

1 Strengthening a collaborative approach to implementing surveillance systems: Lessons 2 from the Enhanced Gonococcal Antimicrobial Surveillance Programme (EGASP) in Malawi 3 and Zimbabwe

4 List of authors

5 Phiona Vumbugwa^{1,7}, Ismael Maatouk⁷, Anna Machiha², Mitch Matoga³, Collins Mitambo⁴, Rose
6 Nyirenda⁴, Ishmael Nyasulu⁵, Muchaneta Mugabe⁶, Mkhokheli Ngwenya⁶, Yamuna Mundade⁷,
7 Teodora Wi⁷, Magnus Unemo^{8,9}, Olusegun O. Soge^{1,10}

8 Affiliation

9 ¹University of Washington, Department of Global Health, Seattle, Washington, United States

10 ²Ministry of Health and Child Care, Harare, Zimbabwe

11 ³University of North Carolina Project Malawi, Lilongwe, Malawi

12 ⁴Ministry of Health, Lilongwe, Malawi

13 ⁵World Health Organization, Lilongwe, Malawi

14 ⁶World Health Organization, Harare, Zimbabwe

15 ⁷World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland

16 ⁸Örebro University Hospital, Örebro, Sweden

17 ⁹University College London, London, United Kingdom

18 ¹⁰Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathology, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington

19 Abstract

20
21 Background: With the number of antimicrobials available to effectively treat gonorrhoea rapidly
22 diminishing, surveillance of antimicrobial-resistant *Neisseria gonorrhoeae* (NG) is critical for global
23 public health security activity. Many low-and-middle-income countries (LMICs) have gaps in their
24 existing sexually transmitted infections (STIs) surveillance systems that negatively impact global
25 efforts geared towards achieving the United Nations (UN) Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). This
26 paper explains the contribution of collaborative surveillance systems to health systems strengthening
27 (HSS) learning from integrating NG surveillance into existing Ministries of Health's (MoH) antimicrobial
28 resistance (AMR) surveillance services in Malawi and Zimbabwe.

29
30 Methods: We used the WHO Enhanced Gonococcal Antimicrobial Surveillance Programme (EGASP)
31 implementation experiences in Malawi and Zimbabwe to demonstrate the collaboration in AMR and
32 STI surveillance. We conducted qualitative interviews with purposively selected health managers
33 directly participating in the AMR and STI programs using a standardized key informant guide to
34 describe how to plan for a collaborative surveillance system. Qualitative thematic analysis was
35 conducted to delineate stakeholders' recommendations using the health systems' building blocks.

36 Results: Stakeholder engagement, prioritization of needs, and power to negotiate were key drivers to
37 a successful collaborative surveillance system. Weak governance, policies, lack of accountability, and
38 different priorities, coupled with weak collaborations, workforce, and health information systems,
39 were challenges faced in having effective collaborative surveillance systems. Data availability, use, and
40 negotiation power were key drivers for the prioritization of collaborative surveillance. Including
41 collaborative surveillance in primary health services and increasing government budget allocation for
42 surveillance were recommended.

43 Conclusions: Strengthening collaborative surveillance systems in LMICs using a people-centered
44 approach increases transparency and accountability and empowers national institutions,
45 communities, and stakeholders to engage in sustainable activities that potentially strengthen health
46 systems. EGASP implementations in Zimbabwe and Malawi serve as models for other countries
47 planning to implement or improve collaborative surveillance systems in their context to guide clinical practice.

48 Key Words: collaborative approach, antimicrobial resistance, surveillance, *Neisseria gonorrhoeae*,
49 sexually transmitted infections, health systems strengthening, global public health, health information
50 systems

51

52 Introduction

53 In 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) estimated 82.4 million new global infections with
54 *Neisseria gonorrhoeae* (NG) in adults aged 15 to 49 years, with the highest prevalence in low-and-
55 middle-income countries (LMICs) (1–3). Globally, many countries have suboptimal sexually
56 transmitted infections (STIs) surveillance systems and laboratory diagnostics because of limited
57 epidemiologic and laboratory capacity, lack of political will, and funding (4,5). Lack of antimicrobial
58 resistance (AMR) surveillance further threatens the progress of achieving the United Nations’ (UN)
59 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which aim to ensure access to safe and affordable medicines
60 and vaccines for all (6–8). Health systems are weakened by a high disease burden, threatening the
61 countries’ economies as productive populations spend more time in hospitals (9). Most Sub-Saharan
62 African (SSA) countries rely on syndromic management of STIs due to limited access to diagnostic
63 assays (10–12). There is a growing need for countries to implement collaborative STI surveillance to
64 provide effective treatment.

65 There is limited data in countries to support the review of STI treatment guidelines. Few countries
66 conduct regular treatment performance assessments, which require laboratory diagnostics (13).
67 Countries’ surveillance systems implementation is guided by National Action Plans for Health Security
68 (NAPHS). Progress is limited by technical, operational, financial, and political challenges (14). While
69 funding mechanisms like The Pandemic Fund and the Global Fund COVID-19 Response Mechanism
70 provided new opportunities for countries to prioritize and improve epidemic preparedness, effectively
71 leveraging funding can be challenging (4,15). Focusing on collaborative surveillance would inform
72 changes needed to respond to and manage AMR and strengthen health systems.

