

## **Logistics Process Evaluation Report – Nigeria (Sokoto State)**

### **AMP Logistics Technical Assistance**

**Mission Dates:** January 12- 31<sup>st</sup>, 2014 (inclusive of travel time)  
**Locations:** Abuja and Sokoto State, Nigeria  
**Consultant:** Douglas Mole  
**Date of Report:** January 30<sup>th</sup>, 2014  
**Report Reviewed By:** Dr. M. Erskine, Alliance for Malaria Prevention (AMP)  
**Subject of Report:** Sokoto State, Nigeria - LLIN Replacement Campaign - December 2013

---

#### **Proviso**

*In preparation of this draft report, every effort has been made to represent the most current, correct, and clearly expressed information as gathered during the evaluation period. These documents represent a summary of the collaborative processes / discussions engaged in between January 14-30, 2014. Nevertheless, inadvertent errors in information may occur.*

*The information and data included have been gathered from a variety of sources and through collaborative meetings / interviews conducted during the limited period of this visit, and reflect the authors' analysis. As with any evaluation, it is a snapshot in time and a limited overview and cannot provide the whole picture. It is hoped that the AMP, Nigeria NMEP, and partner organization's review of this information provides ideas and suggestions that will be helpful for future campaign planning.*

## Contents

Background.....	1
Terms of Reference.....	2
Objectives.....	3
Evaluation Methods.....	4
Campaign Logistics - Process Evaluation Key Findings.....	5
• 5.1 - Logistics and Supply Chain Management	
• 5.2 - Selection and Procurement of LLINs	
• 5.3 - Macro-planning and Logistics Timeline	
• 5.4 - Micro planning (State level)	
• 5.5 - Delivery, Transport and Storage	
• 5.6 - Logistics Training and Outcomes	
• 5.7 - Supply Chain Management / Tracking Tools	
• 5.8 – Flow of funding	
• 5.9 – Data management	
Successes and Challenges.....	6
Recommendations and Conclusions.....	7
• 7.1 - Recommendations	
• 7.2 - Conclusion	
Appendix A: Contact List	
Appendix B: Day-by-day Schedule for Field Visit (January 14 – 30, 2014).	
Appendix C: List of Key Meetings / Interviews	
Appendix D: Documents Reviewed	
Appendix E: List of Acronyms	

## AMP Nigeria Logistics Process Evaluation – Sokoto State

### References:

- a. Terms of Reference – Consultant for Post-Campaign Process Monitoring of Sokoto State Mass LLIN Distribution – Nigeria, dated December 17<sup>th</sup>, 2013
- b. Logistics Evaluation Proposed Format (draft) dated January 5, 2014
- c. Nigeria NMEP Guidelines for Replacement Campaigns dated November 2013
- d. Evaluation of the Integrated LLIN Mass Distribution & Child Health Campaign December 2009 – Sokoto State, Nigeria – Final Report dated December 2010
- e. An Implementation Guide For Nigeria NMCP & Partners dated September 2009

### 1 Background

This report presents results from a logistics process evaluation of the universal long-lasting insecticidal net distribution campaign carried out in the state of Sokoto during December 2013. Nigeria is preparing to commence mass LLIN distribution replacement campaigns as a strategy to “catch-up” with national targets in States, where the original mass campaign took place more than 3 years ago, and where continuous distribution channels have not been established to sustain population coverage above 40%.

Sokoto State in Nigeria is the first completed replacement campaign as of December 2013. Implementation guides developed for the first campaigns in 2009 were revised by NMEP and RBM partners. This process evaluation is part of an exercise to understand whether these new guidelines will be effective for planning, implementing and achieving universal coverage LLIN distributions. It will be used as an instrument for improvement for upcoming future replacement campaigns.

### 2 Terms of Reference

The Process Evaluation for Sokoto State in Nigeria was requested by Nigeria NMEP, PMI and The Global Fund with the goal of capturing lessons learned for further campaigns in other states in Nigeria. The Global Fund and PMI were the funders of the LLINs distributed in the first replacement campaign.

This report reflects the work of the logistics part of the evaluation as conducted by the logistics consultant, as laid out in the mission Terms of Reference (Reference A). As part of the Terms of Reference, a proposed list of questions needed to be developed and submitted to AMP prior to the logistics process evaluation beginning in Nigeria. Utilizing the AMP Toolkit Chapter 9 Campaign Reporting format, a sample questionnaire identifying types of information to be considered was developed (Reference B) and submitted to AMP on January 5, 2013.

