

User feedback on ECoSur tool applied to *The multisectoral surveillance system for antibiotic resistance in Vietnam*

April 2020

Contact: [Marion Bordier](#)

General information

Name of evaluation tool: ECoSur (Evaluation of collaboration for surveillance)

Name of surveillance component or programme evaluated in case study: The multisectoral surveillance system for antibiotic resistance in Vietnam.

Country of programme: Vietnam

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: Collaboration clearly formalised and relevant to the context but a lack of operationalization of the collaborative strategy through the implementation of collaborative activities along the surveillance process.

Time period for evaluation: August-September 2019 (following update of data collected in April-May 2018)

Name(s) of evaluator(s): Marion Bordier – Camille Delavenne

Affiliation of evaluator(s): UMR Astre, Cirad, Inrae, University of Montpellier

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: Camille Delavenne, 2018. Evaluation des collaborations dans les systèmes de surveillance « One Health » : cas d'étude de la surveillance de l'antibiorésistance au Vietnam. Thesis. www2.vetagro-sup.fr/bib/fondoc/th_sout/dl.php?file=2018lyon086.pdf

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: 3 - The tool can be accessed freely online

(https://survtools.org/wiki/surveillance-evaluation/doku.php?id=quality_of_the_collaboration). It consists of three types of documents: a guidance to introduce the tool and to explain its application, documents to collect all necessary data to score the evaluation criteria (semi-quantitative method), and the evaluation matrix (with a guidance) to score criteria and to generate evaluation results. The development of a web interface would make the tool more user-friendly and would ease the data collection step.

2) Compliance with evaluation needs/requirements: 3 - The tool allows to answer the evaluation question which it has been specifically designed for, i.e. are collaborative efforts relevant to the collaborative context and objective(s) and are they effective to generate the expected results? It qualifies the satisfaction level of collaboration in place from the perspective of all stakeholders but cannot measure the overall added value of collaborating for surveillance activities.

3) Efficiency: 4 - The tool is appropriate to evaluate multisectoral surveillance systems targeting AMR. Documents help in collecting all data required to conduct the evaluation and the evaluation matrix is easy to understand and apply. Furthermore, the evaluation method includes a meeting to validate scores with a panel of key stakeholders. This provides an enabling environment for exchanges across sectors, professions and disciplines and improves mutual understanding.

4) Use of a step-wise approach to the evaluation: The tool does not allow to follow the progress of collaboration in the multisectoral surveillance system, unless evaluations are repeated over time and scores compared.

5) Overall appearance: 3 - The tool is well-structured. However, a well-designed web interface would undoubtedly improve the appearance.

6) Generation of actionable evaluation outputs: 4- The tool generates automatically graphical representations of the evaluation results on three distinct charts: one for organisational attributes, one for organisational indices and one for functional attributes.

7) Evaluation of One Health (OH) aspects: 4 - OH aspects are considered and measured through specific attributes: shared leadership, inclusiveness and representativeness of all relevant stakeholders, knowledge integration, etc.

8) Workability in terms of required data (1: very complex, 4: simple): 3 - Necessary data are easy to collect as far as they are accessible. However, required data about components and actors are numerous and their collection may take time in case of multisectoral surveillance systems covering many components. All the surveillance component coordinators should be interviewed, and additional informants may be included depending on the multisectoral surveillance system under

evaluation. Again, if the surveillance system is complex, this will increase the complexity of the data collection process.

9) Workability in terms of required people to include (1: many, 4: few): 3 - ECoSur is meant to be applied by an evaluation team. Team members should be epidemiologists with at least one experienced in surveillance. One team member should be familiar with ECoSur while all others should follow a quick training prior the evaluation exercise. The evaluation process includes a meeting with key stakeholders to validate scores and recommendations formulated by the evaluation team and the organisation of the meeting may be a challenge.

