

User feedback on AMR-ISS tool applied to *Evaluation of the surveillance system for AMR and AMU in the United Kingdom from a One Health perspective*

April 2020

Contact: [Houda Bennani](#)

General information

Name of evaluation tool: AMR-ISS (AMR Integrated Surveillance Systems)

Name of surveillance component or programme evaluated in case study: Evaluation of the surveillance system for AMR and AMU in the United Kingdom from a One Health (OH) perspective

Country of programme: United Kingdom

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:

Main results of evaluation: In progress

Time period for evaluation: January 2019 –June 2020

Name(s) of evaluator(s): Houda Bennani (HB), Barbara Haesler (BH) and Laura Cornelsen (LC)



Affiliation of evaluator(s): HB and BH from the Royal Veterinary College; LC from London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine; all London, United Kingdom

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: 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 - Easy to understand the conceptual framework but complicated to conduct the evaluation.
- 2) Compliance with evaluation needs/requirements:** 2 - The conceptual framework describes the relationship between the integrated surveillance activities for AMR and AMU, OH outputs produced and the expected outcomes. However, no guidance is provided on how to conduct the evaluation.
- 3) Efficiency:** 2 - Requires a lot of time to conduct the evaluation.
- 4) Use of a step-wise approach to evaluation:** 3 - The tool has five evaluation levels.
- 5) Overall appearance:** 2 - The conceptual framework is well presented, but no clear guidance yet.
- 6) Generation of actionable evaluation outputs:** 2 - No clearly defined actionable outputs.
- 7) Evaluation of One Health aspects:** 3 - The conceptual framework describes the relationship between the integrated surveillance activities for AMR and AMU, OH outputs produced and the expected outcomes.
- 8) Workability in terms of required data** (1: very complex, 4: simple): 1 - Requires a lot of time for data collection.
- 9) Workability in terms of required people to include** (1: many, 4: few): 1 - Need to include stakeholders from the different sectors.
- 10) Workability in terms of analysis to be done** (1: difficult, 4: simple): 1 - There is no guidance on how to analyse the data.
- 11) Time taken for application of tool** (1: > 2 month, 2: 1-2 months, 3: 1 week - 1 month, 4: < 1 week): 1 - Taking into account the complexity of data required, the time to conduct the evaluation is long.

Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats

- 1) One thing/key things that I really liked about this tool, or that it covered really well:** Provision of a conceptual model for integrated surveillance of AMR/AMU surveillance and a structure to conduct the evaluation
- 2) One thing/key things I struggled with:** No provision of guidance to collect and analyse data
- 3) One thing/key things people should be aware of when using this tool:** Possible combination with other tools depending on the evaluation question
- 4) One thing/key things that this tool is not covering or not good at covering:** Guidance for conducting the evaluation

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: AMR-ISS (AMR Integrated Surveillance Systems)	
	Score	The reasoning for the score
AMR/AMU	Well covered	The framework was developed specifically for AMR and AMU surveillance
Collaboration	More or less covered	The framework allows to evaluate collaboration between the different organisations involved
Resources	Not well covered	The framework does not include specifically questions regarding financial aspects, but these data can be collected if economic analysis is conducted as part of the evaluation
Output and use of the information	Well covered	The framework allows to evaluate the outputs of integration and the impacts of integration on decision making and on health and economic outcomes
Integration	Well covered	The framework was developed to evaluate the integration of the surveillance system for AMR and AMU
Adaptivity	Not covered at all	The tool does not cover this aspect
Technical operations	Not well covered	The framework includes questions on technical aspects of surveillance such as the data collected, sampling methodology and data analysis

Open comments

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

Governance is not well covered by the tool. It can be assessed as part of the overall organisation and management of the surveillance system for AMR/AMU, but this is not explicitly presented.



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: Houda Bennani, 17/04/2020