### 3 Objectives

The proposed objectives of the logistics process evaluation are laid out in the mission Terms of Reference (ToRs) dated Dec 17<sup>th</sup>, 2013. For this consultancy, specifically focused on logistics, the consultant was to explore where the program and logistics activities did or did not align, or where coordination could be improved. The logistics consultant was asked to examine:

- Involvement of NMEP PSM branch in logistics (interaction between PSM branch and the IVM subcommittee);
- Review of the process of port clearance and transport to States, including tools used for monitoring the pipeline and communication between the freight forwarder, the Federal logistics personnel and the State staff;
- Readiness for storage by the State at State/ LGA level, including assessment of quality of warehouses for ensuring high accountability of LLINs;

**Comment [PWG1]:** This area didn't come out clear in the report

- Adequacy of the tools used for inventory management and tracking and need for improvements;
- Adequacy of staffing for logistics management for LLIN at various levels, including the State contribution to staffing needs for the campaign;
- Training cascade for logistics, from State to LGA to distribution point level, including quality of training, people trained and correct use of tracking tools as a primary outcome reflecting effectiveness of capacity building;
- Reporting back to higher levels LGA/State/National level on the distribution of LLINs to enable a reconciliation;
- Planning for reverse logistics and implementation of movement of leftover nets to pre-identified facilities engaged in routine distribution to pregnant women; and
- Lessons learned in the interaction between NMEP and Procurement agents.

The ToRs ask that key recommendations be identified in a report with the suggested recommendation aligned with the appropriate section of the Nigeria Malaria Campaign Implementation Guidelines.

#### 4 Evaluation Methods

As highlighted in the AMP Toolkit (Chapter 9), the process review for logistics will target capturing:

- What was successful?
- What were the main challenges?
- What were the results of the various logistics activities?
- What lessons have been learned?
- What recommendations are suggested to the implementation guidelines?

The theme of this evaluation is to challenge ideas and processes, and not people. Discussions will focus on relevant information, and results / findings may not have all issues resolved through revision of the implementation guidelines.

The logistics process evaluation was mainly qualitative in nature. The information was gathered through document review (key logistics planning documents such as Campaign Implementation guidelines, procurement documents, tracking tools, training resources, etc.), semi-structured interviews and informal interviews. Some aspects that influenced the scope of the process review are time, availability of key contacts, the distance of Sokoto State from Abuja, and security. Additionally, the ToRs for this mission (Reference A) identified an additional consultant who would be reviewing the program / implementation during the same timeframe, but this was not conducted at the same time as the logistics process review.

Interviews were conducted in Abuja, the capital of Nigeria, and in Sokoto State, where 4 of 23 LGAs (approximately 17%) were visited and 2 distribution point (DP) sites were viewed. AMP, NMEP, and PMI supported the Logistics Process Evaluation. The Sokoto State RBM M & E officer representative facilitated the Sokoto State interviews, field trips and schedule arrangements.

#### 5 Campaign Logistics – Process Evaluation Key Findings

The Sokoto State LLIN distribution occurred during the period December 17-21, 2013. It involved distributing 2,526,100 LLINs in 23 LGAs and comprised an average of approximately 37 distribution points per LGA. The key findings of the logistics process evaluation are laid out under seven areas for easy reference.

Overall the feedback I received from the State was very positive. They were satisfied with the rollout of activities related to logistics, technical and demand creation. Though the focus of this report is logistics, if there were key issues reported during the process evaluation for other work-streams, efforts have been made to mention the item in the appropriate area in this report.

There were several key issues that are important to look at for this campaign and future campaign planning:

- Payment for campaign worker/volunteers at State level has been late (or there has been no payment) in some cases and has created concern at several levels (this was an ongoing issue during the evaluation period). The State MEP manager indicated he was receiving dozens of calls a day about these issues.
- Quantification of LLINs - it was reported in several cases that there was not the right amount of nets and gaps still existed at LGA and distribution point levels.
- It will be important to clarify LLIN numbers and resolve the scheduled mop-up campaign on how this gap will be addressed. The distribution days for the campaign lasted up until the Christmas break, and at the time of the evaluation in Sokoto, the mop up days had not yet taken place.
- Campaign timeline was considered very tight and activity completion dates were compressed.

### 5.1 - Logistics and Supply Chain Management

Logistics and supply chain management were a shared responsibility, with LLIN selection and procurement functions being managed by NMEP and Partners (Global Fund, PMI, JSI and State). The LLIN shipment, entry, custom clearances, and transport to State warehousing were the responsibility of the PMI and Global Fund suppliers. Reception of LLINs at State level and supply chain planning from State to DP locations were the responsibility of SMEP, state partners and the SST. The Sokoto State campaign LLINs were provided from two sources: Global Fund provided 1.2 million LLINs and PMI provided 1.3 million LLINs.

