

## User feedback on FAO PMP tool applied to the *monitoring programme for AMR in animals, food and feed in Norway*

March 2020

Contact: [Madelaine Norström](#)

### General information

**Name of evaluation tool:** FAO PMP tool

**Reason for choosing evaluation tool:** It was suggested to use this tool by the CoEvalAMR working group focusing on case studies. Training was provided for this tool, but I could not attend the workshop. Therefore, I tried the tool by myself whereas others used it under guidance.

**Name of surveillance programme used in case:** NORM-VET, a monitoring programme for antimicrobial resistance in animals, food and feed.

**Country of programme:** Norway

**Animal species covered by part of programme that is evaluated:** Broiler chickens

**Objective(s) of evaluation:** To assess the integrativeness of the programme from a One Health perspective

**Main outcome of evaluation:** This tool was not suitable to assess the integrativeness of the programme from a One Health perspective. However, the scorings showed that the programme is achieving quite good scores according to the evaluation criteria included.

It was intended to apply the FAO PMP to the part of the surveillance programme only that concerned broiler and *E.coli* as indicator bacteria in NORM-VET. However, many questions could not be answered in a meaningful way without having knowledge of the whole surveillance programme as a background for giving scores or answers to many of the questions included in the tools. Thus, most answers and scorings were performed according to the whole surveillance programme. For the parts of describing the programme and apply the theory of change the AMR monitoring in broilers was considered.

**Time period for evaluation:** July-August 2019

**Name(s) of evaluator(s):** Madelaine Norström

**Affiliation of evaluator(s):** Norwegian Veterinary Institute

**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:** 4 - Instructions are short and easily understandable.

**2) Meets evaluation needs/requirements:** 2 - Not for an evaluation from a One Health perspective, but good enough to check that different aspects have been covered on the way to a better antimicrobial stewardship.

**3) Efficiency:** 4 - The tool is efficient to use as the scoring gives results that can be assessed immediately.

**4) Overall appearance:** 4 - The excel sheets are nice, and once some time has been spent to understand/ interpret the outputs, the scores are quite useful.

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

**6) Evaluation of One Health aspects:** 1 - This tool does not really address One Health aspects in my opinion.

**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. The data requested is available and can be referred to even though persons responsible for reporting etc. were asked to help with the scorings as it is not necessarily easy to know if some of the tasks are already completed or not even if there are documents that say this should be in place.

**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. Ideally, this evaluation should be performed within a group of stakeholders. 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 analyses are taken care of in the Excel sheets.

**10) Time taken for application of tool** (1:>2 months, 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 and the final evaluation might not be complete enough for the programme, but it allowed giving an assessment of the tool.

## Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats

**1) One thing that I really liked about this tool:** It is a *starting tool* for countries which so far have not implemented AMR surveillance.

**2) One thing I struggled with:** Some questions were difficult to understand, several questions seemed to ask the same and differences were not easily understandable.

**3) One thing people should be aware of when using this tool:** Some questions not relevant for all countries.

**4) One thing that this tool is not covering or not good at covering:** One Health-ness

## 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: FAO PMP tool	
	Score	The reasoning for the score
AMR/AMU	Well covered	The tool covered all relevant questions.
Collaboration	Not well covered	Some collaboration aspects were covered but far from all.
Resources	Not covered at all	The financial aspects of the program itself were mainly lacking

Output and use of information	Well covered	The reporting templates were sufficient
Integration	Not covered at all	The integrative aspects were not covered
Adaptivity	Well covered	This tool is well suited for assessing the process of the surveillance when repeated after some time (years) again.
Technical operations	Not covered at all	This tool is not made for assessing the laboratory or sample design questions as there is another tool from FAO that is focusing on these aspects.

### Open comments

The FAO-PMP tool is easy to understand and to use. It follows a stepwise approach. It might be difficult to accept that some of the Key Performance Indicators at lower levels not always seem to be in place for a programme that has been running for such a long time in a country where the AMR/AMU challenge has been recognised a long time ago, but then they might be in place for higher steps. So, the tool is a working tool to see how well the national action plans are in place and probably better suited for countries just starting to monitor AMR/AMU.



*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: Madelaine Norström, 17/04/2020*