Findings from Digital Tool Mapping for COVID-19 Webinar
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USAID’s Digital Health Strategy
USAID’s Vision for Action in Digital Health

The Vision presents a roadmap for how USAID can support its partner countries as they strengthen the digital transformation of their health sectors.

Available online here: https://www.usaid.gov/digital-health-vision
Vision for Action in Digital Health: Four Priority Areas

1. Advancing National Digital Health Strategies
2. Strengthening National Digital Health Architectures
3. Leveraging Global Goods
Why Map & Match?

Key Lesson from Ebola:

Adapting existing digital tools rather than deploying new ones helped:

- Speed of deployment
- Save money
- Reduce duplicative investments
- Lead to sustainable tools
- Increase government leadership
- Enable exchange of data
Map & Match Goals

Map **existing** digital health tools deployed **at scale** in country.

- Identify digital health tools **already deployed** for COVID-19 response and vaccine distribution
- Identify digital health tools that **can be adapted** for COVID-19 response and vaccine distribution
Map & Match
Map & Match Overview

**Phase 1:** Initial Mapping
135 countries

- Rapid assessment through a desk based literature review
- High-level gap analysis between deployment/adaptations across countries

**Phase 2:** Expanded Mapping and Country Profiles
22 countries

- Expand research to include global and country surveys
- Interviews with open-source software developers to understand adaptations
- Interviews with Ministry of Health officials to understand Ministry priorities

July – October 2020

October 202 – March 2021
Tools Collected

Phase I: July 20 – October 2020

749

Documents, websites, reports, and landscapes submitted and reviewed.

2,792

# digital tool deployments identified

76%

% of digital deployments NOT identified in the Digital Health Atlas
A ‘use case’ refers to a specific type of information collected, stored, tracked, analyzed, or visualized as it relates to the functional response to an epidemiological event, specifically COVID-19. One digital health tool can be deployed for multiple ‘use cases’.

- Case management
- Contact tracing
- Data science assets
- Event-based surveillance
- Health facility & provider administration
- Infection prevention control
- Laboratory systems
- Learning & training

- One Health
- Points of entry
- Risk communication & community engagement
- Routine surveillance
- Supply chain
- Vaccine planning, monitoring and delivery*

* Added for COVAX

Digital Square | connecting the world for better health
About this data

- This data is meant to provide a quick assessment of existing tools related to the COVID-19 pandemic.
- Our data do not capture 100% accurate information as tools and adaptations are changing. Additionally, the digital health tool information was collected via landscapes and self-reported information via surveys and interviews.
- Only data for the 22 focus countries was validated.
- A best effort was made in terms of collecting data and not all tools operating in country were captured and not all tool information is complete.
- Data collection ended in March 2021 and contains limited information on vaccines.
- Financial information is not included in this data.
Additional Map & Match Outputs

- Executive summary/overview of the project.
- Annex information about digital tools which support vaccine deployment.
- Map & Match survey tools (data model).
- Final data set of Phase I and Phase II data.
- Digital Applications and Tools Across an Epidemiological Curve (DATEC).
- Scale framework.
Investor and Partner Coordination

Coordination and alignment has been a key tenant throughout the Map and Match project.
Findings from Map & Match Data
Why is this analysis needed?

- The Map & Match project resulted in one of the largest known datasets of digital health tool deployments globally and allows for broad assessment of the digital health field.

- Donors, including USAID, often cannot identify and track their digital health investments and as a result it can be difficult to make evidence-based programmatic decisions about digital health. The Map & Match data provides a learning opportunity and baseline for future tracking of digital health investments.

- Using Map & Match as a case study helps identify improvements for data collection and sharing for future digital tool repositories such as the Digital Health Atlas.
Research Objectives

1. **Identify patterns** within (a) health system challenges addressed by digital health interventions and (b) which tools or systems are used in those interventions.

2. Identify activities and digital tools used in USAID partner countries to inform potential future USAID-Washington and Mission-based collaboration, including through harmonized investments in those countries.

3. **Assess USAID investments in digital health tools** within the global portfolio of digital health investments (in response to the COVID-19 pandemic and/or more broadly).

4. Identify solutions to **improve the comprehensiveness, accessibility, and usability** of Map & Match data.
RESULTS
RQ4 How are tool deployments by all funders distributed across countries?

Count of tool deployments per country by all funders
RQ14 Which digital health tools, softwares, and use cases are most supported? In which areas are there noticeable clusters?