Sokoto is a PMI-supported State prior to the LLIN campaign. Therefore, the JSI/Deliver Project was PMI representative for logistics (with TSHIP for implementation and non-logistics activities) on the ground and focused on logistics planning with support from SST, State, LGA and campaign partners. During this evaluation, it was found that all comments on the flow of the supply chain activities were positive and the State logistics partner "Deliver Project" provided good planning and controls in this work stream activity. The SST logistics component from NMEP provided effective guidance and assistance as needed during this activity. This guidance extended down the supply chain into LGA and DP locations using adequate supervision and monitoring for most activities.

**Comment [PWG2]:** For GF LLINs, was this flow also as good? Were there difficulties e.g. in port clearance and transportation to the states by VPP Procurement agent's freight forwarders?

### 5.2 - Selection and Procurement of LLINs

During this evaluation period, due to unforeseen commitments and meetings, it was a challenge to coordinate a meeting with PSM of the NMEP structure. However, discussions with JSI and the general meeting with GF and partners on January 28, 2014 stressed the importance of communication and scheduling of the LLIN pipeline information and movement. This collaboration and regular communication between PSM, the logistics workstream and partner organizations supplying LLINs for the replacement campaigns is an important function that needs continuous engagement at all levels.

**Comment [PWG3]:** Indications are that NMEP PSM branch has some difficulties collaborating with IVM team. They are not always aware of the plans in place as well as feedback such that they are unable to reconcile LLINs at the National level

### 5.3 - Macro-planning and Logistics Timeline

This Macro level activity was the responsibility of the 2 LLIN providers: Global Fund through the VPP process and JSI through the Deliver Project. As was discussed on January 28, 2014 meeting held at NMEP with GF, better communications and an accurate pipeline delivery schedule would assist with providing country arrival dates and planned delivery dates of LLIN commodity to State level warehousing. This shipment information is relevant and would go a long way to keep all stakeholders in the picture and would provide a gauge as to possible timeline problems or unforeseen delays.

The overall campaign timeline was very compressed because of beginning of the Christmas period. This meant that some key activities were very compressed and may have been one of the causes of LLIN

shortages. The timeline for collection and production of data for each distribution site after household mobilization was very short and LLINs began moving while this was taking place. The numbers for pre-positioning LLINs that come from the household mobilization are most accurate if the activity is done right and enough time should be given to determine the net needs prior to transport of LLINs.

#### 5.4 - Micro planning (State level)

Micro planning was primarily a state level responsibility and took place in the state capitol. This specific activity was divided into three main phases:

- The first phase was LGA focal persons (LGA team) gathering details and information from wards and health facilities based upon a provided template and direction provided by NMEP. This information was collected in advance of micro planning at State level.
- The second phase was a workshop held in the State capitol for 5 days with representatives from the SMEP, the LGAs and the SST to compile all LGA information results into one detailed campaign document.
- The third phase was further development by State Team and State Support Team, including budgeting for the overall State campaign.

Although all interviews indicated this process was a well-run activity, it is not clear how much bottom up information was gathered from health facilities. In addition, for Sokoto the microplanning exercise was standard, meaning that it may have been considered as good or better than the last one (when Sokoto was an early State), but it does not reflect a more bottom-up process. For Sokoto State, microplanning took place according to the old guidelines, which may have contributed to the population / LLIN discrepancies (e.g. the activity was more centralized) at the implementation phase. The next campaigns should look at the alignment between microplanning and household registration figures.

#### 5.5 – Delivery, Transport and Storage

State delivery of LLINs through the supply chain was planned and scheduled by the Deliver Project in conjunction with State and LGA team planners. Prior to delivery of LLINs to DPs, supervisors reviewed and verified acceptability, security levels, and overall suitability of storage locations. Detailed tracking tools were utilized, and transport conveyors were reported to be onboard all LLIN truckloads. These conveyors provided an important extra level of safeguards and security. As of this evaluation, reconciliation of quantities had not been completed on the LLINs but overall consensus was that very limited leakage or loss occurred within the supply chain. However, this should be verified through the reconciliations and an audit of the supply chain paper trail.

In most cases, delivery of LLINs to DPs used the “Just In Time” (JIT) delivery system, i.e.: the day before LLINs were moved from LGAs into storage locations at DPs for the following day distribution. In some cases, DPs that were further away from the LGA storage area(s) had deliveries arranged 2 days before the proposed distribution day. The distance indicated as too far for daily delivery was in excess of 50/60 km on average. This approach seemed to work well in the LGAs that had these spread out DP locations.