73 Understanding the process of planning collaborative surveillance potentiates health leaders to make
74 appropriate decisions for better population health outcomes. The WHO Enhanced Gonococcal
75 Antimicrobial Surveillance Programme (EGASP) is a special project under the Global Antimicrobial
76 Resistance and Use Surveillance System (GLASS) to strengthen sentinel surveillance for gonococcal
77 AMR (16). EGASP is a collaborative effort between the WHO, the United States Centers for Disease
78 Control and Prevention (CDC), and WHO collaborating centers on STIs. The EGASP enhances the
79 laboratory capacity in early detection and reporting of NG strains with elevated minimum inhibitory
80 concentrations (MICs) to the recommended treatment for gonorrhoea and emerging resistance to
81 new antibiotics for gonorrhoea at the national level (17,18). Malawi and Zimbabwe are amongst the
82 13 initial EGASP countries and implemented EGASP in 2023 through their national AMR surveillance
83 programs. The global AMR for NG information is reported and shared through GLASS IT WHONET, a
84 Windows-based digital health information system (DHIS) database that captures, analyzes, and
85 manages microbiology laboratory data (19). Collaborative surveillance is a multifaceted concept
86 crucial in enhancing security, safety, and efficiency across all the pillars of health systems
87 strengthening (HSS).

88 Literature has revealed that several organizations have integrated various programs and projects.
89 There is little documented evidence on collaborative surveillance, and many organizations struggle to
90 understand the best way possible (20). Understanding the considerations for implementing
91 collaborative surveillance supports the implementation of the NAPHS strategic toolkit, which shows
92 promises to strengthen health systems. Learning from the EGASP implementation in Malawi and
93 Zimbabwe, the present study details key considerations when implementing collaborative
94 surveillance. Using the six health systems building blocks, we describe challenges to prioritizing

95 collaborative surveillance systems and recommendations when collaborating surveillance systems to
96 contribute to health system strengthening.

97 **Methodology**

98 Design

99 The study follows the qualitative case study design where key informant interviews (KIIs) were
100 conducted using a structured interview guide. Drawing experiences from the EGASP in Malawi and
101 Zimbabwe settings, we demonstrate how collaborative surveillance was planned, the challenges
102 faced, and recommendations for future countries planning to implement collaborative surveillance in
103 routine settings. The study was conducted from April 1st to November 29th 2023.

104 Setting /context

105 Malawi and Zimbabwe are landlocked countries proximal to each other located in the Southern region
106 of Africa. The two countries were selected for EGASP implementation based on their burden of STIs
107 and prior participation in the WHO GASP in 2017. Both countries have functioning microbiology
108 reference laboratories that can perform culture, antimicrobial susceptibility testing, and quality
109 assurance measures. The availability of a clear leadership structure that supports, manages, and
110 guides the implementation of the STI and AMR supported the establishment of sentinel sites required
111 to implement the EGASP in both countries. The EGASP program is run at high-volume STI sites where
112 clinicians systematically collect swabs from men attending the clinic with a suspected urogenital
113 gonorrhoea episode (such as the presence of urethral discharge). The urethral specimens are sent to
114 a reference lab for NG culture and antimicrobial susceptibility testing (AST). An implementing partner,
115 the University of North Carolina (UNC) Project Malawi Research Institute in Malawi and the
116 government-owned National Microbiology Reference Laboratory (NMRL) in Zimbabwe support the
117 EGASP NG lab activities.

118 Participants selection, recruitment, and eligibility

119 Eight health managers directly participating in the AMR, STIs, and EGASP surveillance systems, working
120 in the Ministry of Health (MoH) and its partners at the national level, were purposely selected. All
121 participants were leaders in a clinical or laboratory decision-making role with experience in leading,
122 coordinating, implementing, or providing technical support to the STIs and AMR programs. Only
123 participants involved in the EGASP with a leadership role who consented to be interviewed were
124 included.

125 Health systems building blocks framework

126 Using the World Health Organization's (WHO) six health systems building blocks framework,
127 participants gave their perspectives on challenges and key considerations when prioritizing an
128 expanded scope of collaborative routine surveillance. The framework is used in public health to guide
129 strengthening health systems and improve healthcare delivery, describing the essential components
130 that, when properly developed and integrated, can enhance healthcare systems' overall resilience and
131 effectiveness (13). Table 1 below shows the six building blocks and their focus on collaborative
132 surveillance.

133 Table 1: Health systems strengthening framework in the context of WHO EGASP

Health systems building block	Focus	Areas to strengthen
Leadership and Governance	Overall coordination and management of EGASP	Governance structures, regulations, and policies that guide surveillance system functioning

Information Systems	Collecting, managing, and utilizing data to inform decision-making and monitor the health status of populations.	Timely and quality data collection, analysis, use, and dissemination.
Health Financing	Adequate and sustainable financing of EGASP	The mobilization, allocation, and utilization of financial resources for the surveillance system
Health Workforce	Skilled and motivated workforce to implement EGASP	Training, recruitment, retention, and deployment of healthcare professionals within the surveillance system
Service delivery	Availability and accessibility of essential healthcare services	Improving the quality of healthcare services makes them more responsive to community needs (NG treatment).
Medical & laboratory supplies	Access to essential medical products and technologies	Procurement, supply chain management, and quality assurance of these products.

134 Data collection

135 Participants were identified during the EGASP laboratory and sentinel site assessment visits in Malawi
 136 and Zimbabwe, i.e., while providing technical support to country leadership. Based on the participants’
 137 availability, interviews were scheduled for 30 minutes, conducted, and recorded via ZOOM.
 138 Participants were emailed the key informant guide three to seven days before the interviews.
 139 Interviews were conducted by the lead author in English. We reviewed grey literature from reports
 140 compiled from EGASP country visits, countries' sentinel site assessment reports, discussions from
 141 implementation meetings, and documents shared by participants on NG surveillance to augment
 142 interview data.

