User feedback on NEOH applied to monitoring programme for AMR in animals, food and feed in Norway (NORM-VET)

March 2020
Contact: Madelaine Norström

General information

Name of evaluation tool: Network for Evaluation of One Health (NEOH) One Health-ness Assessment Tool and Evaluation Framework

Name of surveillance component or programme evaluated in case study: A sub-part of NORM-VET, a monitoring programme for antimicrobial resistance in animals, food and feed, namely E. coli in broiler.

Country of programme: Norway

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

Main results of evaluation: Difficult to evaluate only a part of a whole programme, therefore most answers and scorings were performed according to the whole surveillance programme. The tool is well suited for evaluation of a One Health initiative, however needs time and resources to be conducted properly. One aspect of evaluating alone is that I realised that this tool would better be used in cooperation with a group of stakeholders to raise the awareness among those both of the

positive aspects of the initiative or programme as well as what might be less good and thereby encourage a discussion and eventually improve the initiative.

Time period for evaluation: July-August 2019
Name(s) of evaluator(s): Madelaine Norström
Affiliation of evaluator(s): Norwegian Veterinary Institute
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: 2 - Some parts of the tool especially the worksheet "thinking" is difficult to understand for someone not familiar with the terms used. The manual is not comprehensive enough.

2) Meets evaluation needs/requirements: 4 - The outputs give a complete picture.

3) Efficiency: 3 - The theory of change part needs to better integrated.

4) Overall appearance: 3 – The excel sheet for the One Health-ness assessment is nice and mostly understandable.

5) Generation of actionable evaluation outputs: 4 - Graphical presentations are nice and give the reviewers an idea of what needs to be improved in the programme.

6) Allows evaluation of One Health aspects: 4 **-** This is what the tool is really good at.

7) Workability in terms of required data (1: very complex, 4: simple): 3 - This is a very subjective scoring as I've been involved in NORM-VET for 20 years and therefore didn't need almost any (additional) data to score, but could use my knowledge, expertise and experience. If this had been performed by an external evaluator it would have been impossible to find the information asked for through the documentation that is publicly available.

8) Workability in terms of required people to include (1: many, 4: few): 3 - I think it might be a good idea to have several stakeholders involved for the evaluation, but due to restricted budget I performed this myself. But if performed within a group of stakeholders a guidance person will be needed to make sure everyone understands the questions before they score.

9) Workability in terms of analysis to be done (1: difficult, 4: simple): 4 - The analysis for the One Health-ness is taken care of in the Excel sheets. However, the analysis to compare the Theory of Change and the scoring is not understandable.

10) Time taken for application of tool (1: > 2 month, 2: 1-2 months, 3: 1 week - 1 month, 4: < 1 week): 2 - I conducted the evaluation in less than a month but needed to revisit several times to consider if I had fully understood what was meant, if the scoring was fine or not. The final evaluation might not be complete enough for the programme, but it allowed giving a review of the NEOH tool.

Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats

1) One thing/key things that I really liked about this tool, or that it covered really well: Nice output

2) One thing/key things I struggled with: To understand some of the concepts/ terms

3) One thing/key things people should be aware of when using this tool: Needs time and resources to perform an evaluation.

4) One thing/key things that this tool is not covering or not good at covering: AMU

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:	
	Score	**The reasoning for the score**
AMR/AMU	Not covered at all	The tool does not address AMR/AMU questions specifically
Collaboration	Well covered	Several relevant questions are included
Resources	Not well covered	No relevant questions seem to be included, however some information about training level is included.
Output and use of information	More or less covered	The spider diagrams in the One Health-ness tool are easily understood, but the interpretation of the outputs probably means more to the persons involved in the analyses.
Integration	Well covered	The aspect concerning integration is well covered by the questions but as this is not a tool for AMR/AMU in particular, specific aspects are not covered *per se* and the part of thinking and theory of change becomes here an important part of the tool.
Adaptivity	Not well covered	Not included in NEOH at present as far as I can understand
Technical operations	Not well covered	Not included in NEOH at present as far as I can understand

Open comments

The NEOH One Health-ness tool is based on a subjective scoring system with only a few questions supposed to cover each different area to be evaluated. This might be very vulnerable for which scores the area of evaluation gets, both because the scoring is subjective but also because there is so few questions that contributes to the score. This needs to be kept in mind during the interpretation of the results and it would be wise to revisit the questions to see why the scores came out to low or high according to the stakeholders' own perspective of the level of integration of the initiative/ programme evaluated.

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: Madelaine Norström, 17/04/2020