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Introduction

- Systematic approaches to laboratory capacity strengthening (CS) are scarce and little is known about how to monitor and measure CS impact in real-time.
- The Capacity Research Unit (CRU) assisted the Centre for Neglected Tropical Diseases to design, monitor and evaluate (M&E) the capacity development of selected NTD laboratories in Ghana, Kenya, Malawi and Sri Lanka, using Bates et al.’s (2014) 5-step approach to CS. This was a participatory process, involving each laboratory in all steps of the approach.
- Based on laboratory capacity baseline assessments each laboratory developed an individual CS action plan.
- The fifth step of the CS approach is about regular monitoring and refining individual CS action plans and indicators.
- Based on CRU’s experiences, recommendations are given that can inform future M&E of laboratory CS projects.

Methods

- Annual on-site visits and quarterly remote communication (email & Skype).
- Tools for visits: Interviews, focus group discussions, observations, checklists and questionnaires.
- Each on-site visit included a participatory feedback workshop, where all stakeholders assessed progress, reprogrammed action plans and revised indicators.
- Stakeholders included: directors; laboratory staff; heads of department; programme managers; and researchers.

M&E experiences

Benefits of systematic M&E of laboratory CS

- Regular engagement with all relevant stakeholders provides in-depth understanding of CS progress in real-time.
- Flexibility of the data collection tools captured contextual factors and facilitated cross-country comparisons.
- Feedback workshops ensured that reprogramming of action plans took into consideration the perspectives of relevant stakeholders.
- Systematic involvement of CRU in monitoring and evaluation enabled the laboratories to get assistance and to receive recommendations on certain activities in real-time.

M&E challenges

- High staff turnover with different levels of M&E understanding.
- Difficulty to ensure that all relevant stakeholders are involved in monitoring and evaluation activities.
- Changes in prioritisations of capacity strengthening activities.

Selected CS achievements

Individual level

- Improved technical skills and understanding of quality management systems.

Institutional level

- Enhanced collaboration and support for national NTD programmes.
- Improved laboratory infrastructure.

National level

- Development of marketing strategies for laboratory services.
- Securing of additional funding.

International level

- Increased South-South collaboration.

Conclusion

- Monitoring and evaluation of laboratory CS should be systematic and participatory to achieve sustainable outcomes at different levels.
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