#### 5.6 – Logistics Training and Outcomes

Malaria campaign training was identified as being an important component, and included training for all three work-streams: Technical, Demand Creation, and Logistics. The national campaign guidelines outlined a cascade training structure for a State to follow with the assistance of the SSTs. As laid out in the guideline, a 5-day training session should be conducted in clusters dependent on attendance numbers. It was envisioned that specific work-stream training would be part of this overall session.

**Comment [PWG4]:** There was also the GF portion where VPP delivered until the states. NMEP's PSM branch would have been involved in this...is it possible to tell their level of engagement?

**Comment [PWG5]:** NMEP seemed to be waiting for DELIVER to help them in reconciliation of LLINs from last mission meetings. It therefore may be deduced that in cases where campaigns will be purely conducted by NMEP as lead in subsequent campaigns, there may be difficulties unless if they have learned.

From the evaluation visits and discussions, it appears this was the goal. However, it was not accomplished in all cases. Generally, some cluster training was reported to be more of a crosscutting general campaign approach. Reasons were not clear as to why this occurred, but timeframes could have been a factor in some cases.

Specific household mobilizers and LLIN distribution team training was conducted by Ward supervisors. This was a 2-day activity held within the LGAs. There were challenges with the overall organization of these trainings and availability of funding appeared to be another issue.

A role-play approach was utilized in logistics work-stream training at State level to have the trainees practice the knowledge and skills. Incorporating this role-play based training in the logistics training practices at all LGA level training may be useful to help reinforce learning.

**Comment [PWG6]:** How many days did this training of 1754 personnel take approximately?

State Logistics Training	LGA Logistics Training (23)	DP (Storemen / Distributors) Logistics Trained (854 DPs)	Total State Logistics Trained Personnel
23 personnel	23 personnel	2 personnel per DP = 1,708	1,754 personnel

For the logistics training, there is a clear agenda and a PowerPoint presentation (SST Log Training Presentation / Lesson Plan Structure – 2013.ppt) that is available for use at the lower training levels (LGA / ward). However, it may be useful to have a job aid or other document to remind teams and individuals of the procedures to follow.

The ToT at State level started the process and on most accounts seemed to work well as it was cascaded down to DPs. However, one of the functions of the SST is to supervise the training sessions, particularly for people who scored poorly on the post-test. At the same time, the State supervisors and SST should supervise the next level of the cascade, again based on the post-test. The post-test for logistics should be based on a simulation exercise that involves filling out all the supply chain management tools. In some cases, the quality of the trainers for the sessions was not as good as possible.

### 5.7 - Supply Chain Management / Tracking Tools

Supply Chain Management tools were developed with support from SST logistics work stream and the JSI/Deliver Project. These tools were reported to have been used in all training workshops, and used systematically at all levels of the LLIN delivery. The tools developed were:

- Warehouse Stock Sheet
- Inventory Control Card

Showing that in most cases training had been effective, at the LGA level, a person who served as a distribution point stores-person during the campaign was able to produce his campaign logistics tools and he demonstrated competent understanding of their use.

The tools being reviewed are sufficient for tracking the supply chain assuming that they are available, used and reported on properly.

### 5.8 – Flow of funding

While the flow of funding did not specifically affect the logistics operation, it was an issue of concern from all levels of stakeholders interviewed. For the campaign, the budget was split into activities. This meant that workers doing different things on the same day would or would not be paid based on which funding

stream was responsible for that particular role. This caused a lot of confusion in the field. At the time of the process evaluation, there were still people remaining to be paid for their services during the campaign.

While this is not necessarily an issue for the implementation guidelines, it is recommended that the campaign partners align around an improved method for the sharing of budget costs. For example, partners could cover all of the costs for a certain number of LGAs that is determined on the basis of LLINs available. Other options should be explored.

#### 5.9 – Data management

Data management, particularly in the compressed timelines, was difficult. It was not possible to assess whether the training and assigning of roles to the ward supervisor doing data management was effective, but even if it had been functional, the timelines would have been very tight.

The data from the household mobilization is important for the LLIN distribution, so the timelines for this need to be revised. In addition, future campaigns should assess whether the role of the ward-level data management role will assist in improving data management or whether this role should be set at the LGA level. For the LLIN distribution data, it will be important to get a better understanding of the blockages for rapid reconciliation of data (at what level, what cause, etc.).

Interviewees raised a number of issues around the household mobilization process. The net cards produced for the campaign were based on those from the first campaign and therefore carried the message that one net card equaled two nets (versus one net). However, the demand creation activities were successful in passing the message that one net card equaled one net, leading to few problems at distribution points.

In some cases, interviewees identified a shortage of net cards as a problem. In some cases, it seems the household mobilization teams continued to register and mark households without providing a net card. In addition, from the interviews, it seems the households were marked as covered though they had not received a net card. While this represents a problem on the program side, it also affects logistics as the number of nets will be insufficient to meet any increased demand from people without net cards. It is important that the mop up and subsequent reverse logistics include the process in the guidelines.