### Top 10 Softwares

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Software</th>
<th># of Tool Deployments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHIS 2</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CommCare</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RapidPro</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OpenMRS</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODK</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMS</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iHRIS</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xpert</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microsoft Azure</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RQ8 How many digital health tool deployments are funded by local (in-country) donors v. out-of-country donors?

116 / 4% funded locally

2789 / 96% funded by out-of-country donors

- Over-counting is likely due to attribution to a country MOH instead of the World Bank or another external funder.
- But under-counting is also likely due to bias in reporting, as out-of-country donors are more likely to request public-facing reports written about tool deployments.

### Countries with the most tool deployments including at least one local funder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th># of Tool Deployments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**RQ7** How are tool deployments distributed across sectors of donors?

### Sectors of digital health donors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th># of Donors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government (national or international)</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International multi-sector</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-governmental organization</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private foundation</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate foundation</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare provider</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic institution</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Depending on the data source, the perceived/reported donor was not necessarily the original funding source, e.g.:
  - country MoH listed as donor rather than World Bank
  - confusion between corporations and corporate foundations
- Countries with a significant number of unknown donors (some tools may have known and unknown donors): Nigeria (133), India (82), Kenya (73), Ethiopia (63), South Africa (42), United States (38), Uganda (35).
RQ3  Which donors are funding which tool deployments? (for all use cases)

**Top 10 digital health donors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor</th>
<th># of Deployments Funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Agency for International Development</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gates Foundation (BMGF)</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Center for Disease Control and Prevention</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oslo</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations International Children’s Fund (UNICEF)</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Commonwealth &amp; Development Office (FCDO)</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Health Organization (WHO)</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Challenges Canada</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Dept of State/PEPFAR</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavi</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The majority of tools are funded by donors based in the United States (705), International/non-specific (314), Norway (115), United Kingdom (113) and Canada (79).
- Donors based in LMICs were most often based in Malawi (27), Kenya (20), Nigeria (15) South Africa (13) and Senegal (12).
RQ4 How are tool deployments funded by the top funders distributed across countries?
RQ6 How are tool deployments funded by the top donors distributed across digital health use cases?

- Many tools were listed with multiple use cases, which is why these numbers appear very high.
- The graphs on the following two slides can be better viewed in their original format, linked at the end of this slide deck.
RQ6 How are tool deployments funded by the top donors distributed across digital health initiatives?
RQ10 How are tool deployments implemented by the top implementing organizations distributed across countries?

- Depending on the data source, the perceived/reported implementer was not always correct, e.g.:
  - USAID listed as an implementer (these were corrected)
  - Other funders listed as implementers (these were not corrected)

### Top 11 Implementing Organizations of Digital Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementer</th>
<th># of Tool Deployments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Sciences for Health (MSH)</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oslo</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Health Organization (WHO)</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Snow Institute (JSI)</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SystemOne</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BroadReach</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eHealth Africa</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OpenMRS</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrahealth</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATH</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RQ12 How are digital tool deployments distributed by licensing structure, and this associated with government or non-government funding?

Licensing type was applied to tool, although tools may consist of multiple softwares. To be listed as open source, all softwares included in a tool must be open source.
RQ11 Which use cases are not addressed by any global goods?

**Global goods** are digital health tools that are adaptable to different countries and contexts.

Softwares that meet this definition are **free and open source** and used to manage, analyze, or transmit health-related data, with **proven utility in several settings**.

---

A global good is defined by its inclusion in Digital Square’s Global Goods Guidebook (+ Rapidpro)
RQ1  Which digital health tools are most often used for use cases related to COVID-19?

803 tools (28%) were deployed for COVID-19

Top digital health softwares deployed for COVID-19 (all countries)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Software</th>
<th># of Deployments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHIS2</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commcare</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RapidPro</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viamo</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAD4COVID</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RQ2 What tools have been deployed in support of vaccine-related use cases?

- Of the 162 tools deployed in support of vaccinations, 51 (32%) were also used in the COVID-19 response (not necessarily for COVID-19 vaccination).
- Note that data collection ended in March 2021, before many countries had access to COVID-19 vaccines or finalized NDVPs.
- As of December 2021, common tools for vaccination include new modules of DHIS 2 (used by 40+ countries for COVID-19 vaccination) and CommCare, SORMAS, and mSupply.

