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Monitoring progress mechanism: The Joint Reporting Form (JRF)

- Six basic process indicators included on the JRF since 2011, data for 2010
  - Formal written terms of reference
  - Legislative or administrative basis establishing the committee
  - Core membership with at least 5 main expertise areas represented among members
  - Committee meeting at least once a year
  - Agenda and background materials distributed ahead of meetings
  - Declaration of interests by members

- Some regional additional indicators not monitored at global level

- Need to go beyond the process indicators: assessing the effectiveness of NITAGs
  - New indicators on country NITAG Assessment included from 2016 data collection
  - Literature review
The JRF Data: presentation, methodology and limitations

- Presentation of the data collected through the JRF
  - 2015 Data: JRF received from 190/194 WHO Member States (MS)
  - NITAG section not completed at all by 3 WHO MS
  - Less than 5% of missing values

- Methodology used for the analysis
  - Data cleaning
  - Data stratification

- Limitations
  - Data completion
  - Absence of a systematic data validation process with national counterparts
  - => unexplained change of the data reported over time
  - Confusion with Interagency coordination committee (ICC)
National Immunization Technical Advisory Groups (NITAGs) in 2015

Data Source: Joint Reporting Form, 2015, as at 18 November 2016
Map production: Immunization Vaccines and Biologicals, (IVB), World Health Organization
Date of slide: 30 March 2017

- 79 Countries meeting the 6 Process Indicators
- 116 Countries having a NITAG with administrative or legislative basis
- 118 Countries Reporting the Existence of A NITAG with ToRs
- 124 Countries Reporting the Existence of a NITAG
- Not available/ No NITAG established
- Not applicable
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NITAG status report 2015 compared to 2010

60% of countries with a NITAG that has an administrative/legislative basis

79 (41% of countries) NITAG complying with the 6 basic process indicators (88% increase compared with 2010) including 49 developing countries

% of countries with a NITAG that meets all 6 basic process indicators (blue 2010 – red 2015)

Source: WHO/IVB Database, as of 18 November 2016
Trend in the establishment of NITAGs meeting all 6 process indicators & remaining progress to reach 2020 GVAP target

- **8 additional countries** compared to 2014
- **11 countries dropping** compared to 2014: No meeting: 7, countries; No declaration of conflict of interest: 4 countries

Source: WHO/IVB Database, as of 18 November 2016
Where are the gaps?
70 countries did not establish NITAGs

- 31 are in the African region, 14 in the Americas, 11 in the European region, 14 in the Western Pacific region
- 11/56 (20%) are high income countries, 41/105 (39%) are middle income countries, 16/31 (52%) are low income countries
- Population size: median: around 2 million and 28 countries (or 40%) less than 1 million total population (small islands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries reporting/ WHO Member States</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OVERALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of a NITAG</td>
<td>Number of countries</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of countries</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of the entire population covered</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where are the gaps?
Major gap in declaration of interests

Number of countries reporting not meeting one or more of the 6 process indicators

Source: WHO/IVB Database, as of 18 November 2016
Where are the gaps?
Repartition of the 45 countries by income and Gavi eligiblity

- High income
- Middle income non Gavi eligible
- Middle income Gavi eligible
- Low income

- LIC
  - No NITAG established
  - NITAG established but not meeting the 6 criteria
  - NITAG meeting the 6 criteria

- MIC Gavi

- MIC Non GAVI

- HIC
Main issues addressed in NITAG related publications: literature review by AMP-HPID, March 2017*

- Frameworks, processes and evidence to issue recommendations
- Availability of expertise and Human Resources
- Integration within the national decision-making process
- Independence of the NITAG and independence of the recommendations
- Need for collaboration between NITAGs

*PubMed and Science Direct Databases. 54 articles retained
Conclusions on NITAGs’ status

- Much progress including in LMICs
- Need to accelerate progress
- Variations across regions and economic status
- Problematic of small countries
- Declaration of conflict of interest still a major gap
- Need for continuous development process
- Process indicators only proxies of functionality
  - Need for evaluation of NITAGs
  - Need for some measurement of the impact of the NITAGs