreements with analysis or implementing



677 partners. Participants reported feeling comfortable explaining the SNT results and using them in  
678 diverse contexts, which contributed to their growing sense of ownership as they gained more  
679 experience with SNT.

680

681 Participants reported that the SNT analysis process was highly participatory and genuinely  
682 NMP-led, which, during Phase 1, was counter to expectations for some NMPs. NMPs who  
683 initially felt obliged to participate in SNT to appease donors, WHO, and/or prospective partners  
684 reported a low sense of ownership during the start of Phase 1, with low expectations of their  
685 autonomy throughout the process. However, their sense of ownership grew over the course of  
686 Phase 1 and was strong during Phase 2:

687

688 *They [WHO] made us aware of our responsibilities very early on. Well, they told us, at*  
689 *their level, they only produce models, it's up to us to validate them. Afterward, it's up to*  
690 *us to implement them or not. That was clear from the start. Even with us, it was clear*  
691 *from the very beginning. I admit that, at first, I didn't believe it. [...] So, in the beginning, I*  
692 *was very reluctant. I mean, I was informed that I was performing the task, but it was*  
693 *during the process that I began to realize how much I could actually benefit from it.*  
694 (Participant 7)

695

696 The NMP that only participated in Phase 2 reported a high sense of ownership throughout,  
697 beginning with initiation. Participants from this NMP felt that they were driving SNT  
698 implementation and directed committees comprised of technical partners, NGOs, health faculty,  
699 and other ministry partners. Participants from this NMP defined their sense of ownership  
700 through their increased capacity to implement epidemiological stratification and their ability to  
701 provide critical feedback about technical outputs.

702

703 Participants cited analysis partner commitment and prioritization of NMP needs as primary  
704 enabling factors for ownership. It was felt that analysis partners' willingness to engage in  
705 iterative meetings and pace the discussion at the NMP's level of comfort reflected the partners'  
706 deep commitment to supporting the NMP in meeting its objectives. Participants reported giving  
707 regular feedback to analysis partners and validating outputs at each stage of analysis,  
708 beginning from the early steps of the SNT process. In situations where the NMP was unable to  
709 carry out any of the analysis work on their own, NMPs still felt confident in providing their  
710 expertise of the local context and comfortable asking for clarification on the analysis approach  
711 and outputs:

712

713 *He [analysis partner] was also available when we asked questions for clarification. And*  
714 *no, they never, never complained about us asking too many questions. On the contrary,*  
715 *they encouraged us to take more. If ever there were things, concerns about judgment,*  
716 *clarification, if we didn't get the answers now, or if time didn't allow it, to have certain*  
717 *elements [discussed] at the next call, we didn't hesitate to come back to it, to ask to have*  
718 *it explained further to us. (Participant 3)*

719

720 Participants indicated that the space to openly critique analysis outputs was important to them.  
721 As analysis partners began providing outputs for NMPs to review, participants reported that they  
722 were able to provide critical feedback and correct any inaccuracies they observed. Participants  
723 provided several examples where analysis partners were responsive to feedback and corrected  
724 outputs to reflect on-the-ground realities more accurately. In one situation, a stratification  
725 presentation inaccurately indicated that health facilities in a specific region were closed.  
726 Following discussions, analysis partners were quick to ensure that the status of health facilities  
727 was accurately reflected in subsequent analyses. In another situation, rainfall from a global  
728 database was included in the mathematical model because local rainfall data was not available.  
729 NMP members pointed out that the resulting seasonality in the model did not match their  
730 experience. The analysis partners then removed rainfall from the model, which led to model  
731 outputs that the NMP found to be consistent with what they knew of local epidemiology:

732  
733 *I noticed one of the models. I really challenged it. [Analysis partner] who was there,*  
734 *understood. So, I think that even before coming to the meeting, [analysis partner] was on*  
735 *my idea. So, after a while of discussion, [analysis partner] said, well, we're going to*  
736 *remove that component from the interior [of the model]. (Participant 7)*

