



TRIANGULATION FOR IMPROVED DECISION-MAKING IN IMMUNIZATION PROGRAMMES

WORKING DRAFT: JULY 2020

World Health Organization, UNICEF, and
U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Acknowledgments

This document was authored by Heather Scobie, Angela Montesanti, and Michelle Morales from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) in Atlanta; Jan Grevendonk, Carolina Danovaro, and Marta Gacic-Dobo from World Health Organization Headquarters (WHO) in Geneva; and Mamadou Diallo from UNICEF Headquarters in New York.

Substantive input was received by the Strategic Advisory Group of Experts Working Group on the Quality and Use of Immunization and Surveillance Data, including Jaleela Jawad (Ministry of Health, Bahrain), Noni MacDonald (Dalhousie University, Canada), Michael Edelstein (Public Health England, and member of the Technical Consultation on Data Triangulation), Ana Morice (Independent Consultant, Costa Rica), Hashim Elmoussaad (Independent Consultant, Pakistan), as well as the following participants in the Technical Consultation on Data Triangulation: David W. Brown from Brown Consulting Group International LLC; Tove Ryman from Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation; Riswana Soundardjee, Gustavo Correa, Lee Hampton, and Laura Craw, from Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance; Danni Daniels and Siddhartha Data from WHO Office for the European Region. We thank Roberta Pastore for the WHO Office for the Western Pacific Region; Minal Patel and Adam Cohen from WHO; Rajendra Bohara and Selina Ahmed from the WHO Country Office for Bangladesh; Lora Shimp, Adriana Alminana, Lisa Oot, and Wendy Prosser from John Snow Inc.; and Denise Traicoff, Aaron Wallace, Paul Chenoweth, Aybuke Koyuncu, Dmitri Prybylski, Jennie Harris, Gavin Grant, Kathleen Wannemuehler, Dieula Tchoualeu, Ben Dahl, Louie Rosencrans, Lauren Davidson, Sara Jacenko, Alyssa Wong, Joel Adegoke, Chung-Won Lee, Carla Lee from CDC, who reviewed drafts of this document and provided constructive comments. We also thank Chris Murrill, Sadhna Patel, Kristie Clarke, Susan Reef, and Morgane Donadel who provided valuable inputs when developing the triangulation framework. Additionally, we are grateful to the many colleagues who provided feedback through SurveyMonkey® and opportunities at the EPI Partners' Meeting in Budapest, Hungary (2018), WHO Region of the Eastern Mediterranean Monitoring Workshop, WHO Scholar course on Triangulation for Immunization Programme Improvement, and country workshops.

Disclaimer

Heather Scobie, Angela Montesanti and Michelle Morales work with the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Use of trade names is for identification only and does not imply endorsement by the Public Health Service or by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Jan Grevendonk, M. Carolina Danovaro[-Holliday] and Marta Gacic-Dobo work for the World Health Organization. The authors alone are responsible for the views expressed in this publication and they do not necessarily represent the decisions, policy or views of the World Health Organization.

Mamadou Diallo works for UNICEF. The author alone is responsible for the views expressed in this publication and they do not necessarily represent the decisions, policy or views of UNICEF.

Feedback can be addressed to EPITriangulation@gmail.com

Orientation to this Guide

1. Introduction

Triangulation is the synthesis of two or more existing data sources to address relevant questions for programme planning and decision-making. Triangulation can include assembling the data together in one graph or stitching information from several graphs together with a narrative thread. Triangulation requires critical thinking and some basic analysis skills, but the activity goes beyond making graphs — it's about turning data into reliable information for action.

Even in the absence of perfect data, public health practice has long acknowledged that combining many pieces of weaker evidence through triangulation can form a strong basis for more informed decision-making. Through the use of multiple data sources, the process identifies and addresses the limitations of any one data source and/or data collection methodology. A more complete view of the programme issue can be obtained by making sense of complementary information and integrating knowledge of the broader context.

2. Objectives of this Guide

Triangulation can be used by immunization and vaccine preventable disease (VPD) surveillance programmes to address key questions to guide management, tailor strategies, and make decisions to achieve goals. This guidance provides a systematic approach to using triangulation for programme improvement. To achieve success, the analyst's critical thinking and creative input are key. Within this context, **the main objectives of this triangulation guide** are as follows:

- »» To **increase knowledge and understanding** related to triangulation among immunization programme and VPD surveillance managers at the national and subnational levels;
- »» To **provide a triangulation process** for developing questions, identifying data sources, and interpret different data together considering underlying context and limitations;
- »» To **provide examples** of how triangulation can be used for programme improvement;
- »» To **provide guidance and resources for implementing data triangulation** and building data triangulation capacity within countries.

