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Conducting assessments

• Who conducts assessments in your country?
• When was the last set of assessments done?
• Were recommendations from assessments implemented?
• What tools do you use? What influences your use of the tool?
• If more than one is there a preference for one over the other?
• What resources are needed to support site level/country level implementation of assessments?

Accessibility to assessments

• Who is responsible for ME reporting in your country?
• How can we increase/improve access?
• Is there a database of ME assessments for your country? Would it be useful to have central repository of ME assessments?
• Based on visualisation presentations what did you like/not like? what would you like to see?
Summary of Responses

- Reporting on management effectiveness is the responsibility of the government.
- Combination of site-level and national level management authorities conduct assessments i.e. government authority, NGOs.
- Most known assessments are from within the past 1-5 years, some in the past ten.
- METT and RAPPAM seemed to be the most frequently used tools; usage partially influenced by donors, past usage and resources available.
- Frequency of assessments are mostly opportunistic and based on project/reporting cycles; dependent on funds, project goals, etc.
- Belize and Guyana appear to have rigorous national level assessment programs.
- Resources needed to support regular assessments included time, money, staff, building skills and technical capacity at national/site level to conduct assessments.
Day 1 Summary of Group work

- Uptake of recommendations from assessments was low or nil, due in part to restricted budget and resources to act.
- In the case of Belize and Guyana: *assessments are required by government and considered in national budgets*.
- Availability/access to assessment varies but is mostly limited.
- There is great interest in having a central repository for this information, but consideration needed as to who would manage this (time, money, staff...).
- Formal data-sharing agreement(s) and protocol(s) need to be in place.
- Visualisation is desirable and appealing; the story map seems easier to develop from a technical perspective but all options should be considered.
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