

HDC all-member call February 15, 2018

You can access a recording of this call here:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1GiDmHjmrCSJ8-QhkSFrb2nHPHa9oL147/view?usp=sharing>

Participants: David Butz (WDI @ U. of Michigan); Garrett Mehl, WHO; Liz Millar, MEASURE Evaluation; Lauren Wall, PATH/Digital Square; Adele Waugaman, USAID; Jennifer Shivers, Regenstrief; Christina Villella, MEASURE Evaluation; Lisa Spellman (MITA/DICOM); Paul Biondich, Regenstrief; Tigest Tamrat (WHO); Sam Wambugu (MEASURE Evaluation); Rita Sembajwe (RTI International); Martin Osumba (RTI); Steve Ollis (MCSP/JSI); Manish Kumar (MEASURE Evaluation); Pascal Mwele (RAD/ BroadReach), Miquel Sitjar (Palladium), Emily Nicholson (IntraHealth), Paul Tuthill (Jhpiego), Bill Weiss (USAID), Xen Santas (CDC); Steven Wanyee (Intellisoft Kenya & KeHIA)

Agenda:

- Welcome
- Recap of January discussion & next steps
- Discussion of non-software global good endorsement criteria
 - <http://pgb.me/dhiendorse> - DHI draft criteria synthesis
 - https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/16nZHBsb6Zjsh9T_7Fj7zvMXUspjh39CNSS76UT6WHJU/edit#gid=0 - software global good endorsement criteria
- Inputs to March HDC Technical Advisors' meeting
- Any other business

Recap of January DH&I WG meeting

- Review of December in-person meeting, which was oversubscribed. You can see a recap in our January minutes.
 - [The meeting report is saved on our Drive.](#)
- Review of Maturity model
- The DH&I WG established a third subworking group that is reviewing the [Digital Health investment Review toolkit \(DHIRT\)](#)
 - The DHIRT is a scoring tool designed to help funders (donors, ministries of health) integrate best practice like the Principles for Digital Development into digital health procurements. The tool includes 12 questions funders should ask, and an accompanying scorecard to rate the extent to which submitted proposals successfully answer these questions. It also includes links to other relevant tools that users of the DHIRT can use for further guidance/reference as needed.
 - Next meeting is February 23 - email lw@path.org to join
 - The tool includes the principles for digital development

- Looking for members to test out the tool -- look at existing proposals to review and refine the tool, particularly donors and implementers
- We conducted a 2017 after action review:
 - Request for small working groups to include other areas
 - Bring more donors and members of WHO to the table
 - Request for more alignment with other working groups and other efforts
 - Highlight of the role of the March co-leads working group meeting
 - Shared Platform for tools to be shared for global goods
 - Request for 2018 milestones and priorities identified
 - MOH request for assistance for which tools to use along maturity continuum
 - Consider endorsement for public goods and associated criteria
- Success in 2017 contributing to global goods (maturity model, pitch deck)
 - Request from the group to do more than that, to empower WG members to promote/refine global goods
 - Recognizing an all-volunteer group, and recognizing that many of these tools already in creation, WG in Dec agreed to focus efforts on identifying criteria to prioritize which of the tools under development should be prioritized for collaboration within the context of the DH&I WG
 - Digital Square has developed a [software global goods maturity model](#)
 - There is a request for engagement and/or endorsement of non-software global goods. At our in-person December meeting, we started drafting criteria for this group to use to determine our prioritization of engagement.
 - The cochairs of this group refined this list ([which can be seen here](#)), but there cannot yet be applied due to lacking (wo)man-power and availability of information.
 - In order to be able to validate or endorse things as 'good' public goods for countries to use, to enable us to move forward in a standardized way.
 - Now that we're thinking about how to apply this work we've done--thoughts on the criteria drafted to date? How should tools be validated at the country level?
 - Martin Osumba: Important to think through critically what this maturity model (prioritization criteria) should look like, how can it be applied at the country level -- in Kenya, implementation of the HDC roadmap: (1) beyond developing the roadmap there's a lack of clarity at the country level about the national secretariat responsible for overseeing monitoring the maturity process of global good adoption across the country. Does the maturity tool pick that up? (2) It's still not clear in terms of leveraging the maturity model to help them pitch conversations about alignment of initiatives and partners toward embracing a global good that has been endorsed. It's still business as usual, let's keep various efforts and initiatives running as they are notwithstanding the roadmap for monitoring adoption of global goods, incl their reuse and adaptation. Build countries' internal capacity to monitor.

