# PIP PC Implementation: SWOT Analysis Results

## STRENGTHS

Aspects of the PIP Framework / PC Implementation that are working well, and that can be built on in the future

- The PC Implementation plan is innovative, and adds value to pandemic preparedness.
- There is strong participation and collaboration across stakeholders at a global, national and regional level with diverse representation.
- The approach is systematic, evidence-based and tailored to countries’ needs.
- Tools and guidelines have been developed and trainings have been provided in a number of areas (e.g. risk communication, burden of disease manual).
- The geographical breadth of projects contributes to better global preparedness.
- GISRS has been strengthened through a number of actions. For example, National Influenza Centers (NICs) have been established and maintained, and there is continued support for the National Laboratory Network and National Public Health Laboratories.
- Technical capabilities for detection have improved in many target countries. Laboratories have gained experience and event-based surveillance has improved.
- Information is shared more regularly, including monitoring and surveillance data.
- Progress has been made in deriving country and global disease burden estimates.
- Detailed assessments of capacity of National Regulatory Authorities (NRA) have been carried out in target countries. NRA personnel have gained experience in thinking about regulatory constraints in a pandemic scenario.

## WEAKNESSES

Aspects of the PIP Framework / PC Implementation that are not reaching their potential and need change or further investment

- There is a lack of clarity on the impact of PIP activities and its specific objectives, making it hard to understand whether the ability to respond to a pandemic has improved.
- The connection with national pandemic planning and PC implementation is not clear.
- Data limitations such as: countries still do not share data and viruses very easily; epidemiology and laboratory data should be better integrated; better links are needed between country/regional/global data management; technical and local knowledge should be integrated.
- Insufficient skilled personnel; more training and capacity building is needed.
- The priority country focus might not always work and more general regional support might also be needed.
- There is a lack of clarity on current vaccine pandemic production capacity.
- Advances in and around event-based surveillance are difficult to measure are difficult to attribute solely to PIP.
- The current systems of annual partnership contributions do not provide long-term predictability/sustainability of funding.

## OPPORTUNITIES

Elements within PIP PC Implementation or in the broader environment that could be exploited to help reach the objective of preparedness for pandemic influenza

### Opportunities within the broader environment

- Following large-scale recent epidemics, there is heightened global awareness about potential health implications of a pandemic. This creates an opportunity for knowledge, support and buy-in of PIP internationally.
- An opportunity exists for collaboration/alignment with global institutions working on pandemic preparedness (e.g. World Bank).

### Opportunities within WHO and the PIP programme

- Development of clear key performance indicators (KPIs) would be able to show the effect on influenza pandemic preparedness and response.
- Simulation exercises can be conducted to challenge the ability to respond to a pandemic.
- Decision-making can be guided by data, using the increased data generation from past PIP PC Implementation work (e.g. Burden of Disease studies).
- There are opportunities for better integration/collaboration across AOW, and inclusion of activities from GAP.
Further improvements can be made by continuing key work such as training programs and guideline development, enhancing technical capabilities for detection and evidence-based surveillance, increasing political commitment, using the web for risk communication, and economic costing.

Robust project-based budgeting and planning could improve execution of activities under PIP PC implementation.

Opportunities exist to improve PC predictability, equity, fairness and sustainability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THREATS</th>
<th>Elements in the broader environment that could endanger or inhibit progress in preparedness for pandemic influenza</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• There is a lack of full political support across governments. Member state commitment is perceived to be limited.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implementation of regulatory measures remains weak and governments still doubt necessity of measures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pandemics and epidemics are now a political issue rather than a technical issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Insufficient integration of work into national programs leads to fears about sustainability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A lack of visibility of end-to-end preparedness &amp; response capacity improvements may lead to inadequate or inefficient planning &amp; response.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other global initiatives (e.g., from the World Bank) could drive preparedness activities in directions that are not aligned with the approach of the PIP PC Implementation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• During a pandemic, at a country level, the people who have had their capacity built through PIP may be pushed aside and are no longer in control/response positions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of sustainable demand for seasonal vaccination may jeopardise pandemic preparedness activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regulatory capacity activities might not support regulatory convergence, creating potential vaccine access delays.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of clarity as to how the funds have actually contributed to improved global pandemic preparedness may discourage manufacturers’ continued commitment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>