143 Data analysis

144 The lead author manually transcribed and analyzed all recordings using Dedoose version 9.0. The
 145 transcription process involved reading the text multiple times, thus enhancing the author’s familiarity
 146 with the transcripts. The analysis was done per each health system building block. Researchers went
 147 on to code every line of the transcripts to identify emergent themes. This was followed by a grouping
 148 of codes with similar ideas. To better understand key informant’s accounts, we used the notes and
 149 documents referenced by participants collected during the interviews and country visits. A descriptive
 150 analysis detailed the challenges, facilitators, and recommendations in prioritizing collaborative
 151 surveillance using the health systems' building blocks.

152 Positionality statement

153 The professional knowledge in healthcare and practice-based experience from the EGASP that the
 154 lead analyst (PV) participated in helped to conceptualize the research. Participants were engaged in a
 155 sensitive and open manner. The research was conducted ethically, respecting inclusive and equitable
 156 workspace for all gender identities.

157 Ethical considerations

158 The University of Washington (UW) internal review board (IRB) approved the study as non-human
 159 subject under the study number UW IRB STUDY00018156. The research paper was reviewed by WHO
 160 publication clearance committee. All participants gave informed verbal consent to participate and
 161 record at the start of the interviews. Verbal consent was documented on the a table in the interview
 162 script. No personally identifiable information (PII) was collected. The data was stored in a secure
 163 SharePoint folder on a computer with a protected password. This data is available upon request.

164 **Results**

165 Participants profile

166 Table 2: Participants profile

Organization	National Level	Above national level	Study Identification
Ministry of Health	5	0	MoH
Funding Agent	0	1	FA
Implementing Partners	1	1	IP
Total	6	2	

167 Of the six participants from the national level, three were from each country. Five participants
168 identified themselves as males, two as females, and one preferred not to disclose their gender
169 identity. All participants supported the EGASP implementation in Malawi and Zimbabwe.

170 Key considerations when collaborating on a surveillance system

171 Participants highlighted using existing surveillance priorities, strategies, resources, and data as
172 considerations countries use to plan an effective collaborative surveillance system. When planning for
173 the EGASP implementation, health leaders from the national level indicated that they used lessons
174 learned from Integrated Disease Surveillance Response (IDSR). However, this is activated in
175 emergencies. Key lessons from the EGASP collaborative surveillance included using existing structures,
176 people, processes, resources, coordinated plans, data, programs, and involvement in STI and NG
177 surveillance implementation.

178
179 A national leader from Malawi indicated the need to know the landscape, programs available,
180 stakeholders involved, and the flexibility of the programs for easy and efficient collaboration. In
181 support, participants stated that for EGASP in Malawi, the leadership team used the existing
182 collaborations to support the uptake and implementation of surveillance. Previously, the UNC Project
183 Malawi research institute, having a private laboratory fully equipped to run a national surveillance
184 system, worked with the MoH in Malawi in conducting NG resistance surveillance for gentamicin, the
185 first-line drug for syndromic treatment of urethral discharge in the country. In collaboration with the
186 laboratory, sentinel sites run within the MoH structures with dedicated health workers responsible
187 for data and sample collection. The sentinel site has a small laboratory for specimen handling,
188 packaging, and shipment to the reference laboratory. During working hours, a dedicated courier
189 transports specimens on a motorcycle from the clinic site to the reference laboratory. The UNC Project
190 Malawi Research Institute also strengthened MoH's national and regional laboratory reference
191 centers, conducting the AMR surveillance, including quality sample collection, handling, and
192 processing, which resulted in the two national laboratories becoming ISO 15189 certified. However,
193 the country's public health system faces human resources shortages in clinical and laboratory systems.
194 UNC Project Malawi, therefore, was selected to start the implementation of EGASP in Malawi while
195 building the MoH capacity for EGASP.

196
197 A participant from Zimbabwe emphasized that planning collaborative surveillance without engaging
198 relevant stakeholders would stall uptake and impede implementation. Another participant cited that
199 using existing structures and systems, low-hanging fruits, evidence, and experience from other public
200 health programs was essential in sustainable collaborative surveillance. The participants stated that
201 they used the expertise from implementing WHO GASP in 2018 to plan the WHO EGASP 2023
202 implementation. Three sentinel sites were selected, with the National Microbiology Reference
203 Laboratory (NMRL) conducting the EGASP laboratory activities, including NG culture and AST.
204 Although the sentinel sites chosen were located far from the NMRL, the district laboratories close to
205 the facilities had personnel knowledgeable about preserving the specimens before transportation.
206

207 All participants agreed that having a solid coordination system and a clearly defined structure
208 simplifies stakeholder communication and reporting while implementing the EGASP surveillance
209 system. One participant cited their country having rekindled collaboration with the neighboring
210 country, South Africa, in coordinating support with procurement and supply for critical reagents and
211 laboratory supplies that are not readily available in the country. Implementation was through the MoH
212 structures for both countries, with technical support from the WHO and WHO collaborating centers
213 in the USA and Sweden.