In all cases, the tools for reconciliation of data for all activities should be reviewed, as should the specific for people responsible for data management (at all levels). It will be necessary to determine appropriate channels / procedures for moving the data up the supply chain levels and ensure means for doing this are included in the budget. This process should be well-defined in the guidelines.

## 6 Successes and Challenges

The Sokoto State Campaign has been undergoing a review at various levels. One item (PowerPoint presentation) shared as part of this process evaluation was called "Summary of Findings of LLINs Replacement Campaign in Sokoto State" (January 16, 2014). Campaign areas that were highlighted in the document provided were as follows:

#### Challenges

- Political interference at LGAs and ward levels.
- Lack of motivation of personnel at LGAs and ward levels.
- Non-release of State counterpart funds.
- Delay in the submission of campaign data by some LGAs.

#### Proposed Next Steps

**Comment [PWG7]:** As in Supply Chain Management / Tracking Tools, it may be good to list the various tools used for data management since additionally, below it says that all should be revised

**Comment [PWG8]:** Is it possible to state what specific areas per tool need attention?



- Reverse Logistics– Movement of unused nets back to the state
- Finalization of Campaign Report writing
- Preparation for post campaign activities
- Follow up to increase hanging rate
- Compilation of missed communities and households to be taken care of during post campaign activities

**Comment [PWG9]:** There was a strategy developed for the reverse logistics. Can this be reviewed in line of the consultant's knowledge of the field to see if it properly addresses this area? Are there any unused LLINs in the LGAs? It seemed that the quantification was inadequate to cover the population?

Successes reported on at the State level during this evaluation in the delivery of the campaign by all stakeholders were based on the well-developed logistics tools/material and technical material. This material was professionally done and well delivered by all State partners on time. Areas that were discussed:

- Good cooperation seemed to be evident between state and campaign partners and stakeholders in the rollout of this campaign.
- Adequate supervision at State, LGA, Ward and DP levels.

Some key challenges experienced during the campaign, as reported during this evaluation (besides Sokoto State LLIN Campaign Report challenges):

- Coordination on funding and availability of resources in time for campaign activities to avoid demotivation of personnel.
- Security issues of crowd control at some DPs due to large turnouts.
- Quantification of LLINs - it was reported in several cases that there was not the right amount of nets and gaps still existed at LGA levels.
- Waste disposal procedures were in some LGAs a concern, i.e. no proper direction.
- Campaign timeline schedule was considered very tight and activity completion dates were very compressed.
- Data collection process was an activity needing close observation to centralize results at State level prior to LLIN transport to DPs.

## 7 Recommendations and Conclusions

### 7.1 – Recommendations

This process evaluation was conducted from the logistics perspective; however, some issues came forward that were not logistics in nature, but were felt to be important for campaign planners to review. Thus recommendations are not solely limited to logistics; especially, those areas raised in interviews several times may be mentioned below.

Activity	Recommendation	2013 Guideline Sections
LGA logistics training	Introduce logistics role-play sessions at LGA and ward levels to develop strong knowledge base levels.	Amend section 4.2.2.3 – Work-stream specific training.  Ensure logistics agenda revised for role-play at each level to ensure good understanding of use of tools.
Reverse LLIN logistics	Need to develop this activity and have in place if/when surplus LLINs need relocation	Guidelines for execution of this function should be added / detailed regardless of any anticipated zero LLIN balance.

Logistics Commodity Management Assessment	This post-campaign activity should be developed, implemented and budgeted for improved reconciliation and to review LLIN supply chain effectiveness and quality.	Included in Nov 2013 guidelines but presently has not been scheduled or implemented in State. Guideline should include methodology and budget should be ensured. Is it possible to add one person to each independent monitoring team to focus on this specific aspect? Define who that person should be.
Campaign State Timeline	Dates of activities should allow sufficient time to successfully complete activity. Preplanning and forecasting in advance will be of assistance.	<p>Planning in a reverse process based on fixed delivery dates of LLINs to State warehousing will allow sufficient time for each activity.</p> <p>The generic timeline needs to be revised to ensure that activities are not compressed.</p> <p>The generic timeline should be shared with the State team during microplanning so that modifications can be made with State inputs. This should be added to the guidelines.</p>
LLIN Waste Management	Better training to ensure LGA and DPs are aware of the environmental issues and procedures.	Amend section 6.2.6 -Possibly expanding this section to reflect processes (best practices) to employ during waste management post campaign activities.
Activity Funded Payment	This area needs close follow-up to compensate workers and staff in an acceptable timeframe.	<p>While not necessarily for the implementation guidelines, this is something that the funding partners should discuss to agree upon a way forward. The State should be involved in these discussions. If possible, one funder paying all campaign activities in one LGA could be an option.</p> <p><u>Note:</u> This was a major area of concern throughout this State evaluation and at all levels (Federal, State, LGA).</p>