737  
738 According to participants, their close involvement in the analysis process helped foster deeper  
739 comprehension of how analysis partners arrived at their conclusions. This enabled participants  
740 to communicate the implications of different outputs with implementing partners and  
741 interministerial partners more effectively:

742  
743 *I think the strong point of the collaboration we've had with the WHO and its technical*  
744 *support for this exercise is that we've been involved in it. The fact that we had several*  
745 *meetings, around ten meetings, so phases that were organized on a weekly basis,*  
746 *where all the [program] staff and its implementing partners who had a very good*  
747 *knowledge of malaria transmission, of the local context, really enabled us to accept the*  
748 *results. So we were able to take ownership of the results, defend them and use the right*  
749 *language to defend our work. (Participant 6)*

750  
751 Particularly in Phase 2, NMPs felt comfortable adapting the SNT process to suit their own  
752 needs. At least one interviewee from each NMP drew strong connections between the NMP's  
753 close work with analysis partners and the NMP's growing capacity to implement parts of the  
754 SNT analysis on their own. Close involvement in the analysis steps of SNT, coupled with  
755 greater confidence in communicating outputs to other stakeholders, laid the foundation for  
756 NMPs' capacity to implement SNT analysis without external support. One participant described  
757 how NMP capacity and NMP ownership are intertwined, particularly as the SNT process  
758 requires adaptation to a changing local context:

759  
760 *We learn as we implement and these things we do, they're not cast in stone. They are*  
761 *living things. They tend to change as we move along. So something that is so like "it has*  
762 *to be this number 1 to 5 steps." No. You would need to understand what works best at*  
763 *the time. As we are implementing, we are getting to understand how best we can do this*

764 *thing better. [... So the] capacity part of things is very important and that ownership from*  
765 *the country is also very, very important. And which you can see the relation between the*  
766 *capacity and the ownership come side-by-side. (Participant 9)*

767

768

### 769 **Future plans for SNT**

770

771 All participants stated explicit plans for their NMPs to continue using and even expanding SNT,  
772 citing its value and the lessons learned for improving prevention and care outcomes thus far.

773 Several participants wanted to extend SNT to even finer geographical levels:

774

775 *We're going to continue [with SNT] and even go further. As we move forward in the fight*  
776 *against the disease, we need to be more and more specific. So, we may need to go to*  
777 *the health facility level to see, at district level, which health facilities have a high*  
778 *incidence, which health facilities are like the ones we have now, what do we need to do*  
779 *to target these health facilities in order to make progress? Because we need to put*  
780 *ourselves in the position of eliminating malaria. (Participant 11)*

781

### 782 *Plans for new resource mobilization approaches*

783

784 Following the successful use of SNT outputs for Global Fund applications, NMPs began to  
785 explore how they could reuse SNT outputs for other donors, particularly the private sector.  
786 Participants described plans to seek resources from private sector malaria elimination initiatives  
787 to fill funding gaps. Three NMPs identified funding opportunities from private sector partners and  
788 initiated discussions using SNT outputs to demonstrate their proposed activities and funding  
789 justifications. At the time of the interview, one NMP was in the process of establishing a private  
790 sector committee to eradicate malaria, drawing in private sector partners across various  
791 industries. This committee was specifically designed to mobilize funding for the national  
792 strategic plan, built on SNT outputs, which had yet to be implemented because of limited  
793 funding.