214

215 Governance and Leadership

216 Respondents cited policies required to prioritize collaborative surveillance, including the National
217 Health Strategic Plan, Joint Midterm Reviews, the Diagnostic Network Plan for public health
218 surveillance, laboratory preparedness, and response, as one of the ten global strategic focus areas.
219 Other frameworks to utilize were One Health Framework for Africa and the Biosafety and Biosecurity
220 Initiative launched in 2019, as one participant stated:

221 *“It is easier for a leader to institute workforce laws backed by policies and laws.” MoH*

222 Several participants agreed that policies empower leaders to prioritize collaborative surveillance at
223 organizational, national, regional, or primary levels through clearly articulated and documented
224 strategies. Another participant noted that policies support communication of the benefits of
225 collaborative surveillance when engaging key stakeholders in collaborative surveillance. Most
226 participants, however, cited the need to ensure enforcement, supervision, and implementation of
227 policies would support the strengthening of collaborative surveillance systems. One participant was
228 quoted saying:

229 *“Without accusing, there are policies that say, for example, every woman that attends an antenatal
230 clinic must have syphilis testing. That's a policy that exists in a country, and most countries achieve
231 80% of the people that come in readily available at antenatal clinic, it's not 100% as well for prophylaxis
232 prevention of ophthalmias neonatal. Yes, policies exist. But the enforcement, the supervision to assure,
233 and ensure that policies are implemented and followed up are where the gaps are. It's good to have a
234 policy, but it's another thing to have important policy and implementation.” MoH*

235 Health Information System

236 Participants indicated using data was essential in prioritizing what surveillance systems should
237 collaborate on. Participants from Malawi and Zimbabwe acknowledged using the WHONET reporting
238 platform for AMR to report EGASP data.

239 Six participants mentioned collaborative surveillance using available data, and data needs to
240 categorize priorities more effectively, coupled with resource optimization. One participant highlighted
241 that digitization of data collection would ease data access, analysis, and use, thereby justifying
242 collaborative surveillance to support the strengthening of systems:

243 *“It is easy to plan and prioritize collaborative surveillance because the data speaks better. But because
244 all the data sets are in books, it becomes difficult to analyze them; you need to make them electronic.
245 Imagine vaccinating more than 10 or 15 million people, and that information is in your booklet; how
246 will you analyze it?” IP*

247 Another participant echoed that the first thing to do is a mindset change, understanding that the
248 quality of data used determines the outcome product of their plan; therefore, credible plans and
249 decisions require credible and reliable data. In support, one respondent highlighted that:

250 *“motivators are a difficult phenomenon to bring about and use as a driving force for enhancing
251 surveillance because they always change. Over time, they will be pushed by activists and by interest,
252 like political interest; now, if COVID-19 had affected more villages and confined itself to small villages*

253 *in Africa, the response would not have been the same. So, motivators are defined by the people; they*
254 *come and go, they're not reliable, but data is reliable." MoH*

255 Health financing

256 To strengthen the implementation of collaborative surveillance, participants indicated that building
257 from existing resources would be essential to pivot the new resource gaps in the system. In their
258 descriptions, participants agreed that Zimbabwe and Malawi laboratories capacity building received
259 support from the Fleming Fund, an entity supporting LMICs to generate, share, and use data to
260 improve AMR surveillance through the One Health approach. Three participants stated that the
261 funding supported more than thirty laboratories to generate AMR surveillance, including five
262 veterinary laboratories, seven for human health, one dedicated towards food, and one for the
263 environment across Zimbabwe and Malawi. Building on this momentum, another participant indicated
264 that the WHO trained sixty Zimbabwean nationals from MoH, Lands, Agriculture, Fisheries, Water,
265 Climate and Rural Development (MoLAFWRD) and Environment, Climate, Tourism and Hospitality
266 Industry (METHI) to support the AMR surveillance. With the available resources, the EGASP funding
267 was focused on procuring Etest strips, refresher training, and supportive visits.

268 Two national managers indicated having surveillance systems is costly, and an estimated budget
269 informs making realistic decisions and areas of prioritization on collaborative surveillance systems.
270 One participant responded that:

271 *"But I think, as I mentioned before, it is important that when it comes to financing, we understand*
272 *exactly how much it costs us to do surveillance, what resources we need, then we'll be able to source*
273 *funds according to our need and prioritization. If we do not understand how much it costs us, we will*
274 *always feel like we don't have enough to plan collaborative surveillance." FA*

275 Participants stated that reliance on public funding sources is the ideal funding scenario that promotes
276 the prioritization of collaborative surveillance. All participants mentioned that collaboration is made
277 easy when the government prioritizes surveillance funding augmented by donor funding. One
278 participant supported this by saying:

279 *"I think political leaders and decision-makers tend to think that surveillance is the responsibility of a*
280 *funder. But, for instance, with STIs, we're doing syndromic management. You cannot just do central*
281 *syndromic management without surveillance because you need to validate those treatment algorithms*
282 *continuously, and without surveillance, it's not going to be possible, yet that is not considered a priority*
283 *for funding. The only possible way is to ride on existing funding for AMR to run the few samples we*
284 *can, but that is also not sustainable." MoH.*

285 Health Workforce

286 Participants stated that investment in health workforce education and training matches the
287 population's needs as a driver to support collaborative surveillance. One participant stated that having
288 a skilled workforce who understand the importance of surveillance and are keen and able to use and
289 interpret surveillance data supports prioritizing collaborative surveillance. Some participants
290 suggested that having a skilled workforce at all health facilities drives the plan to collaborate on
291 surveillance systems. For EGASP, participants stated that sentinel sites were selected based on
292 adequate staffing of health facilities to ensure program continuity. Participants stated that building a
293 resilient and motivated workforce with retention strategies is key to implementing collaborative
294 surveillance and systems strengthening.