### Top 10 digital health softwares deployed for vaccination-related use cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Software</th>
<th># of Deployments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OpenSRP</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHIS 2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OpenMRS</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistimo</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODK</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OpenLMIS</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ColdTrace</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mSupply</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eSURV (Electronic Surveillance)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RQ19 To what extent are duplicative tool deployments funded by the same donor?

Digital health fragmentation is the result of a lack of connection and synchronization between different digital health interventions, but is also frequently used as a catch-all term to describe many of the problems you encounter when you don't use an enterprise planning approach.

- Based on available data in Map & Match, we tried to measure fragmentation using a combination of use case, tools, and softwares.
- Most tool deployments were listed with multiple softwares and multiple use cases, making it very challenging to identify duplication from these data.
- Some duplication of tools across use cases is expected, e.g. subnational deployments and certain use cases like risk communication and community engagement.
- This can be assessed by individual donor or individual country as a deep-dive, but shouldn’t be examined without context.
RQ19 To what extent are duplicative tool deployments funded by the same donor?

- This graph deep dives into the country with the most USAID-funded tools, Tanzania.
- Each colored box on the bar graph indicates one software; larger boxes indicate multiple deployments of a software (perhaps used in different tools, or at different scales).
- The next slide provides more context for this graph.
To what extent are duplicative tool deployments funded by the same donor?

3 deployments of DHIS 2 for case management:
- family planning for CHWs (5 regions)
- national HMIS in district hospitals
- HIV services (12 regions)

3 deployments of Logiak for case management:
- family planning for CHWs deployed (5 regions)
- dispatch center and ambulances for maternal health (2 regions)
- maternal healthcare for CHWs (1 region)

2 deployments of OpenLMIS for supply chain:
- national eLMIS for medications
- national stock management for vaccines
DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS
RQ18 What were facilitators and barriers to the collection and processing of this data?

**FACILITATORS:**

- Strong community and partners that shared resources for review.
- Innovators and implementers willing to be interviewed and share their knowledge about tools.
- Use of standardized lists for digital health interventions, digital health challenges, and health systems challenges.
- Well-designed list of mutually exclusive use cases.

**BARRIERS:**

- Lack of published material in English about many digital tool deployments.
- Lack of information about deployment dates and end dates of digital tools, which makes it hard to assess historical and current trends.
- Lack of inclusion criteria for what qualifies as a digital tool.
- Survey fatigue.
- Difficulty accessing sources and people outside of the digital health community.
- Inconsistency in the right person or group to validate the use of a tool (e.g. MOH, funder, implementing organization) - no single person typically had all the required information about a given tool.
- Additional barriers to processing are included on the Limitations slide.
Integration with the Digital Health Atlas

As the Map & Match project adds ~2200 digital projects to the DHA, we’ve identified some opportunities for optimization of the database. These have been shared with WHO colleagues.
Recommendations for digital health data collection and sharing

- The digital health community should define inclusion criteria for a digital tool, as the range of tools included now is too broad for meaningful comparison.

- The digital health community should agree upon standardized definitions for basic data elements such as donor, use case, implementer, and software, similar to how they have defined digital health challenges and interventions.

- Data about digital tool deployments is more effective when it’s collected at the point of implementation and date-stamped, not retrospectively. Funders, implementers, and tool owners should outline expectations for collection, sharing, and maintenance of this information as part of support for a country’s digital architecture, not just extractive data monitoring.

- Country governments, funders, and digital tool developers should align to promote the Digital Health Atlas (DHA) as the primary source of information about digital tool deployments globally, and create incentives for responsible parties to add and regularly update projects to the Atlas, with WHO playing an important role in maintenance and standardization.
Key messages

- The Map & Match dataset is imperfect, but can still serve as a valuable resource to identify general trends in global digital health tool deployments across countries, donors, implementing partners, use cases, and softwares, and set the stage for further research.

- There are clear market dominators in most stratifications of the data, and many of these are global goods that align well with USAID’s Digital Health Vision. There are also many digital health tool deployments that should be assessed for their potential to scale to other countries or to other use cases.

- USAID’s digital health investments align well (geographically, by use case, etc.) with those of the international donor community as a whole, which indicates opportunities to drive prioritization and focus areas in the future.

- As the landscape of COVID-19 has changed significantly since Map & Match data collection ended, more data is needed to assess countries’ current responses, priorities, and facilitators and barriers to sustainable digital development.
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