794

### 795 *Plans for data quality improvement and subnational-level engagement*

796

797 Participants spoke extensively about their plans for improvements in data management and  
798 data quality through improved documentation, centralized data repositories, and, most  
799 importantly, systematic engagement of subnational offices and health facilities. Participants  
800 emphasized the role that subnational offices could play in addressing data quality issues in a  
801 timelier fashion and improving the acceptability of outputs. In their view, health facility staff are  
802 key players in malaria elimination efforts and must be included more intentionally:

803 *If I had the opportunity to do this exercise again, I would insist that the actors*  
804 *responsible for the health districts take part in this process. [...] Given that they are the*  
805 *ones directly responsible for combating the disease at operational level, their*  
806 *involvement will be very useful because it will enable them to appropriate this technique*

807 *and to have the necessary resources and skills to respond in the event of the*  
808 *identification of a certain number of anomalies. So we need to involve the operational*  
809 *level players, who will help to facilitate and complete the analysis [...] and validate the*  
810 *assumptions. But they can also use this tool [SNT] for planning purposes, in the context*  
811 *of stratification at the district level, for example. (Participant 6)*

812 *Plans for developing the capacity to implement SNT analyses independently*

813

814 Most NMPs reported high confidence in conducting stratification on their own but felt that they  
815 would need additional support for microstratification and mathematical modeling. The NMPs  
816 with low confidence in managing stratification on their own reported that while the SNT process  
817 had been inclusive, their involvement was not enough to understand how to execute the  
818 analyses themselves:

819

820 *As our participation was passive and not active, since we just provided the data, and*  
821 *attended meetings, we won't be able to do it without capacity building. There is a*  
822 *process involved. Generally, people use software for data collection. However, it is not*  
823 *easy to master the [analysis] software. Someone must explain to us how it works.*  
824 *(Participant 2)*

825

826 While engaging a local expert would allow NMPs to have more in-person support, participants  
827 highlighted that this might compromise timelines if the consultant is engaged with other projects.  
828 For one NMP, their experience with local consultants was such that when the consultant had a  
829 more lucrative contract, the NMP's work was deprioritized.

830

831 Some participants felt that support from WHO and external analysis partners strengthened  
832 NMPs' legitimacy in the eyes of prospective donors and other partners. As NMPs navigated the  
833 power dynamics involved with funding, they were cognizant of the persistent devaluation of local  
834 expertise, even when they felt that their expertise was being valued in their collaborations with  
835 analysis partners. NMPs expressed concerns about whether the acceptability of their outputs or  
836 competitiveness for funding would change without the external validation of international  
837 institutions, highlighting the need for a delicate balance between legitimacy and autonomy.  
838 Participants with high confidence in executing analyses on their own felt that this balance could  
839 be achieved if the NMP performed most of the work and sent their work to WHO or analysis  
840 partners to receive their endorsement. Executing analysis themselves would also let the NMP  
841 engage more deeply and effectively with their partners:

842

843 *It's true that at a certain point, well, we extracted the data, transmitted it and waited. As a*  
844 *result, we didn't feel much of a player in the field, and we didn't have the capacity to use*  
845 *it either. [...] We hope to have a better capacity, at the level of the [program], to not only*  
846 *manage the data, but of course to have the support and possibilities of a more correct*  
847 *exchange with [analysis partner]. So when we've already done some analysis, we'd like*  
848 *to have a different interpretation and/or more in-depth guidance. (Participant 3)*

849

850 Regardless of confidence in their current capacity for implementing some or most SNT analyses  
851 internally, all participants reported a deep desire to strengthen NMP capacity for analysis. One  
852 participant hoped to have more than one focal person working with analysis partners to better  
853 mitigate timeline challenges and knowledge loss from NMP turnover. Some participants felt that  
854 more emphasis should have been placed on capacity development during the SNT process to  
855 better ensure sustainability:

856  
857 *When countries are doing most of the work, rather than now coming from outside, will*  
858 *also add a lot more value. The feedback I would say to WHO is identify those that would*  
859 *lead the process in-country and then build capacity to some extent that they will steer*  
860 *the process with little or no support from the external. Because if you try to say “let me*  
861 *do everything for them because they are just starting,” you end up not getting them to*  
862 *the speed that you require, even if they are going to do it again. So let them concentrate*  
863 *more in building capacity. Let every other person that is required to know, that this is*  
864 *how modeling is being done. This is why we are doing it. If it's going to take longer time,*  
865 *wait for that time to come to build necessary capacity before you run to carry out the*  
866 *SNT process in countries. It's better to delay [than to] rush and do it while the countries*  
867 *are not on board because they understand little or nothing in the process. (Participant 9)*  
868

