User feedback on NEOH tool applied to *Monitoring of Antimicrobial Resistance and Antibiotic Usage in Animals in the Netherlands (MARAN)*

May 2020
Contact: Ayla Hesp

General information

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

Name of surveillance programme used in case: MARAN (Monitoring of Antimicrobial Resistance and Antibiotic Usage in Animals in the Netherlands)

Country of programme: Netherlands

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):
- o   Humans
- X   Livestock
- o   Aquaculture
- o   Bees
- o   Green environment
- o   Aquatic environment
- X   Food chain
- o   Companion animals
- o   Equidae
- o   Camelids and Deer
- o   Wildlife
- X   Other, please describe: Livestock; broilers, layers, slaughter pigs, veal calves, dairy cows, turkeys. Evaluation focuses on randomly isolated commensal indicator E. coli from all monitored species.

Objective(s) of evaluation (tick at least one):
- X   Performance
- o   Infrastructure
- o   Functionality
- o   Operations
- o   Collaboration
- o   One Health-ness / the strength of One Health
- o   Impact
- X   Other, please describe: The original purpose of the Dutch monitoring system was to monitor evolution and trends in AMR in livestock as a threat to public health. In this evaluation we want to investigate how informative the programme is for this purpose.

Main result of evaluation: Unique in the sense in that it forces user to think of the functioning of AMR surveillance system within the relevant context. This also makes that NEOH can have a big impact and can lead in the long term to progress. However, it is easy to get lost in the extensive handbook. A NEOH quick guide is currently missing.

Time period for evaluation: December 2019 - Ongoing
Name(s) of evaluator(s): Ayla Hesp[1,2], Ursula Bergwerff[1,3]
Affiliation of evaluator(s):

1. Department of Bacteriology and Epidemiology, Wageningen Bioveterinary Research, Lelystad, The Netherlands;

2. Department of Infectious Diseases and Immunology, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands;

3. Department of Farm Animal Health, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands

Evaluator(s) relationship with tool (tick at least one)**:**
- o   Owner
- o   Developer
- X   User without involvement in development or ownership of tool
- o   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
2) Compliance with evaluation needs/requirements: 4
3) Efficiency: 2
4) Use of a step-wise approach to the evaluation: not scored
5) Overall appearance: 3
6) Generation of actionable evaluation outputs: 3
7) Evaluation of One Health aspects: 4
8) Workability in terms of required data (1: very complex, 4: simple): 2
9) Workability in terms of required people to include (1: many, 4: few): 2
10) Workability in terms of analysis to be done (1: difficult, 4: simple): 2
11) Time taken for application of tool (1: > 2 month, 2: 1-2 months, 3: 1 week - 1 month, 4: < 1 week): 1

Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats

1) One thing/key things that I really liked about this tool/that this tool covered really well: Great impact; forces you to think in detail about the evaluation system
2) One thing/key things I struggled with: Complexity for practical use
3) One thing/key things people should be aware of when using this tool: With addition of a practical 'quick guide' it could be much easier to use
4) One thing/key things that this tool is not covering or not good at covering: Easy to get lost in all the definitions from the handbook, distracting from evaluation itself

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: NEOH	
	Score	**The reasoning for the score**
AMR/AMU	Well covered	It is possible to make it very AMR/AMU specific
Collaboration	More or less covered	Compared to other tools more involvement of collaboration
Resources	Not well covered	Not the focus of the tool
Output and use of the information	Well covered	Great impact; forces you to think in detail about the evaluation system, because of the systems thinking approach; you evaluate how your programme is functioning within the bigger context.
Integration	Well covered	See above
Adaptivity	More or less covered	Because of the systems thinking approach, more indirect consequence
Technical operations	Not covered at all	Not focused on laboratory aspects

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: Ayla Hesp, May 27th 2020