State LLIN Quantification	This area needs to be reviewed since LGAs reported zero surpluses and existing gaps still remain after this campaign. Source population figures or yearly projection % may need a closer review for upcoming campaigns.	The macro quantification based on projected population is unlikely to be accurate since the country is coming to a census year. This makes the microplanning more important.  <u>Note:</u> This was a major area of concern throughout this State evaluation.
Mop up campaign	Needs to be defined in terms of what this means (household mobilization versus people holding net cards). Needs to happen directly post-campaign.	More clearly defined in the implementation guidelines and to be considered on state-specific timelines.
Microplanning	In future, more attention to microplanning and information from the lowest levels needs to be factored in (new guidelines).	No recommendations, just to follow new guidelines.
Communication between Partners and NMEP elements i.e. Defining deadlines better, sharing of information with NMEP-JSI-GF and other Partners	Better communications should be developed at both the Macro/Micro levels of planning.  At Federal level, discussion needs to take place in advance of modifying guidelines to determine if the new proposal is well housed under the ITN expert group. Does this include all relevant partners to ensure information sharing?  At the State level, engagement needs to happen early from NMEP and all partners.	For Federal level, no changes until decisions are taken.  For State level, ensure that State engagement is put in the timeline for microplanning versus implementation. This would start at the State engagement process, early in the start-up.
State Advocacy (i.e.) LCCN involvement levels	More involvement in the overall ownership and logistics component of campaign.	This would start at the State engagement process, early in the start-up, preferably during microplanning 3 months prior to the LLIN distribution date.
Possible NMEP top down driven campaign process	NMEP should try to engage SMEP teams for better ownership and bottom up involvement of campaign actors.	State must be considered an equal partner in all planning phases.  A sense from lower levels that the activity is Federally driven

		and not State owned.
Ministry of Health concurrent interventions of Polio, MNCH and LLIN campaign in some areas caused strain on State resources	Better communications and coordination planning to lessen the resource impact on the focal persons at State/LGA levels.	<p>Include in the guidelines to schedule routine campaigns for other SMOH departments during microplanning.</p> <p>With early State engagement, it is hoped that changes on campaigns would be communicated to the Federal level to allow adjustments in scheduling and planning.</p>
Data Collection timelines from peripheral levels	Increase planning days to enable sufficient time to compile and to then provide data to logistics work stream for LLIN loading tables, delivery planning, etc.	Modify generic campaign timeline. Provide procedures and channels for data flow up the data chain.

## 7.2 – Conclusion

During this process evaluation, the results found were both process and systemic (institutional) based concerns. NMEP's national procedures and partnership process requirements must be understood by all stakeholders and need to be communicated down into State level planning. This needs to be cleared in the guidelines as to what Federal level structure is going to oversee the process. As of now, not all partners feel that they are receiving timely information.

The State engagement process is crucial. It is important for the Federal and State levels to establish clear and regular communication to ensure that everyone is aware of what is to take place when. If the recommendations of the report are followed, there will be a State-specific timeline that can be shared with all partners. The Federal level will need to ensure effective coordination and communication around the State engagement and microplanning process.

When assessing changes to be made, it will be important to look at the timelines (and not compress activities) and the budgets (to ensure funds are available on time). Most importantly, adequate support for the logistics supply chain must be ensured through whatever means possible. A quantitative evaluation of the supply chain and its management (audit of supply chain trail) would likely support this process evaluation.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks to NMEP, PMI, JSI and partners for all their cooperation. Particular thanks goes to the Sokoto State teams and their supporting partners. The support provided by them during this Logistics Process Evaluation visit was very much appreciated. The NMEP and key stakeholders core were very responsive and supportive throughout this mission. I wish NMEP, SMEP, stakeholders and all partners continued success with the planning and implementation of their 2014 LLIN replacement campaigns in Nigeria.