869

## 870 **DISCUSSION**

871

872 This study centered on NMPs’ self-reported perspectives to understand their experiences with  
873 the SNT process they underwent in partnership with WHO and collaborators. This study found  
874 that positive experiences with the SNT process enabled NMPs to appropriately target  
875 interventions, refine strategic plans, optimize and prioritize resources, and identify opportunities  
876 to strengthen data systems and capacity for data use. This study also found that NMPs felt a  
877 strong sense of ownership of the SNT process, effectively advocated for themselves in the face  
878 of competing partner priorities, and were invested in continuing to use and improve SNT in the  
879 future. Participants’ testimonies also shed light on the different ways in which external parties  
880 can support the SNT process while safeguarding NMP’s ownership and autonomy.

881

### 882 ***Acceptability and use of SNT outputs***

883

884 All NMPs included in this study used SNT outputs to inform intervention planning in either their  
885 national strategic plans, funding requests, or both. Among the decisions made using SNT  
886 outputs, NMPs referred most commonly to decisions around the identification of highest-risk  
887 areas, expansion of SMC, and targeting of LLIN types, the major prevention interventions  
888 currently implemented in malaria-endemic countries. Other countries not included in this study  
889 have also used SNT-like approaches to inform these decisions [11,13,16]. NMPs’ incorporation  
890 of SNT outputs directly in their strategic plans demonstrated the validity and acceptability of  
891 the results of the SNT process to NMPs, even if the full strategy could not be included in funding  
892 requests to donors, given resource gaps and other constraints. The acceptability of SNT outputs  
893 was also evident in NMPs’ commitment to improving acceptability at the subnational level

894 through more engagement of subnational offices, as well as countries' willingness to use  
895 SNT outputs to mobilize additional resources, such as from the local private sector or  
896 domestically. This finding further demonstrates that private sector engagement is a critical yet  
897 underutilized opportunity for NMPs to procure the additional funding needed to support  
898 intervention implementation [18].

899

### 900 ***Shifts in perspectives on data and data use***

901

902 Implementation of SNT drove shifts in NMP perspectives about data, including its use,  
903 management, and quality improvement. NMPs understood more deeply the strengths and  
904 limitations of their current data collection and became more invested in maximizing their data  
905 use to inform decisions. NMPs recognized that many issues in data gaps and quality that were  
906 identified during SNT were partly due to a lack of training on data collection and use at the  
907 health facility level, as has been reported in other studies [19,20]. Other studies have also found  
908 that using data to inform decision-making in malaria highlights the limitations of routine data and  
909 the need for improved data quality management [11,12,18,19]. This study found that SNT  
910 motivated NMPs to strengthen surveillance, create integrated data repositories, stratify at finer  
911 geographical levels, modify their approaches to data coordination, and strengthen capacity for  
912 data use at all levels of the health system.

913

914 One way in which SNT resulted in a growth in the culture of data use is illustrated in the multiple  
915 ideas presented by participants on stratification at smaller geographic units, which would better  
916 represent the heterogeneity of malaria transmission, especially for countries with sizable  
917 geographic and population diversity [21]. More detailed stratification would require data quality  
918 improvement through the engagement of subnational offices. This revealed the potential  
919 cascading effects on data use that the SNT experience could have beyond the central office of  
920 the national malaria program. As data quality improves, the perceived robustness of the  
921 analytical results should also improve, with both factors acting together to boost the confidence  
922 of NMPs to make evidence-informed decisions with their data.

