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

May 2020
Contact: Marianne Sandberg

General information

Name of evaluation tool: FAO-AMR-PMP

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). 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).

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: July-October 2019

Name(s) of evaluator(s): Marianne Sandberg, Lis Alban
Affiliation of evaluator(s): The Danish Agriculture and Food Council
Evaluator(s) relationship with tool (tick at least one)**:**
- ☐ Owner
- ☐ Developer
- X   User without involvement in development or ownership of tool, but developer did facilitate the evaluation process
- ☐ Other, please describe:

Citation of work, if published: Liza Nielsen, Lis Alban, Johanne Ellis-Iversen, Koen Mintiens and Marianne Sandberg, 2020, Evaluating integrated surveillance of antimicrobial resistance: experiences from use of three evaluation tools, Clinical Microbiology and Infection, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmi.2020.03.015

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 understand and fill in.

2) Meets evaluation needs/requirements: 3 - Evaluating quantity and quality needs to be better addressed.

3) Efficiency: 4 - Easy to fill in.

4) Use of a step-wise approach to the evaluation: 4 - Follows a step-wise approach with four levels. Logic is followed for several of the questions listed, e.g. planning an activity is related to Level 1, whereas undertaking the activity is associated with a higher level. Likewise, activities undertaken only locally are associated with Level 1, whereas regional activities are associated with Level 2 or 3, and national activities with Level 4.

5) Overall appearance: 4 for the general assessment, 2 for the sector-specific assessment - That was quite confusing.

6) Generation of actionable evaluation outputs: 4 - Actions can be agreed by the stakeholders during the assessment.

7) Allows evaluation of One Health aspects: 3 - Not addressed particularly.

8) Workability in terms of required data (1: very complex, 4: simple): 4 - Apparently simple

9) Workability in terms of required people to include (1: many, 4: few): 1 - All stakeholders need to be represented or present to do the evaluation, because it requires discussion and agreement.

10) Workability in terms of analysis to be done (1: difficult, 4: simple): 4 - Mostly yes/no answers to questions.

11) Time taken for application of tool (1: > 2 month, 2: 1-2 months, 3: 1 week - 1 month, 4: < 1 week): 4 - Can be done in some days.

Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats

1) Things that I really liked about this tool, or that it covered really well:
- The progressive approach to tackle the implementation of a National Action Plan (NAP) through the different focus areas and stages of development toward a One Health plan. This gives an overall feeling at which stage the NAP is and what is required to move further
- It includes the most important topics without going in too much detail, to spot the actions to be taken
- It is quite easy to complete
- The tool makes sense from a veterinary point of view

- There is flexibility in applying it at different levels (overall vs. sector-specific)
- It brings stakeholders together to think about their NAP and decide on actions to move forward
- Progress and governance

2) Things I struggled with:
- How can the self-assessment be objective to allow meaningful comparison?
- The current sector-specific assessment is not fully developed and needs revision to allow better assessments
- Of the four categories, three scored the progress towards an outcome independently of the method used. In the fourth category; awareness, the scores related to the use of a specific assessment method (KAP). This generated low scores, if a country is already past the initial 'mapping of requirements' stage in implementation or has chosen to use different methods, but has high awareness
- The terminology is not always clear, with different ways of interpretation (e.g. campaign, burden, key stakeholders)
- What is meant with monitoring of veterinary services through PVS?
- How to go to a full One-Health approach and is it really relevant?

3) Things people should be aware of when using this tool:
- Representation of all key stakeholders needed to do the assessment
- It is not relevant to be applied to regional or small-scale action plans
- It is not meant for comparison between countries
- It is a self-assessment tool of the implementation of a NAP for AMR

4) Things that this tool is not covering or not good at covering:
- Not good at covering environment
- It lacks crops, aquaculture, and feed as a sector-specific assessment
- It is not a full OH assessment as it does not include surveillance of AMR/AMU in humans. Add a sector-specific assessment for human health
- The size of implementation of the operational activities should be quantified
- The quality of the activities is not measured
- The awareness section appears to be assessing implementation of evaluation of the outcome rather than the actual outcome. This is dissimilar to the other categories and the scores mean something different

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	Tool: FAO-AMR-PMP	
	Score	**The reasoning for the score**
AMR/AMU	Well covered	The framework was developed specifically for AMR and AMU – and residue surveillance
Collaboration	More or less covered	The framework contributes to collaboration between the different organisations involved but does not measure the degree of collaboration as such

Resources	More or less covered	The framework includes specific questions regarding financial aspects (limited vs not limited budget) and contributes to awareness through training
Output and use of information	Not well covered	The difference in scoring between the dashboard output at evaluation 1 and evaluation 2 (over time) might indicate impact.
Integration	More or less covered	Contributes to integration, but there is no measure for integration
Adaptivity	Well covered	The difference in scoring between the dashboard output at evaluation 1 and evaluation 2 (over time) indicates progress
Technical operations	Not covered at all	Low- as it is evaluating at an overarching level rather than at the detailed technical level.

Open comments

Governance is a separate part covered by many questions and hence measured.

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