295 One respondent indicated that:

296 *"If countries in the African region cannot afford to have staff specifically hired to conduct routine*
297 *surveillance, it complicates the patient flow, and the current budgets do not allow, rather governments*

298 *and other stakeholders should try to make the available workforce adopt the guidelines, this has been*
299 *helping other countries in deploying health workers to rural, remote, and underserved areas.” FA*

300 Service delivery

301 Participants agreed that providing an adequate service requires collaborative effort, support, and
302 relationship building among staff and management. Clear communication and involvement were cited
303 as integral to having a collaborative surveillance system with the potential to strengthen health
304 systems. Participants indicated the need to streamline activities according to the capacity of staff and
305 infrastructure, which could promote the implementation of collaborative surveillance where the
306 workload and staff are balanced. One participant was quoted saying:

307 *“One of the most depressing terminologies that I came across, unfortunately, was task shifting and*
308 *task sharing. And it meant that you are a doctor but be a clerk and a laboratory person simultaneously,*
309 *and you cannot. As such, collaboration is only feasible where the workforce and the demand for service*
310 *are aligned.” IP*

311 Logistics and supplies

312 Four participants cited strong stakeholder coordination and inter-agency engagement, while three
313 indicated empowering countries to prioritize local markets as essential to having the commodities and
314 supplies. One participant, however, stated:

315 *“if governments have resources to support the procurement of TB and Malaria commodities, the same*
316 *strategy should be channeled to procurement for all other systems; that way, implementation is made*
317 *easy.” MoH*

318 Learning from EGASP, using WHO collaborating centers, and engaging with neighboring countries
319 already implementing the same projects facilitated the procurement and shipment of supplies to the
320 EGASP participating countries. Early procurement of commodities during the initial stage of
321 engagements also allowed supplies to be received well on time before implementation.

322

323 *Challenges faced in implementing a collaborative surveillance system*

324 All participants agreed that LMICs face a myriad of challenges while implementing collaborative
325 surveillance systems. Two national leaders cited an example of staff shortage at laboratory and
326 sentinel sites, which threatens implementation sustainability as staff become overwhelmed with
327 work. One public health leader, however, indicated that careful consideration of tasks is required to
328 avoid duplicating work and roles. Another participant stated:

329 *“Having dedicated staff is expensive and not sustainable; countries, therefore, try to train at least*
330 *everyone depending on funding, but again, with high health worker mobility, this is a huge challenge.”*
331 *IP*

332 Non-availability of commodities was cited as a critical challenge to having a collaborative surveillance
333 implementation by participants. One participant indicated that most commodities specifically for
334 laboratory tests are manufactured out of Sub-Saharan Africa, rendering it a bottleneck in engaging
335 collaborative surveillance; either the commodities become too expensive or unavailable, taking
336 months before they are delivered, which heavily impacts timelines. The risk of having commodities
337 expire on hand before use due to bureaucratic local and external approvals was cited by five
338 participants as detrimental to collaborating systems.

339 Lack of support from stakeholders from government policymakers, communities, implementing
340 partners, and other sector ministries has been cited as a significant setback in implementing

341 collaborative surveillance. One participant called attention to the EGASP surveillance being
342 implemented and key stakeholders not being involved. In support, an MoH participant stated that:

343 *“stakeholders are key in driving the program, and hence, when left out, other parts to promote*
344 *collaboration will pull down efforts regardless of having all plans and resources in place. Such include*
345 *other health departments like health promotion, other sector ministries, implementing partners, and*
346 *civil societies and communities.” MoH*

347 Where funding is available, one manager highlighted that most of the resources go into commodities
348 like medicines and consumables, with very little going into infrastructure upgrades or human resource
349 capacity development, restricting capacity to do mapping of what other programs and services can be
350 collaborated. In unison, participants cited lack of funding as a key driver in stalling collaborative
351 surveillance. One participant stated:

352 *“... for example, the net budget for financing routine surveillance is donor dependent, with*
353 *approximately 60% of all program specific, like the HIV and TB programs, up to 90% donor funded, the*
354 *government funding is very little to none, funding emerges when there is an emergency, how then do*
355 *you plan collaboration?” MoH*

356 Lack of accuracy, timeliness, and use of data was also a challenge to collaborative surveillance, cited
357 by four participants. One international participant indicated that countries lack mechanisms that
358 collect data needed to make informed decisions. At the same time, another argued that mechanisms
359 to collect data are available, and what is lacking is the ability to analyze and use the data to inform
360 collaboration. The same participant cited that most LMICs have become so donor-dependent that they
361 take every program that comes with funding without looking at the country's priorities; such programs
362 make collaborating challenging due to the funding and mechanism restrictions even though they could
363 be aligning. Therefore, health leaders were cited for lacking the power to negotiate for collaboration
364 of surveillance programs.

365 All participants pointed out that programs tend to maintain parallel reporting systems, which creates
366 a heavy burden for data collection, analysis, and use. One participant cited that the WHONET platform
367 is not integrated with the national level's District Health Information System 2 (DHIS2), hindering data
368 sharing and access to credible data to inform collaborative surveillance.

369

370 *Recommendations when Implementing a Collaborative Surveillance*

371 Several recommendations for implementing collaborative surveillance were discussed by participants
372 using their knowledge of EGASP as well as past experiences. Participants recommended using sector-
373 wide approaches, human center design, data, existing resources, collaboration, line-ministries
374 coordination, and existing policies when implementing collaborative surveillance systems. Key
375 informants indicated that for health leaders to plan collaborative surveillance, there is a need to
376 increase accountability, transparency, and responsiveness to action plans. A participant from MoH
377 encouraged supported people-centered care approaches, stating that empowering communities in
378 health decision-making processes will support collaborative implementation and responding to
379 community needs. Another participant recommended that Health leaders ensure coordination and
380 inclusivity of projects through multisectoral, multi-stakeholder, public, and private sector
381 collaborations. Table 3 summarizes the recommendations provided by participants.