3. Document Structure and Target Audience

The [triangulation guide](#) is **structured for the national and subnational levels**. For both levels, there are separate documents for general triangulation guidance and annexes that provide specific triangulation guidance for key topics: immunity gaps; programme performance; and programme targets (denominators) (Fig 2). The content and focus of these documents are described in Table 1.

The **target audience** for the national guidance documents are immunization and VPD surveillance programme staff at the national, regional or provincial levels. The subnational guidance documents have been developed to orient staff to triangulation for key programme questions at the district or health facility levels (Fig 2). These guides may also be useful for non-governmental organizations providing programmatic and technical assistance to national immunization and/or VPD surveillance programmes.

Fig. 2. Structure of Triangulation Guidance. National guidance targeted for national & regional/provincial levels; subnational for district/facility levels.

Audience	Document	
All	0.  Cover & Orientation to Guide	
National 	1.  General Triangulation Guidance	
	Topic Specific Annexes	
	2.  Immunity gaps	
	3.  Programme performance	
4.  Programme targets (denominators)		
Sub-national 	5.  General Triangulation Guidance	
	Topic Specific Annexes	
	6.  Immunity gaps	
	7.  Programme performance	
8.  Programme targets (denominators)		

Triangulation is relevant for most contexts and a variety of different applications. To achieve success in triangulation (i.e., conducting analysis, incorporating into tools and processes, and building capacity) requires **adaptation to local context**. Materials to support capacity building are available by request at: EPITriangulation@gmail.com.

Table 1. Content and examples of questions covered in triangulation guidance by level

Document	 National level	 Sub-national level
 General guidance	In-depth introduction to triangulation principles and the 10-step process Hints on choosing questions, identifying data sources, visualizing and interpreting data	Fundamental introduction to triangulation and the 4-step process Hints on choosing questions, identifying data sources, summarizing data
 Immunity gaps: Annex	In-depth examples of triangulation to identify immunity gaps <i>Are there any age groups, geographic areas, high-risk populations with immunity gaps?</i>	Basic examples of triangulation to identify immunity gaps <i>Do the data suggest there are immunization coverage gaps?</i>
 Programme performance: Annex	In-depth examples of triangulation to assess programme performance <i>Is coverage compatible with other measures of programme performance and impact?</i>	Basic examples of triangulation to assess programme performance <i>Which health units have poor performance or data quality issues requiring follow-up?</i>
 Programme targets: Annex	In-depth examples of triangulation to assess programme targets (denominators) <i>Do immunization target population estimates align with known demographic trends?</i>	Basic examples of triangulation to assess programme targets (denominators) <i>Do programme targets accurately capture everyone in the catchment area?</i>

4. How the Guide was Developed

The use of triangulation to check data quality (i.e., external consistency) has been described in the WHO *Data Quality Review (DQR) toolkit*.¹ The current triangulation guide builds upon the DQR desk review and adapts the ‘public health triangulation’ process from the global HIV/AIDS programmes² as general best practices for data analysis across broad topics relevant for EPI.

This guide was developed based on evidence from a landscape review; experiences of triangulation use in countries; and feedback from a Technical Consultation on Data Triangulation, the SAGE Data Working Group, and other immunization experts. It has been shared during Immunization Data Partners’ Meeting (2018), a WHO Scholar Course, as well as regional and country-level workshops, and feedback from various participants has been considered. For further reading, a *Public Health Data Triangulation for Immunization and Vaccine-preventable Disease Surveillance Programmes: Draft Framework* is available online.²

Triangulation guidance has been incorporated into the *Gavi Analysis Guidance (2020)*, available in English, Spanish, French and Russian,³ and the WHO *Handbook on the use, collection, and improvement of immunization data* (March 2020 draft). These resources may also be helpful.

¹ World Health Organization (WHO). Data Quality Review. Geneva: WHO; 2017 [Available from: http://www.who.int/healthinfo/tools_data_analysis/dqr_modules/en/].

² WHO, UNICEF and U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Public Health Data Triangulation for Immunization and Vaccine-Preventable Disease Surveillance Programmes: Framework (draft). 2019. <https://www.learning.foundation/vpd-triangulation-draft>

³ Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance. Analysis Guidance (2020). <https://www.gavi.org/our-support/guidelines/report-and-renew>