10) Workability in terms of analysis to be done (1: difficult, 4: simple): 4 - As far as the structure and objective of the tool have been clearly understood and that the meaning of the attributes is mastered, the graphical outputs are easy to interpret. Moreover, the tool allows the identification of the criteria that have influenced the evaluation results, and this helps the evaluators when investigating the strengths and weaknesses of the collaboration and formulating recommendations.

11) Time taken for application of tool (1: >2 months, 2: 1-2 months, 3: 1 week - 1 month, 4: < 1 week): 3 - In normal conditions (systems with a number of components between 3 and 8, informants easy to access), the evaluation will take less than one month if an evaluation team is almost dedicated full time to it. However, the application of the tool includes a meeting with key stakeholders and it can be difficult to find a convenient date for all of them.

Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats

1) One thing/key things that I really liked about this tool:

- The tool is the only one assessing in-depth collaboration for surveillance activities.
- It is a free access stand-alone tool.
- It is aimed to be applied in a participative way with relevant stakeholders and can serve as a concertation tool to improve mutual understanding and to support the definition of collective solutions to improve collaboration.
- Graphical representations of the evaluation results ease the interpretation and the formulation of recommendations.

2) One thing/key things I struggled with:

- The framework allows for an in-depth analysis of collaboration for the governance and implementation of surveillance activities. Consequently, each criterion is very specific in addressing a characteristic of collaboration at one of the different collaborative levels. When scoring, it is easy to go beyond the area the attribute is focusing on and to evaluate a characteristic at a wrong stage while it is addressed elsewhere.

3) One thing/key things people should be aware of when using this tool:

- The tool evaluates the performance of collaboration but not the overall performance of the multisectoral surveillance system (even if sectoral surveillance capacities are considered to evaluate the quality and appropriateness of collaboration). To do so, EcoSur attributes should be used in combination with tools specific to surveillance evaluation (e.g. Oasis).

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

- At this stage of development, this tool does not fully evaluate the impacts and cost of collaboration.

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: ECoSur	
	Score	The reasoning for the score
AMR/AMU	Not well covered	The tool is not specific to AMR/AMU surveillance and can be applied to any multisectoral surveillance system whatever the hazards or risk factors targeted, including AMR/AMU.
Collaboration	Well covered	Collaboration is at the heart of this evaluation tool. Collaboration is evaluated in different dimensions (across sectors and professions, disciplines, public and private organizations, geographical scales) and areas (collaboration for the governance and for the implementation of surveillance activities).
Resources	Well covered	The tool well covers human, financial and material resources at three levels: planning, allocation, availability.
Output and use of information	More or less covered	The tool evaluates the relevance the information produced by the multisectoral surveillance system and the quality of its communication (both in terms of contents and means) to surveillance actors and end-users.
Integration	Well covered	The aim of the tool is to qualify the degree of integration that the multisectoral surveillance system seeks to achieve, to assess if this is coherent with the collaborative context (including socio-economic context, sectoral surveillance capacities, stakeholder expectations, international/regional regulation guidelines, standards) and whether the collaborative modalities and activities (at the governance and operational level) designed and implemented are appropriate and functional (including allocation of relevant technical, human and financial resources) to achieve it. The tool addresses integration at three levels: integration of data systems, integration between sectors and disciplines, integration in the national and international context.
Adaptivity	Well covered	The tool evaluates the existence and functioning of collaborative mechanisms for steering, coordinating, and supporting scientifically and technically surveillance activities. It includes the consideration of feedback loops that inform collaborative mechanisms, so they are able to act upon changes in the context and system. Additionally, specific attributes target the monitoring and evaluation of collaboration through (i) the existence and use of performance indicators and (ii) implementation of internal and external evaluations. Finally, the tools is considering the existence, accessibility and relevance of training for actors involved in collaboration.
Technical operations	Not well covered	The tool does not aim at evaluating the surveillance performance. However, the tool takes into consideration that evaluation of collaboration cannot be completely disconnected from sectoral surveillance organisation and performance, as certain collaborative characteristics are impacted by the settings and capacities in the different domains covered by the multisectoral surveillance system.



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: Marion Bordier, 17/04/2020