## **Appendix A**

### **Contacts List**

The following is a list of individuals contacted during the logistics process evaluation visit (names appear in the general sequence that individuals were met and do not reflect any other particular order):

1. Dr. Nnenna Ezelgwe – National Co-ordinator, NMEP, Nigeria Federal Ministry of Health
2. Dr. Joel Akilah – Head of Integrated Vector Management (IVM), NMEP, Abuja
3. Dr. Uwem Inyang – Program Manager Malaria, Health Population/Nutrition Team, USAID
4. Abidemi Olubukunmi Okechukwu – Malaria Program Manager, USAID
5. Jessica Kafuko – Senior Malaria Advisor, USAID
6. Javier Barrera – HoD, International Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, Abuja
7. Hamisu Hassan – Senior Logistics Advisor, USAID/Deliver Project, Abuja
8. Emmanuel Obi - NetWorks Project, Malaria Consortium
9. Godwin Aidenagbon - USAID / MAPS Project, Malaria Consortium
10. Dr. Khaliru Alhassan – Director of Medicals Services, Sokoto State
11. Aminu Umar Ahmed – SMEP / RBM Malaria Program Manager, Sokoto State
12. Bello Usman – SMEP / RBM M&E, Sokoto State
13. Nura Bala – College of Nursing, State campaign supervisor, Sokoto, State
14. His Grace, Archbishop John Onaiyekan - President, Christian Association of Nigeria, Co-Chair NIFAA
15. Mohammed Sahabi G/Madi – Chairman of Tangaza, LGA
16. Akiyu Omar Maikurawa - LGA Secretary of Tangaza, LGA
17. Lawali Umar - RBM Manager of Tangaza, LGA
18. Abubakar Moh'd K. – D.P.H.C. of Tangaza, LGA
19. Abubakar Omar – Health Educator of Tangaza, LGA
20. Sani A. Ballah – Stores Keeper of Tangaza, LGA
21. Alh Mani Maishinko – Chairman of Silame, LGA
22. Manugh Ruwa – Council Secretary of Silame, LGA
23. Umaru Aliyu Lsa – Council DPHC of Silame, LGA
24. Malami Mhghji – RBM Focal Person of Silame, LGA
25. Usman B. Danjuma – DDPHC of Silame, LGA
26. Alk Abubakar L. Shamaki – Chairman of Yaba, LGA
27. Buhari Altine Javedi – Director PHC of Yaba, LGA
28. Isah Hassan – RBM Co-ordinator of Yaba, LGA
29. Zainab Sa'idu – Logistics Advisor Malaria, Sokoto City, Sokoto State
30. Zayyam Bello Grandi – Chairman of Rabah, LGA
31. Dr. Bello Madawaki – Director of Primary Health Care, Rabah LGA
32. Alh Abubakar Harante – DDPHC
33. Bello B. Gandi – RBM Focal Person, Rabah, LGA
34. Hubibu N. Rabah – Staff Primary Health Care Department, Rabah, LGA
35. Dr. Zainab Mohammed – Malaria & Child Health Specialist, Tship, Sokoto State
36. Dr. Mohammed I. Auwal – Senior MCH Advisor, Tship, Sokoto State
37. Abdul-Quadir Oni – Deputy Chief of Party, JSI, Abuja
38. Ezekiel Akintunde – Director Malaria, JSI, Abuja
39. Joachim Okieimen – Logistics Advisor Malaria, JSI, Abuja
40. Dangana Christopher Azo – Global Fund Malaria Division, SFH, Abuja

**Appendix B****Day-by-day Schedule for Process Evaluation Field Visit (January 14 – 30, 2014)**

Jan 12/13	-	Travel days to Nigeria
Jan 14	-	Informal introductions / meetings with PMI and NMEP, Abuja
Jan 15	-	Formal meetings with PMI team, NMEP and IFRC, Abuja
Jan 16	-	Informal meeting with SST Logistics for Sokoto State
Jan 17	-	Formal meeting with NetWorks Project and MAPS, Malaria Consortium, Abuja
Jan 18/19	-	Evaluation prep & arrangement of travel details to Sokoto State
Jan 20	-	Flight to Sokoto State and meeting with SMEP. Schedule developed for LGA/Wards evaluation trips
Jan 21	-	Meeting with NIFAA Co-Chairs and evaluation trip to Tangaza, LGA and Silame, LGA with meetings
Jan 22	-	Evaluation trip to Yaba, LGA and Deliver Project, Sokoto City
Jan 23	-	Evaluation trip to Rabah LGA, Town Dispensary DP and Maikujera Dispensary DP in Rabah, LGA with meetings
Jan 24	-	Return flight from Sokoto State to Abuja & meeting with NMEP, Abuja
Jan 26	-	Meeting with Senior Logistics, USAID/Deliver Project, Abuja
Jan 27	-	Meeting with JSI team in Abuja
Jan 28	-	Global Fund, NMEP and Partners meeting, Abuja
Jan 29	-	Report process evaluation writing
Jan 30	-	Debrief meeting with NMEP / PMI, Abuja, departure flight commence from Nigeria
Jan 31	-	Travel day

