

User feedback on ISS-AMR framework for the evaluation of the impacts on decision-making of the Canadian Integrated Program for Antimicrobial Resistance Surveillance

April 2020

Contact: [Cécile Aenishaenslin](#)

General information

Name of evaluation tool: Integrated surveillance system for AMR Evaluation framework

Name of surveillance programme used in case: Canadian Integrated Program for Antimicrobial Resistance Surveillance (CIPARS)

Country of programme: Canada

Surveillance component or programme covers (tick one):

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

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

- Humans
- 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
- One Health-ness / the strength of One Health
- Impact
- Other, please describe: Level of integration, Impact on decision-making

Main result of evaluation: Evaluation undertaken as part of a research project

Time period for evaluation: July-August 2017 (data collection) & August 2019 (tool assessment)

Name(s) of evaluator(s): Cécile Aenishaenslin

Affiliation of evaluator(s): University of Montreal



Evaluator(s) relationship with tool (tick at least one):

- Owner
- Developer
- User without involvement in development or ownership of tool
- Other, please describe:

Citation of work if published: Not published yet.

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 - No guidance on how to score the different evaluation question, except for the level of integration.
- 2) Meets evaluation needs/requirements:** 4 - The tool was developed specifically for CIPARS evaluation, in collaboration with the surveillance team.
- 3) Efficiency:** 2 - It takes time to complete the evaluation of all questions. If just some questions are selected (e.g. level of integration) it can be very fast.
- 4) Overall appearance:** n/a - The tool is not publicly available yet.
- 5) Generation of actionable evaluation outputs:** 2 - No automated output produced. The users need to develop their own report.
- 6) Allows evaluation of One Health aspects:** 3 - Evaluation of the integration is a major focus of the tool, but the methodology needs to be better described.
- 7) Workability in terms of required data** (1: very complex, 4: simple): From 1 to 4, depending on the evaluation questions selected.
- 8) Workability in terms of required people to include** (1: many, 4: few): From 1 to 4, depending on the evaluation questions selected.
- 9) Workability in terms of analysis to be done** (1: difficult, 4: simple): From 1 to 4, depending on the evaluation questions selected.
- 10) Time taken for application of tool** (1: > 2 month, 2: 1-2 months, 3: 1 week - 1 month, 4: < 1 week): 1 or 2, depending on the evaluation questions selected.

Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats

- 1) Things that I really liked about this tool/that this tool covered really well:** This framework is designed specifically for evaluating integrated surveillance systems for AMR.
- 2) Things I struggled with:** The development of the tool is still in progress. There is currently no clear guidance for each evaluation question on which data to collect, how to collect them and analyse them.
- 3) Things people should be aware of when using this tool:** Depending on the objective of the evaluation, this framework can be used in combination with other frameworks such as NEOH and ECoSur.
- 4) Things that this tool is not covering or not good at covering:** If the need is to evaluate only one component of the surveillance system (i.e. NOT the integration), this framework is not appropriate.

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: ISS-AMR	
	Score	The reasoning for the score
AMR/AMU	Well covered	Good for these aspects IF the evaluation objective is targeting the evaluation of the integration of One Health aspects in the system.
Collaboration	Well covered	The tool includes questions related to the composition and effectiveness of the team and its network of end-users.
Resources	Not well covered	The tool includes guidance for evaluating economic impacts, but is not focused on resource allocation.
Output and use of information	Well covered	The tool includes aspects related to the dissemination of surveillance information, and one evaluation level aims at evaluating how the integration of One Health in the surveillance system has impact on decision-making.
Integration	Well covered	The tool includes a semi-quantitative scale and several specifications on the different dimensions of integration in surveillance systems for AMR and AMU that can serve as a basis to evaluate the level of integration.
Governance	More or less covered	The tool does not provide direct guidance on how to evaluate the governance structure.
Adaptivity	Not well covered	Not the focus of the tool up to now. However, the main goal of the tool is to provide guidance on how to evaluate the added value of One Health integration for surveillance of AMR and AMU (still at the conceptual level).
Technical operation	Not well covered	The tool proposes ways to define the sensitivity of an integrated surveillance system, but this is not the focus of this tool.

Open comments

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

This tool is a conceptual framework that was developed in collaboration with CIPARS to evaluate the added value of an integrated One Health approach. The evaluation is still in progress and guidance for the use of this approach will be better defined in the next step of the project. Interested users can contact [Cécile Aenishaenslin](#) for more information on the evaluation and tool.



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.

- Yes**
- No**

Name and date: Cécile Aenishaenslin, 13/05/2020