- Paul: See the value in non-software global goods to help discern the sophistication and maturity of them because this will help countries determine which to work with. Right now we need to get to the place where we're able to determine the level of maturity of a given public good.
- Martin: Not just to assess maturity of the tool, but to also seek alignment around the use of mature tools.
- Paul: We heard in Dec that we need some coordination around the development and promotion of these tools.
- Rita: Can we include in the criteria some way to identify a core group in the Ministry -- denote the individuals how these tools are being used. A how-to-use manual (Martin).
- Sam Wambugu: Like the conversation so far; building off what's been said -- one category that we should consider including is availability of human capacity to apply the tools the way they are intended to be applied. Scale of the human resource capacity for digital health still too low.
- Steve Wanyee: Important as part of the strategy/process to think more about engagement related efforts at the country level. Figure out how to educate people about how similar or different this maturity work is from other efforts that might be aiming to achieve somewhat similar goals to this work, e.g. endorsement/certification efforts for digital health solutions.
- Xen Santas: Maturity model a multi-phase activity - focused on descriptions on different stages of maturity/improvement - measures/tools for assessing how to determine in any given context where one is along the continuum. Aim is to identify appropriate activities for getting to the next stage of activities. Aligns well in that specific activities will map well to specific global goods tools that are designed to get from one stage to the next. Determining for each tool at what point / staging of maturity / is the tool intended.
- Paul: Would need to be arrived at by experience.
- Garrett: Helpful for the global good to identify at what stage of maturity (within a country context) the tool would be most appropriate.
- Steve: Identifying when tools should be used -- need for continued dissemination and evangelism for these tools.
- Paul's summary: additional criteria to consider, as well as how we can guide people towards where in the implementation process the tools can be used, but also more granularity in the criteria so it can evolve into a maturity model itself.
- Pathway to use this criteria/strategy to apply the model:
 - Who does the assessment?
 - A) In order to be endorsed by the working group, the owners of the tool in question must answer the criteria questions

- B) Members of this working group can apply the criteria to the tool in question
 - C) The developers/owners of the tool first demonstrate to how their tool meets the criteria, and then the working group approves? This would put the burden of proof on the developer of the tool but would ensure that approval is standardized. (Emily Nicholson)
 - Emily: How many of the criteria would need to be met to be considered a global good? All, just some? Are the criteria weighted?
 - Do we want to create the expectation that these kinds of criteria are published publicly along with tool development?
 - Martin: Actual testing of the tool at country level should be required to understand how usable a tool is by implementers and the gov/MOH level. To what extent does the tool spur actionable decisions at country level to move up maturity levels.
 - Paul: Certain attributes of a tool that make it sustainable / a global good.
 - Adele: Should there be a standard way that country-level tester feedback should be gathered/shared with tool developers to support tool iteration/development?
 - Jennifer: would be good to have lists of tools currently in development/not yet endorsed, as well.
- Preparation for March HDC meeting (HDC Steering Committee and Working Group leads)
 - Opportunity to provide feedback on agenda - the agenda is being reworked and prioritized based on feedback from Steering Committee and WG leads
 - To be stewards of this group, the DH&I WG co chairs will share work that has been done, this group's priorities moving forward
 - We will also use our survey results (to be shared with this group via slide deck soon! Apologies for delay) to discuss group's priorities and requests for engagement with HDC at large
 - There may be a new strategy or organization of the HDC in order to best operationalize the groups and engage groups like ours more strategically
 - Request for key messages to share?
 - Bill: The meeting should provide us visibility into what other WGs are doing and they can see what we are doing. From this, we and other groups can better think about what are opportunities to work together with other groups? Also... how we support countries to implement and use global goods will be discussed.
 - Lisa Spellman: Extends thanks to the cochairs for running this group and keeping this moving forward.