## **Appendix C**

### **List of Key Meetings / Interviews**

- a. January 14, 2014 – Informal initial introduction meeting with USAID (PMI) and NMEP MoH.
- b. January 15, 2014 – Planned meeting with USAID (PMI) team on structure of evaluation.
- c. January 15, 2014 – Planned meeting with NMEP National Coordinator, SST Team Leader.
- d. January 15, 2014 – Meeting with IFRC reference security situation in Sokoto State.
- e. January 16, 2014 – Informal initial introduction discussions with SST logistics member on evaluation arrangements.
- f. January 16, 2014 – Further discussion with USAID (PMI) concerning format of evaluation.
- g. January 17, 2014 – Formal meeting with NetWorks Project and MAPS, Malaria Consortium, Abuja.
- h. January 20, 2014 – Flight to Sokoto State and meeting with SMEP. Schedule developed for LGA/Wards evaluation trips.
- i. January 21, 2014 – Meeting with NIFAA Co-Chairs and evaluation trip to Tangaza, LGA and Silame, LGA with meetings.
- j. January 22, 2014 – Evaluation trip to Yaba. LGA, and meeting with JSI (Deliver Project) in Sokoto City.
- k. January 22, 2014 – Evaluation trip to Yaba. LGA, and meeting with JSI (Deliver Project) in Sokoto City.
- l. January 23, 2014 – Evaluation trip to Rabah, LGA, and meeting with Tship in Sokoto City.
- m. January 24, 2014 – Debrief RBM Manager in SMEP & departed for Abuja and attended further meeting with NMEP in Abuja.
- n. January 26, 2014 – Formal discussions with SST logistics member. on campaign logistics activities.
- o. January 27, 2014 – Formal discussions with JSI Team in Abuja.
- p. January 28, 2014 – General meeting with Global Fund, NMEP, SunMap, SFH, Abuja
- q. January 30, 2014 – Debrief meeting with NMEP, PMI and JSI on general Process Evaluation mission points

## **Appendix D**

### **Documents Reviewed**

The following documents and resources were provided and reviewed as part of this process evaluation:

- a. An Implementation Guide For Nigeria NMCP & Partners dated September 2009, sourced from: AMP.
- a. Evaluation of the Integrated LLIN Mass Distribution & Child Health Campaign December 2009 – Sokoto State, Nigeria Final Report dated December 2010, sourced from: AMP.
- b. Nigeria NMEP Guidelines for Replacement Campaign dated November 2013, sourced from: AMP.
- c. Final Timelines for LLINs campaign in Sokoto State (revised) dated November 5, 2013, sourced from: AMP.
- d. Training Daily Attendance Sheet of Participants dated 20 Nov 2013, sourced from: Deliver Project.
- e. Sokoto State LLIN Campaign Report, December 2013 Campaign, sourced from: SMEP, Sokoto.
- f. Logistics Training Material, November 2013, sourced from: State Deliver Project partner.
- g. Micro Positioning Plan Sokoto FINAL, not dated, sourced from: State Deliver Project partner.
- h. Sokoto State End of Campaign Debriefing PPT, dated January 16, 2014, sourced from: SMEP, Sokoto State.
- i. Demand Creation, Distribution, Monitoring, HHM and Technical tools, not dated, sourced from: SMEP, Sokoto.



**Appendix E****List of Acronyms**

ACC	Sokoto State NGO – Association for Community Change
BCC	Behaviour Change Communication
CBA	Comparative Bidding Analysis
CSO	Civil society organization
DC	Demand Creation
DELIVER	JSI program/ state logistics partner in Sokoto State
DP	Distribution Point
DS	Distribution Sites
EPI	Expanded Programme on Immunization
HH	Household
IFRC	International Red Cross and Red Crescent Society
IVM	Integrated Vector Management
JSI	John Snow Incorporated
LCCN	LLIN Campaign Coordination Network
LGA	Local Government Area
LLINS	Long Lasting Insecticide Treated Nets
MAPS	Malaria Action Programme for State
MC	Malaria Consortium
MIS	Malaria Indicator Survey
MNCH	Maternal Newborn Child Health
MoH	Ministry of Health
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organization
NIFAA	Nigeria Inter-Faith Action Association
NMEP	National Malaria Elimination Program
NMIS	National Health Information System
NMSP	National Malaria Strategic Plan
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
PMI	President's Malaria Initiative
PR	Principal Recipient
PS	Positioning Site
PSM	Procurement Supply Management
PPS	Pre-Positioning Site
RFQ	Request for Quotation
SCM	Supply Chain Management
SFH	Society of Family Health
SMEP	State Malaria Elimination Programme
SR	Sub-Recipient
SST	State Support Team
Tship	Targeted States High Impact Project
UC	Universal Coverage
VHT	Village health team