923

### 924 ***Capacity for conducting SNT***

925

926 All participants alluded to the different levels of capacities available in their NMP, as well as the  
927 current capacity gaps, with respect to what would be needed for their NMP to completely,  
928 independently, and locally conduct an SNT process. Multiple capacities would be required,  
929 including leadership in policy-making and coordination, data coordination and management,  
930 basic descriptive analysis, advanced analytics such as geostatistics and modeling, and health  
931 economics and budget management. These skill sets can be shared by different individuals and  
932 institutions, both within and outside government. Approaches for capacitating should be adapted  
933 across skills, skill levels, and audience, both at national and subnational levels. The growth of  
934 these capacities is essential for countries to continue to expand and adapt SNT-like  
935 approaches.

936

937 Findings from this study suggest that funders and partners interested in sustainable evidence-  
938 informed decision-making should focus on allocating resources and efforts to deliberately  
939 develop capacities where there are gaps, which can differ substantially between countries. As  
940 capacity grows, funders also need to develop trust in that capacity and the locally-derived  
941 technical outputs it produces without the need for validation from external institutions, as some  
942 participants pointed out in the study.

943

#### 944 ***Ownership***

945

946 This study arrived at definitions of country ownership defined by each participant. Others have  
947 noted that only localized, context-specific definitions of ownership can determine when and how  
948 country ownership is being realized [22]. Context-specific definitions enable better measurement  
949 of the power dynamics in the “daily practice” of donor-recipient relations, including the extent to  
950 which local expertise is valued and involved at all stages [23]. In the case of SNT, the  
951 exploration of ownership found that open communication, strong collaboration, and decision-  
952 making power were the key components that contributed to NMP members’ definitions and  
953 sense of ownership.

954

955 Although participants felt ownership of the SNT process, they still experienced challenges  
956 leveraging SNT outputs to convince implementing partners and other external stakeholders to  
957 align with NMP priorities. Other studies of equity in global health collaborations found that  
958 although national stakeholders note a shift in efforts around collaborative goal-setting, they are  
959 still cognizant of underlying power dynamics and proactively adapt to donor priorities [24].  
960 NMPs’ keen awareness of the existing power dynamics between themselves, funders,  
961 implementers, and other partners is also evident in the findings from this study.

962

#### 963 ***Enabling factors for analysis partners***

964

965 This study found that proactive inclusion, extensive dialogue, trust-building, and adaptability on  
966 the part of technical partners were important factors in enabling countries to have positive  
967 experiences with the SNT analysis process. The enabling factors identified in this study align  
968 with previous research where national stakeholders in Nigeria and the Democratic Republic of  
969 the Congo characterized effective technical assistance as country-driven, cultivating self-  
970 reliance and autonomy, trust-focused, and adaptive [25]. Despite the reported availability of  
971 SNT technical partners to answer questions, engagements were still insufficient for NMPs to  
972 understand more complex methods, such as mathematical modeling. This speaks to the need  
973 for technical partners to spend even more time explaining complex methods inclusively and  
974 accessibly so that NMPs can better understand how and when to use these methods and  
975 interpret their outputs appropriately.

976

#### 977 ***Implications for the HBHI approach and priority-setting in public health***

978

979 Among the NMPs included in this study, SNT was a highly successful approach for the strategic  
980 use of information in decision-making. The impact of these decisions on malaria burden,

981 including whether stagnating trends have now started decreasing, will be seen in the coming  
982 years. However, the SNT exercises of 2019-2023 have already spurred changes within NMPs,  
983 where there is strong momentum to continue adapting SNT techniques to tailor intervention  
984 strategies to the local context and advocate for country priorities. Beyond malaria, ministries of  
985 health, partners, and donors can learn from NMPs' experiences with SNT to design effective,  
986 country-owned, and sustainable initiatives to improve evidence-informed decision-making in  
987 other parts of the health system.

988  
989

## 990 **LIMITATIONS**

991

992 This study is limited by its sample size and participant selection method. Although all NMPs who  
993 were supported by WHO to implement the full SNT analysis during Phase 2 were asked to  
994 participate in this study, all but one NMP were responsive to requests. It is therefore possible  
995 that the inclusion of additional NMPs could have identified other challenges or opportunities for  
996 improvement. Additionally, the findings of this study are geographically limited to the experience  
997 of NMPs from West Africa.

