User feedback on FAO PMP tool applied to the *ClassyFarm programme* in Italy

April 2020
Contact: [Laura Tomassone](#)

General information

Name of evaluation tool: FAO PMP

Name of surveillance programme used in case: ClassyFarm. Its main focus is a risk categorization of farms according to an integrated approach: biosecurity, welfare, AMU/AMR, animal health and lesions at slaughterhouse. Our case study focuses on the 'Implementation of the ClassyFarm system in swine production in Piedmont region'.

Country of programme: Italy

Surveillance component or programme covers (tick one)**:**
- o AMU
- o AMR
- X 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):
- ☐ Performance
- ☐ Infrastructure
- X Functionality
- ☐ Operations
- ☐ Collaboration
- ☐ One Health-ness / the strength of One Health
- ☐ Impact
- X Other, please describe: implementation/progress

Main outcome of evaluation: We used the 'general assessment' section of the FAO PMP tool (this was preferred to the sector-specific assessment, which lacked information and has a 'yes/no' answering option). To complete the tool, we interviewed the representatives of: ClassyFarm project (IZS Brescia), National health system veterinarians, private farm veterinarians, farmers, swine industry, academic experts in AMR/AMU.

With regards the four focus areas of PMP, our evaluation showed:
- Awareness: overall activities and achievements are unbalanced, with 60% achievement only for stage 3 (several activities in stage 1 and 2 not implemented/foreseen, and stage 4 at 0% level - since activities mainly developed in the animal sector)
- Evidence: overall activities and achievements are quite good (40-83%) and expected to improve, as several activities are not fully implemented yet (data collection on AMU/AMR)
- Governance: overall very good (63-100%), being the activities within a NAP
- Practice: overall activities and achievements fair, but unbalanced (from level 1 to 3: 50-71%, level 4 activities 17%, with 0% KPI since activities are not developed in all sectors)

Time period for evaluation: July-October 2019
Name(s) of evaluator(s): Laura Tomassone, Daniele De Meneghi
Affiliation of evaluator(s): University of Turin, Dept. of Veterinary Sciences
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 - Easy to fill in, instructions/guidelines available for using the tool.
2) Compliance with evaluation needs/requirements: 3 - Only quantitative, no qualitative assessment.
3) Efficiency: 4 - It evaluates all focus areas/steps with a progressive approach.
4) Use of a step-wise approach to the evaluation: 3 - It allows quite a good "step-wise" approach to the different evaluation aspects/phases.
5) Overall appearance: 4 for the general assessment, 2 for the sector-specific assessment - Was quite confusing and disappointing.
6) Generation of actionable evaluation outputs: 4 - The visualisation of outputs in the dashboard allows to highlight the actions needed to the stakeholders.
7) Evaluation of One Health aspects: 2 - It is mainly focused on animal health.
8) Workability in terms of required data (1: very complex, 4: simple): 4 - Data required in the questions proposed in the different sections of the tool are usually simple and easy to be provided)
9) Workability in terms of required people to include (1: many, 4: few): 2 - Need to interview different stakeholders.
10) Workability in terms of analysis to be done (1: difficult, 4: simple): 4 - The tool itself analyses the data entered and calculates the % of achievements.
11) Time taken for application of tool (1: > 2 month, 2: 1-2 months, 3: 1 week - 1 month, 4: < 1 week): 4 - The tool is straightforward and easy to apply.

Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats

1) Things that I really liked about this tool/that this tool covered really well:
- The progressive approach to tackle the implementation of the different steps of project through the different focus areas and stages of development of the initiative.
- It includes the most important topics without going into too much detail, and allows highlighting the surveillance actions to be taken.
- It is quite easy to complete
- There is enough flexibility to apply it at different levels (overall strategy vs. sector-specific).

2) Things I struggled with:
- Scoring options do not consider the possibility of 'not applicable' / 'not planned' actions
- Sometimes difficult to discriminate between the 'ongoing' and the 'partly completed' scoring options
- The current sector-specific assessments are not fully developed and need revision to allow better assessments.
- The terminology is not always clear, with different ways of interpretation (e.g. campaign, burden, key stakeholders).
- Glossary is not complete (e.g. 'SMART' indicators)

3) Things people should be aware of when using this tool:
- Need a representation of all key stakeholders to do the assessment
- It is not fully relevant when applied to regional or small-scale action plans
- It is not meant for comparison between countries/action plans
- It can be used as a self-assessment tool for the implementation of a NAP/action plan

4) Things that this tool is not covering or not good at covering:
- Not good at covering the environmental component
- It is not a full One Health assessment. It does not include surveillance of AMR/AMU in humans and other sectors of the agri-food system (crop, aquaculture, feed sectors, etc.); these could be added as sector-specific assessments
- Quantify the level of implementation of the operational activities (see difficulties to discriminate 'ongoing' vs. 'partly completed').
- The quality of the activities is not measured.

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: FAO-PMP	
	Score	**The reasoning for the score**
AMU/AMR	Well covered	The tool was purposely designed for evaluating NAP on AMR/AMU
Collaboration	Not covered at all	Rather reporting than data exchange. Participation of stakeholders and actors considered only at institutional level (not grass-root level), social and gender components not considered
Resources	More or less covered	Although only present in 'governance', budget and finance are considered

Output and use of information	More or less covered	Outputs are evaluated (better than impacts), e.g. production of guidelines on prudent use of AM, data reporting to organisations
Integration	Not well covered	Questions on data reporting, adherence to international testing and data standards, but the level of knowledge integration, shared decision making and planning across sectors is not investigated.
Adaptivity	Well covered	The tool was purposely designed for helping countries to improve their NAP on AMR/AMU
Technical operations	Not well covered	The tool includes questions on the targets of surveillance (e.g. pathogens - commensal microorganisms, substrate - environment, animals, animal products, humans)

Open comments
Use this space to provide further observations, e.g. other aspects of importance such as general AMU/AMR governance

The tool also covers extensively governance of AMR and AMU that is one of its focus areas.

Disclaimer (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: L. Tomassone, on behalf of the authors – 17/04/2020