382

383 Table 3: Recommendations for implementing a collaborative surveillance system

Health systems focus	Main Challenge	Approach
-----------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------

Governance & Leadership	No policies and enforcement of policies, if available	A people-centered approach using quality and evidence-based decisions.
Health Financing	Low or no public funds with high external funding dependence	Use a sector-wide approach to mobilize and manage resource allocation through resource mapping and needs assessments. The government should specify and increase the budget allocated to surveillance.
Health Information System	Fragmented and siloed health information systems (disease- or funder-specific) are not linked to the national data warehouse systems.	One entirely digitized national health information system that can provide visual analysis for data at all health facility levels.
Health Workforce	Shortage of staff, inadequately trained workforce	Investment in education and training of health workers to match employment needs
Service Delivery	Fragmented and siloed systems	Strengthen primary health integration of services policies – not siloed systems.
Medical Supplies	Expensive commodities due to no locally available manufacturing capacities and complex supply chain systems.	Countries to leverage universities and external partnerships to manufacture their own reagents and testing kits

384

385 Discussion

386 The present study demonstrates an inseparable relationship between HSS pillars when considering
 387 collaborative surveillance learning from the EGASP implementation and evidence from the health
 388 leaders. The key to successful collaborative surveillance remains stakeholder engagement and
 389 consultations, and countries take a front-line role in steering and leading the processes. The approach
 390 can be applied at community, subnational, national, regional, and global levels, relying on shared and
 391 effective governance, communication, collaboration, and coordination. Leadership and management
 392 capacities require effective advocacy, governance, financing, resource mobilization, and quality
 393 improvement of these complex efforts to sustain health systems (21,22).

394 EGASP countries, together with WHO and WHO collaborating centers, have demonstrable evidence of
 395 successful collaboration by utilizing the existing standardized health systems and laboratories. To
 396 implement in the routine setting, using experiences from other public health programs
 397 implementation provides context-based decisions that can be replicable when considering other
 398 interventions of collaboration. To achieve successful and sustainable collaborations that maximize
 399 resources, private and public stakeholders can learn from other programs or interventions that are
 400 successfully collaborated (23,24). Collaborative surveillance in a routine setting involves multiple
 401 entities or organizations working together to collect, analyze, share information, or resources to
 402 enhance situational awareness, detect threats, and respond effectively (25,26). More importantly,
 403 collaboration breaks information silos, improving data flow between organizations for better decisions
 404 (27). By sharing information and resources, organizations can avoid duplicating efforts and allocate
 405 resources more effectively.

406 The strength that lies in good governance exhibited through accountability, transparent leadership,
 407 and collaborative routine surveillance is often underestimated for its potential to strengthen health

408 systems. Clear, binding policies and legislation allow stakeholders to make decisions, secure resources,
409 and collect data without constant change or fear of political persecution. Although political influence
410 and support are essential, this often derails progress when power shifts from one hand to another.
411 Good governance includes having policies that protect investments and steer support for technical
412 leaders who, most often, are responsible for making decisions to ensure service integration across all
413 health system pillars (28,29).

414 The results of the present study showed that collaborative surveillance requires holistic attention to
415 how all health system pillars perform. No pillar is superior to the other, nor alone would collaborative
416 surveillance be effective. The pillars work hand in glove, and prioritizing one and not the other
417 potentially affects the performance and function of the other. Balancing new and existing tasks is
418 essential for successful collaboration to ensure quality service provision and data management, which
419 informs better decision-making (30,31). A sustainable collaborative program is guaranteed when
420 continuous oversight of the entire system's performance is provided. It is critical to note the link and
421 ripple effects of lack of funding, donor dependency on the health workforce, health information
422 systems, and supplies and commodities in strengthening collaborative surveillance systems (32).
423 Although mobilizing local funds to support collaborative surveillance positively impacts the
424 strengthening of systems, it is only a starting point to enhancing the performance of other health
425 system pillars. As the world's focus shifts to globalization and sustainable funding, governments in
426 Africa ought to take a leaf from the after-shocks of COVID-19 and realize that if COVID-19 had only
427 happened in Africa, the response would not have been the same (33,34).

428 Advocacy and digitalization are powerful tools necessary for strengthening health systems, yet very
429 few individuals and institutions prioritize empowering health managers and technical leaders in these
430 areas. Not all health leaders with the power to make decisions have the knowledge of data use and
431 interpretation. To plan an effective collaborative surveillance system, investment in digitalization and
432 focusing efforts on data capturing, analysis, use, and dissemination should be a priority for health
433 stakeholders (35). Developing, strengthening, and reviewing health policies relies on data. With data,
434 health managers should be adequately prepared to convince policymakers, legislators, financing
435 agencies, and private organizations of the need to prioritize collaborative surveillance, which
436 potentially strengthens health systems.

437 **Limitations**

438 The study depended on having access to key persons coordinating, collaborating, managing, or
439 implementing EGASP and AMR surveillance in Zimbabwe and Malawi only. Given the limited number
440 of leaders in that area, the study relied on country visits, reports, and grey literature from the
441 implementations to improve the validity of the results.

442 **Conclusions**

443 EGASP and national AMR programs collaborated on surveillance, bringing a potential resource to
444 providing the evidence required by countries to validate and review syndromic treatment guidelines,
445 potentially strengthening health systems. There is a need to strengthen collaborative surveillance
446 systems in LMCs using a people-centred approach that increases transparency, accountability and
447 empowers national institutions and communities for sustainable activities. To achieve a sustainable
448 and successful collaborative surveillance system that maximizes resources from both private and
449 public sources, country-led stakeholders' engagements are key to using contextualized evidence in
450 decision-making when choosing the best approach to implementation. Advocacy and digitalization are
451 essential for strengthening the surveillance systems requiring direct investments. Lessons learned
452 from EGASP implementations in Zimbabwe and Malawi serve as models for other countries that plan
453 to implement or improve collaborative surveillance systems for a routine setting in their context.