998

999 This study's findings also may not apply to countries that underwent SNT without WHO  
1000 involvement. During Phase 2, several countries underwent SNT either on their own or with the  
1001 technical support of partners other than WHO, and the process may have differed. Their  
1002 experiences of ownership, use of outputs, and relationships with partners may not have been  
1003 the same as those reported by the countries included in this study.

1004

1005

## 1006 **CONCLUSIONS**

1007

1008 NMPs reported positive experiences with the SNT process and a growing appreciation for the  
1009 utility of SNT for malaria intervention planning and resource mobilization. SNT outputs were  
1010 widely used and highly acceptable. Despite challenges with data quality, availability of local  
1011 capacity, and difficult decisions under limited resources, NMPs reported strong enthusiasm for  
1012 the continued use of SNT, articulated plans to extend it in new ways, and expressed a desire to  
1013 grow capacity to conduct analyses on their own. Trust-building, iterative discussions, and NMP-  
1014 centered approaches were instrumental to achieving the results observed.

1015

1016

## 1017 **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

1018

1019 HBHI: High Burden to High Impact initiative

1020 IRS: indoor residual spraying

1021 LLIN: long-lasting insecticide-treated bednet

1022 MoH: Ministry of Health

1023 NGO: non-governmental organization

1024 NMP: national malaria program



1025 NMSP: national malaria strategic plan  
1026 SMC: seasonal malaria chemoprevention  
1027 SNT: subnational tailoring of interventions  
1028 WHO: World Health Organization

1029

## 1030 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

1031

1032 The authors would like to thank Mwalenga Nghipumbwa, Laurent Moyenga, and Yacouba  
1033 Savadogo for assisting with mock interviews during study design, and Abdisalan Noor for helpful  
1034 discussions.

1035

### 1036 *Disclaimer*

1037 Beatriz Galatas is a staff member of the World Health Organization. This author alone is  
1038 responsible for the views expressed in this article and does not necessarily represent the  
1039 decisions, policies or views of the World Health Organization.

1040

## 1041 **REFERENCES**

- 1042 1. Bhatt S, Weiss DJ, Cameron E, Bisanzio D, Mappin B, Dalrymple U, et al. The effect of  
1043 malaria control on Plasmodium falciparum in Africa between 2000 and 2015. *Nature*. 2015  
1044 Oct 1;526(7572):207–11.
- 1045 2. World Health Organization. World malaria report 2020. World Health Organization; 2020.
- 1046 3. World Health Organization. World malaria report 2017. World Health Organization; 2017.
- 1047 4. World Health Organization. World malaria report 2018. World Health Organization; 2018.
- 1048 5. World Health Organization. World malaria report 2023. World Health Organization; 2023.
- 1049 6. World Health Organization. High burden to high impact: a targeted malaria response. World  
1050 Health Organization; 2018.
- 1051 7. World Health Organization. World malaria report 2021. World Health Organization; 2021.
- 1052 8. Alegana VA, Suiyanka L, Macharia PM, Ikahu-Muchangi G, Snow RW. Malaria micro-  
1053 stratification using routine surveillance data in Western Kenya. *Malar J*. 2021;20:1–9.
- 1054 9. Gosling R, Chimumbwa J, Uusiku P, Rossi S, Ntuku H, Harvard K, et al. District-level  
1055 approach for tailoring and targeting interventions: a new path for malaria control and  
1056 elimination. *Malar J*. 2020;19:1–7.
- 1057 10. Thawer SG, Chacky F, Runge M, Reaves E, Mandike R, Lazaro S, et al. Sub-national  
1058 stratification of malaria risk in mainland Tanzania: a simplified assembly of survey and  
1059 routine data. *Malar J*. 2020;19:1–12.
- 1060 11. Cissoko M, Sagara I, Landier J, Guindo A, Sanogo V, Coulibaly OY, et al. Sub-national  
1061 tailoring of seasonal malaria chemoprevention in Mali based on malaria surveillance and  
1062 rainfall data. *Parasit Vectors*. 2022;15(1):278.

