# Review of Implementation of Surveillance System Investments

October 2024

**Objectives:**

Verify the implementation of investments in surveillance systems, focusing on the number of reporting units using electronic information systems for data entry and submission of HTM data and notifiable disease information, as applicable in the country context. CTs should adapt the ToRs, as necessary, according to the country-specific investments in surveillance systems and specify clearly if HTM and/or notifiable disease surveillance systems are covered.

These ToRs should be used in portfolios that include the following indicator in their C19RM performance framework: M&E 5.1: *Percentage of reporting units digitally entering and submitting data at the reporting unit level using the electronic information system*.

If the performance framework includes a Work Plan Tracking Measure (WPTM) that reflects a high investment in surveillance systems (routine and/or notifiable diseases) that is perceived to be high risk, consider including its verification in the spot check.

**Scope of Review:**

***[detailed scope to be agreed with the Country Team prior to commencing the review]*:**

**Desk Review:** Review existing documentation on electronic information systems at reporting units. The review will also focus on verifying data in the national digital platform on the number of reporting units submitting reports through digital systems at the point of data generation units. This will include the number and type of units reporting immediately notifiable diseases (case-based and aggregated) and the systems used to report these data. Verify the availability and use of guidelines and standard operating procedures (SOPs) for data entry and identify and assess procedures for correcting errors.

**Site Visits**: A key part of the review process is to conduct site visits to selected reporting units (facilities, districts, community health workers (CHWs), etc.) that digitally enter and submit data at the reporting unit level using the electronic information system for surveillance of HTM and/or epidemic-prone diseases surveillance (specify - e.g., HMIS, CHIS, or other). During these visits, the LFA will assess the availability and functionality of digital data entry systems at the selected reporting units, including the availability and use of guidelines and standard operating procedures (SOPs) for data entry for HTM and epidemic prone diseases surveillance, and will review the recording procedures to ensure the data quality assurance system at the point of entry.

In its report the LFA should indicate how many reporting units it visited to verify the availability and use of the digital reporting system for data entry.

To assist the LFA in gathering assurance information, the following table may be used as a guide. Please note that the below is not an exhaustive list of questions the LFA should address in the review.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Question | Response and comments |
| 1. Please review if the country’ digital reporting system covers routine reporting only, or if it covers also notifiable disease (epidemic prone diseases) reporting.   Please specify the type of digital platform used (DHIS2, eCHIS, ELMIS, eIDSR..etc) |  |
| 1. Specify the point of digital data entry (community/health facility/district/region) for i) routine reporting and ii) notifiable disease reporting. |  |
| 1. How many of the reporting units in the country are expected to submit reports electronically?   Please specify for i) routine reporting and ii) notifiable disease reporting, as applicable. |  |
| 1. Out of the expected reporting units, review how many submitted their reports electronically in the previous reporting period?   Please specify i) the number of reporting units that submitted routine reports and ii) number of reporting units which submitted reports on notifiable diseases. |  |
| 1. How many of the visited sites have a fully functional and reliable digital reporting system available during the site visit?   Note:  *Reliable:* Refers to the platform's ability to operate without frequent crashes, downtime, or errors, ensuring that data is accurately captured and maintained over time.  *Fully Functional*: Means that all the intended features of the platform work as designed, including data entry, reporting, real-time monitoring, and analytics, without any technical limitations or disruption.  *To assess the reliability and functionality of the electronic platform, the following approach is recommended:*  *1. User Feedback: LFAs should collect input from users regarding any recurring issues, errors, or downtimes experienced over the past three months. This qualitative feedback provides valuable insights into the platform’s reliability.*  *2. On-Site Check: LFAs should observe user(s) performing data entry and submitting reports at a specific site. This will help confirm that the platform operates as intended during the visit.*  *A comprehensive technical audit of the electronic plat form is not required, unless specifically requested and agreed with the Global Fund Country Team.* |  |
| 1. Do the reporting units have manuals or guidelines that describe the procedures for data recording, entry, and submission to the next level of the reporting unit? Please check their availability. |  |
| 1. When was the staff of the reporting unit last trained to use the electronic reporting system? |  |
| 1. Are there source documents available at the site to verify reporting accuracy (yes/no)? If the answer is no, please specify the reason. |  |
| 1. Is there a data quality assurance mechanism in place?   If yes, please review its adequacy, including how it is being enforced. |  |
| 1. Is there evidence of how data is used for decision making at health facility, districts, regional and national level? Please explain. |  |

**Deliverable(s):**

The report should address each of the points listed under the scope of review/list of tasks and include:

1. Detailed description of digital reporting system put in place to report against the selected indicator highlighting critical issues/risks that need to be addressed to ensure the robustness of the system and the reliability of the data. Please list the issues/risks and recommended actions in order of priority.
2. The LFA should comment on the context and root causes of the issues identified, providing background information as necessary and prioritise the list of issues in an executive summary according to their significance.
3. Recommendations for addressing issues identified. Recommendations should be:

* Detailed and actionable
* Few and prioritised
* Specific and contextualised
* Time-bound
* Identifying the main entity responsible for implementation
* Precise and prescriptive

Should the review identify clear evidence of fraud, the LFA should ensure it uses the GF communication protocol to inform the GF Secretariat and the OIG to allow consideration of evidence collection and other issues relevant to a possible criminal investigation.

**Level of effort:**

This task should be undertaken by the LFA Programmatic/M&E expert who is accountable for the technical content of this report. S/he can be supported, as needed, by other LFA team members in the planning and during the verification. The LoE for this task, including report writing, depends on which elements of the ToR and the number and location of service delivery sites are included in the review, as agreed between the Global Fund Country Team and the LFA. Usually, 1-2 sites can be visited per day depending on the specific country context