454

455 *Funding statement:* Researchers received no funding to carry out the study.

456 *Declaration of interest:* The authors declare no conflict of interest.

457 **References**

- 458 1. WHO releases new guidance to improve testing and diagnosis of sexually transmitted
459 infections [Internet]. [cited 2024 Mar 13]. Available from:
460 [https://www.who.int/news/item/24-07-2023-who-releases-new-guidance-to-improve-](https://www.who.int/news/item/24-07-2023-who-releases-new-guidance-to-improve-testing-and-diagnosis-of-sexually-transmitted-infections)
461 [testing-and-diagnosis-of-sexually-transmitted-infections](https://www.who.int/news/item/24-07-2023-who-releases-new-guidance-to-improve-testing-and-diagnosis-of-sexually-transmitted-infections)
- 462 2. Rowley J, Vander Hoorn S, Korenromp E, Low N, Unemo M, Abu-Raddad LJ, et al.
463 Chlamydia, gonorrhoea, trichomoniasis and syphilis: global prevalence and incidence
464 estimates, 2016. *Bull World Health Organ*. 2019 Aug 1;97(8):548-562P.
- 465 3. Global progress report on HIV, viral hepatitis and sexually transmitted infections, 2021
466 [Internet]. [cited 2024 Mar 13]. Available from: [https://www.who.int/publications-detail-](https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/9789240027077)
467 [redirect/9789240027077](https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/9789240027077)
- 468 4. Unemo M, Lahra MM, Cole M, Galarza P, Ndowa F, Martin I, et al. World Health
469 Organization Global Gonococcal Antimicrobial Surveillance Program (WHO GASP): review
470 of new data and evidence to inform international collaborative actions and research
471 efforts. *Sex Health*. 2019 Sep;16(5):412–25.
- 472 5. Fleming Fund [Internet]. [cited 2024 Mar 13]. Malawi: Country Grant. Available from:
473 <https://www.flemingfund.org/grants/malawi-country-grant/>
- 474 6. Anand P, Wu L, Mugwanya K. Integration of sexually transmitted infection and HIV pre-
475 exposure prophylaxis services in sub-Saharan Africa: a scoping review. *Front Reprod*
476 *Health*. 2023;5:944372.
- 477 7. Bridging the gaps in the global ... | Routledge Open Research [Internet]. [cited 2024 Mar
478 13]. Available from: <https://routledgeopenresearch.org/articles/1-8>
- 479 8. Gajdács M, Urbán E, Stájer A, Baráth Z. Antimicrobial Resistance in the Context of the
480 Sustainable Development Goals: A Brief Review. *Eur J Investig Health Psychol Educ*. 2021
481 Jan 19;11(1):71–82.
- 482 9. Cameron A, Esiovwa R, Connolly J, Hursthouse A, Henriquez F. Antimicrobial Resistance
483 as a Global Health Threat: The Need to Learn Lessons from the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Glob*
484 *Policy*. 2022 May;13(2):179–92.
- 485 10. Kiggundu R, Lusaya E, Seni J, Waswa JP, Kakooza F, Tjipura D, et al. Identifying and
486 addressing challenges to antimicrobial use surveillance in the human health sector in low-
487 and middle-income countries: experiences and lessons learned from Tanzania and
488 Uganda. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control*. 2023 Feb 9;12(1):9.
- 489 11. Chandy SJ, Thomas K, Mathai E, Antonisamy B, Holloway KA, Stalsby Lundborg C. Patterns
490 of antibiotic use in the community and challenges of antibiotic surveillance in a lower-
491 middle-income country setting: a repeated cross-sectional study in Vellore, South India. *J*
492 *Antimicrob Chemother*. 2013 Jan;68(1):229–36.