- 1063 12. Djaskano MI, Cissoko M, Diar MSI, Israel DK, Clément KH, Ali AM, et al. Stratification and  
1064 adaptation of malaria control interventions in Chad. *Trop Med Infect Dis.* 2023;8(9):450.
- 1065 13. Noor AM, Kibuchi E, Mitto B, Coulibaly D, Doumbo OK, Snow RW. Sub-national targeting of  
1066 seasonal malaria chemoprevention in the Sahelian countries of the Nouakchott Initiative.  
1067 *Plos One.* 2015;10(8):e0136919.
- 1068 14. Ozodiegwu ID, Ambrose M, Galatas B, Runge M, Nandi A, Okuneye K, et al. Application of  
1069 mathematical modelling to inform national malaria intervention planning in Nigeria. *Malar J.*  
1070 2023;22(1):137.
- 1071 15. DIALLO OO, Diallo A, Toh KB, Diakite N, Dioubate M, Runge M, et al. Subnational tailoring  
1072 of malaria interventions to prioritize the malaria response in Guinea. *medRxiv.* 2024;2024–  
1073 06.
- 1074 16. Lemant J, Champagne C, Houndjo W, Aïssan J, Aïkpon R, Houetohossou C, et al.  
1075 Modelling to support decisions about the geographic and demographic extensions of  
1076 seasonal malaria chemoprevention in Benin. *medRxiv.* 2024;2024–04.
- 1077 17. Smith JA, Jarman M, Osborn M. Doing interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Qual*  
1078 *Health Psychol Theor Methods.* 1999;1(1):218–40.
- 1079 18. Okumu F, Gyapong M, Casamitjana N, Castro MC, Itoe MA, Okonofua F, et al. What Africa  
1080 can do to accelerate and sustain progress against malaria. *PLOS Glob Public Health.*  
1081 2022;2(6):e0000262.
- 1082 19. Okello G, Molyneux S, Zakayo S, Gerrets R, Jones C. Producing routine malaria data: an  
1083 exploration of the micro-practices and processes shaping routine malaria data quality in  
1084 frontline health facilities in Kenya. *Malar J.* 2019;18:1–13.
- 1085 20. Rumisha SF, Lyimo EP, Mremi IR, Tungu PK, Mwingira VS, Mbata D, et al. Data quality of  
1086 the routine health management information system at the primary healthcare facility and  
1087 district levels in Tanzania. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak.* 2020;20:1–22.
- 1088 21. Ohiri K, Ukoha NK, Nwangwu CW, Chima CC, Ogundeji YK, Rone A, et al. An assessment  
1089 of data availability, quality, and use in malaria program decision making in Nigeria. *Health*  
1090 *Syst Reform.* 2016;2(4):319–30.
- 1091 22. Onokwai JC, Matthews S. A Case Study of Country Ownership Over Donor Aid: The Global  
1092 Fund and the Ghanaian Country Coordinating Mechanism. *J Dev Soc.* 2022;38(2):166–83.
- 1093 23. Khan MS, Meghani A, Liverani M, Roychowdhury I, Parkhurst J. How do external donors  
1094 influence national health policy processes? Experiences of domestic policy actors in  
1095 Cambodia and Pakistan. *Health Policy Plan.* 2018;33(2):215–23.
- 1096 24. Cakouros BE, Gum J, Levine DL, Lewis J, Wright AH, Dahn B, et al. Exploring equity in  
1097 global health collaborations: a qualitative study of donor and recipient power dynamics in  
1098 Liberia. *BMJ Glob Health.* 2024;9(3):e014399.

1099 25. Kanagat N, Chauffour J, Ilunga JF, Ramazani SY, Ajiwohwodoma JJO, Anas-Kolo SI, et al.  
1100 Country perspectives on improving technical assistance in the health sector. Gates Open  
1101 Res. 2021;5.

1102