# User feedback on ATLASS tool applied to *AMR in Salmonella isolated from pigs – a part of the DANMAP system*

March 2020

Contact: [Marianne Sandberg](#)

## General information

**Name of evaluation tool**: ATLASS
**Name of surveillance programme used in case**: AMR in Salmonella isolated from pigs – a part of DANMAP (DANMAP is an integrated approach for AMU/AMR in animals and humans in Denmark)
**Country of programme**: Denmark
**Surveillance component or programme covers** (tick one)**:**

- o AMU
- X AMR
- o Both
- o Other, please describe:

**What is covered by (part of) component or programme evaluated** (tick at least one):

- ☐ Humans
- X Livestock
- ☐ Aquaculture
- ☐ Bees
- ☐ Green environment
- ☐ Aquatic environment
- ☐ Food chain
- ☐ Companion animals
- ☐ Equidae
- ☐ Camelids and Deer
- ☐ Wildlife
- ☐ Other, please describe:

**Objective(s) of evaluation** (tick at least one):

- X Performance
- X Infrastructure
- X Functionality
- X Operations
- X Collaboration
- X One Health-ness / the strength of One Health
- X Impact
- ☐ Other, please describe:

**Main results of evaluation**: Evaluation undertaken as an exercise with focus on assessment of the tool
**Time period for evaluation**: 23-27 February 2020

**Name(s) of evaluator(s)**: Marianne Sandberg and Johanne Ellis-Iversen
**Affiliation of evaluator(s)**: The Danish Agriculture and Food Council, Technical University of Denmark
**Evaluator(s) relationship with tool** (tick at least one)**:**
  ☐  Owner
  ☐  Developer
  X  User without involvement in development or ownership of tool
  ☐  Other, please describe:
**Citation of work, if published:** n/a

## Scoring of different aspects of the evaluation tool

*When answering, please describe in words and use a scale with four levels, where 1 = not satisfactory, 2 = major improvements needed, 3 = some improvements needed, 4 = satisfactory and provide a short explanation for the score.*

**1) User friendliness**: 4 - Able to use it without much preparation.

**2) Meets evaluation needs/requirements**: 3 - Comprehensive, the whole network and all sectors are included, but scales have few levels, hence smaller progression is not possible to measure due to imprecise answers.

**3) Efficiency**: 2 - It seems to be overlap in questions, the same information is asked repeatedly (are all details really needed?). The tool would benefit from guidance on which questions are used for dashboard outputs and which are just for system description.

**4) Use of a step-wise approach to the evaluation**: 4 - Follows a step-wise approach with different areas containing sub-categories reflecting both level of implementation and geographical organisation.

**5) Overall appearance**: 4 - A tool for AMU/AMR and residues focusing on all aspects in the "laboratory part". In the "Surveillance part" all aspects also seem to be covered very well.

**6) Generation of actionable evaluation outputs**: 4 - Suggestions for actions/areas to progress to next levels (by choosing the next levels text).

**7) Allows evaluation of One Health aspects**: 4 - Covers all sectors and measures/assesses integration aspects.

**8) Workability in terms of required data** (1: very complex, 4: simple): 1 - A lot of data and details are needed.

**9) Workability in terms of required people to include** (1: many, 4: few): 4 (or 3) - One person could in theory fill in the tool if 2-3 people provided additional expertise (e.g. lab, epi).

**10) Workability in terms of analysis to be done** (1: difficult, 4: simple): 4 - The tool does the analyses.

**11) Time taken for application of tool** (1: > 2 month, 2: 1-2 months, 3: 1 week - 1 month, 4: < 1 week): 4 - Facts to fill in are required, but not discussions, or complex system dynamics required (the system is given by the tool). No free text is required, and no extra analytical work has to be done.

## Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats

**1) Things that I really liked about this tool/that this tool covered really well**: Dashboard and automated analyses, easily understandable figures for communication of results.

**2) Things I struggled with**: Understanding the need for the level of detail.

**3) Things people should be aware of when using this tool**: Need vast amount of detailed information, takes a long time to fill in.

**4) Things that this tool is not covering or not good at covering**: It is not possible to evaluate smaller progression in epidemiological performance in the programme.

# Scoring of themes

*Score the degree that the themes are covered by the evaluation tool.*
*Scoring scale: Well covered, More or less covered, Not well covered, Not covered at all.*

| Themes used in decision-support tool, defined here | Tool: ATLASS | |
|---|---|---|
| | **Score** | **The reasoning for the score** |
| AMR/AMU | *Well covered* | Made specifically for AMU/AMR and residues. |
| Collaboration | *Well covered* | Between levels and between actors within levels and frequency of collaborations (multidisciplinary and inter sectoral). |
| Resources | *More or less covered* | Not possible to get detailed financial performance measures, but ask for constraints in different resources (money and labour) |
| Output and use of information | *More or less covered* | Objectives and measurement for success not addressed |
| Integration | *More or less covered* | Not detailed and in depth, but addressed in many areas. |
| Adaptivity | *Well covered* | Designed for multiple assessments over time. |
| Technical operations | *More or less covered* | All aspects very well covered, except from that the actual epidemiological performance such as estimation of effect of design and sample sizes is not possible to do within the tool. However, questions about e.g., representativeness of data collected are asked and a score from 1-4 must be given. |

# Open comments

Governance was addressed as an independent topic in several places.

*Disclaimer statement (for corresponding author):*

*By submitting this case study report to the CoEvalAMR consortium, I grant permission for it to be uploaded to the CoEvalAMR website in the section "case studies" for public access and use under the relevant CC license. I understand that name, email (where applicable), affiliation, and geographic region of the author(s) will be published along with the submitted document.*

*I confirm that the information in the report is accurate and does not violate General Data Protection Regulation / national data protection legislation or copyright laws. I confirm that the report contains the author's/authors' own subjective view stemming from the application of the tool and does not represent an institutional view. I acknowledge that the site editors may reject my report should the content be deemed offensive or inappropriate.*

*I confirm that I understand the above statement and give consent to the report being used in the way described.*

*X   Yes*
*o   No*

*Name and date: Marianne Sandberg, 04/05/2020*