- 493 12. Matoga M, Chen JS, Krysiak R, Ndalama B, Massa C, Bonongwe N, et al. Gentamicin
494 Susceptibility in *Neisseria gonorrhoeae* and Treatment Outcomes for Urogenital
495 Gonorrhoea After 25 Years of Sustained Gentamicin Use in Malawi. *Sex Transm Dis*. 2022
496 Apr 1;49(4):251–6.
- 497 13. Mchenga M, Chirwa GC, Chiwaula LS. Impoverishing effects of catastrophic health
498 expenditures in Malawi. *Int J Equity Health*. 2017 Jan 21;16(1):25.
- 499 14. Latif AS, Gwanzura L, Machiha A, Ndowa F, Tarupiwa A, Gudza-Mugabe M, et al.
500 Antimicrobial susceptibility in *Neisseria gonorrhoeae* isolates from five sentinel
501 surveillance sites in Zimbabwe, 2015-2016. *Sex Transm Infect*. 2018 Feb;94(1):62–6.
- 502 15. Totten MK. Collaborative Governance the Key to Improving Community Health. *Trustee J*
503 *Hosp Gov Boards*. 2016;69(7):19–22.
- 504 16. Enhanced Gonococcal Antimicrobial Surveillance Programme (EGASP): general protocol
505 [Internet]. [cited 2024 Mar 13]. Available from: [https://www.who.int/publications-detail-
506 redirect/9789240021341](https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/9789240021341)
- 507 17. WHO_diagnostic_testing_2023.pdf [Internet]. [cited 2024 Mar 13]. Available from:
508 https://sahivsoc.org/Files/WHO_diagnostic%20testing_2023.pdf
- 509 18. Wadsworth CB, Sater MRA, Bhattacharyya RP, Grad YH. Impact of Species Diversity on the
510 Design of RNA-Based Diagnostics for Antibiotic Resistance in *Neisseria gonorrhoeae*.
511 *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2019 Aug;63(8):e00549-19.
- 512 19. Global antimicrobial resistance and use surveillance system (GLASS) report: 2022
513 [Internet]. [cited 2024 Mar 13]. Available from: [https://www.who.int/publications-detail-
514 redirect/9789240062702](https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/9789240062702)
- 515 20. Everybody's business -- strengthening health systems to improve health outcomes
516 [Internet]. [cited 2024 Mar 13]. Available from: [https://www.who.int/publications-detail-
517 redirect/everybody-s-business---strengthening-health-systems-to-improve-health-
518 outcomes](https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/everybody-s-business---strengthening-health-systems-to-improve-health-outcomes)
- 519 21. Global health sector strategies on HIV, viral hepatitis and sexually transmitted infections
520 for the period 2022-2030 [Internet]. [cited 2024 Mar 13]. Available from:
521 <https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/9789240053779>
- 522 22. Essue BM, Kapiriri L. Priority setting for health system strengthening in low income
523 countries. A qualitative case study illustrating the complexities. *Health Syst Basingstoke*
524 *Engl*. 2021;10(3):222–37.
- 525 23. Vumbugwa P, Puttkammer N, Majaha M, Stampfly S, Biondich P, Shivers JE, et al.
526 Leveraging Health Information System Maturity Assessments to Guide Strategic Priorities:
527 Perspectives from African Leaders [Internet]. medRxiv; 2024 [cited 2024 Mar 13]. p.
528 2024.02.27.24303453. Available from:
529 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2024.02.27.24303453v1>

- 530 24. Ministry of Public Health of the DRC. National Development Plan Health Informatics 2020-
531 2024. 2020. National Agency for Clinical Engineering, Information and Health Informatics
532 (ANICiS) (unpublished).
- 533 25. Agarwal A, Kapila K, Kumar S. WHONET Software for the Surveillance of Antimicrobial
534 Susceptibility. *Med J Armed Forces India*. 2009 Jul;65(3):264–6.
- 535 26. Pradier C, Balinska MA, Bailly L. Enhancing multi-sectoral collaboration in health: the open
536 arena for public health as a model for bridging the knowledge-translation gap. *Front
537 Health Serv*. 2023;3:1216234.
- 538 27. Modernizing Global Health Security to Prevent, Detect, and Respond - 1st Edition |
539 Elsevier Shop [Internet]. [cited 2024 Mar 13]. Available from:
540 [https://shop.elsevier.com/books/modernizing-global-health-security-to-prevent-detect-
541 and-respond/mcnabb/978-0-323-90945-7](https://shop.elsevier.com/books/modernizing-global-health-security-to-prevent-detect-and-respond/mcnabb/978-0-323-90945-7)
- 542 28. RWANDA National Strategy for Health Professions Development (NSHPD 2020-2030).pdf
543 [Internet]. [cited 2024 Mar 13]. Available from:
544 [https://www.rbc.gov.rw/fileadmin/user_upload/strategy/RWANDA%20National%20Stra
545 tegy%20for%20Health%20Professions%20Development%20%28NSHPD%202020-
546 2030%29.pdf](https://www.rbc.gov.rw/fileadmin/user_upload/strategy/RWANDA%20National%20Strategy%20for%20Health%20Professions%20Development%20%28NSHPD%202020-2030%29.pdf)
- 547 29. The Kenya Ministry of Health Virtual Academy. | MOH-VA [Internet]. [cited 2024 Mar 13].
548 Available from: <https://elearning.health.go.ke/>
- 549 30. Scobie H (CDC/DDPHSIS/CGH/GID). TRIANGULATION FOR IMPROVED DECISION-MAKING
550 IN IMMUNIZATION PROGRAMMES.
- 551 31. Tripartite and UNEP support OHHLEP’s definition of “One Health” [Internet]. [cited 2024
552 Mar 13]. Available from: [https://www.who.int/news/item/01-12-2021-tripartite-and-
553 unep-support-ohhlep-s-definition-of-one-health](https://www.who.int/news/item/01-12-2021-tripartite-and-uneep-support-ohhlep-s-definition-of-one-health)
- 554 32. Mathenge V, Onuekwe C, Nass S, Akim C, Msunyaró E, Mfinanga E, et al. Strategies to
555 improve COVID-19 vaccination coverage in Manyara region, Tanzania, July to September
556 2022: best practices and lessons learned. *Pan Afr Med J*. 2023;45(Suppl 1):3.
- 557 33. Tegally H, San JE, Cotten M, Moir M, Tegomoh B, Mboowa G, et al. The evolving SARS-
558 CoV-2 epidemic in Africa: Insights from rapidly expanding genomic surveillance. *Science*.
559 2022 Oct 7;378(6615):eabq5358.
- 560 34. Mounier-Jack S, Griffiths UK, Closser S, Burchett H, Marchal B. Measuring the health
561 systems impact of disease control programmes: a critical reflection on the WHO building
562 blocks framework. *BMC Public Health*. 2014 Mar 25;14:278.
- 563 35. Young AI, Benonisdottir S, Przeworski M, Kong A. Deconstructing the sources of genotype-
564 phenotype associations in humans. *Science*. 2019 Sep 27;365(6460):1396–400.
- 565