

## User feedback on FAO PMP tool applied to *AMR surveillance in Belgium*

April 2020

Contact: [Ilias Chantziaras](#)

### General information

**Name of evaluation tool:** FAO PMP

**Reason for choosing evaluation tool:** A ready-to-use tool, targeting various aspects AMR surveillance.

**Name of surveillance component or programme evaluated in case study:** AMR surveillance in Belgium (as suggested in the National Action Plan)

**Country of programme:** Belgium

**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:** With regards the four focus areas of PMP, our evaluation found:

- *Awareness:* Many awareness raising actions are taken but the impact has not always been measured. Awareness assessments have not been carried in all agriculture and food sectors. The awareness of the stakeholders is at a high level. But to evaluate impact of assessment campaigns a baseline measurement is necessary.

- *Evidence:* A lot of data and evidence on AMR and AMU is collected in Belgium but the quality of the data can be improved. AMR and AMU surveillance should be extended to all one-health sectors.
- *Governance:* The One Health NAP is under development so the activities on stages 1 and 2 received medium to low scores the scores in stages 3 and 4 were close to zero.
- *Practice:* Operational plans related to prudent AMU need to be implemented in all agriculture and food sectors, and evaluated and updated where necessary. Guidelines, regulations and actions that may lead to better waste management exist in several sectors but their impact on AMR is not evaluated.

**Time period for evaluation:** April - May 2019 first phase, second phase July - October 2019

**Name(s) of evaluator(s):** Starting point were the results from the two preliminary Belgian PMP Team meetings that took place in Brussels (April-May 2019). The secondary evaluation and subsequent scoring of the PMP tool were performed by Ilias Chantziaras, Maria-Eleni Filippitzi and Nicolas Antoine Moussiaux. For the scoring of stage 4, the evaluators were Ilias Chantziaras and Maria-Eleni Filippitzi.

**Affiliation of evaluator(s):** Flanders Research Institute for agriculture, fisheries and food (ILVO)/ Veterinary Faculty, Gent University; Dept. Epidemiology and Public Health, Sciensano; Veterinary Faculty, University of Liège

**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:** 4 - It can be used by people with no special training

**2) Compliance with evaluation needs/requirements:** 3

**3) Efficiency:** 3 - To be used by administrators, not trained evaluators

**4) Use of a step-wise approach to the evaluation:** 4 - Inherent parts of the development of the tool

**5) Overall appearance:** 3 for the general assessment - List of references/links that the user can look into for further reading, appearance in excel could be upgraded; 2 for the sector-specific assessment - Confusing set up, revision recommended

**6) Generation of actionable evaluation outputs:** 3 - Although it has a nice focus on the generation of actionable evaluation outputs, these outputs could be not precise enough on how to take specific actions (e.g. how can you benchmark veterinarians? what should be taken into account?)

**7) Evaluation of One Health aspects:** 2 - Focused mainly on animal health

**8) Workability in terms of required data** (1: very complex, 4: simple): 3 - The required data follow the same pattern, but its nature is quite complicated, so it cannot be 4.

**9) Workability in terms of required people to include** (1: many, 4: few): 4 - Not a lot of people are needed.

**10) Workability in terms of analysis to be done** (1: difficult, 4: simple): 4

**11) Time taken for application of tool** (1: > 2 month, 2: 1-2 months, 3: 1 week - 1 month, 4: < 1 week): 4

## Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats

### 1) Things that I really liked about this tool:

- PMP is very good as a first stage evaluation, as it allows to identify fast and easily at what stage/level you are (e.g. as a country)
- The progressive approach to tackle the implementation of the different steps of project through the different focus areas and stages of development of the initiative.
- It includes the most important topics to be evaluated without going into too much detail, and spots the actions to be taken
- It is quite easy to complete
- There is enough flexibility to apply it at different levels (overall strategy vs. sector-specific)
- It covers very well the aspect of governance.

**2) Things I struggled with:** Information is missing in terms of specific actions to be taken (i.e. you get info about a general problem but no details about it and how to tackle it)

**3) Things people should be aware of when using this tool:** Primarily used as a self-assessment tool for the implementation of a national action plan

**4) Things that this tool is not covering or not good at covering:** It is not a full One Health assessment. It does not include surveillance of AMR/AMU in humans and other sectors of the agri-food system (crop, aquaculture, feed sector); these could be added as sector-specific assessments

## 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 <a href="#">here</a>	Tool: FAO-PMP	
	Score	The reasoning for the score
AMR/AMU	More or less covered	PMP's attributes fall close to our case study, however it misses further links besides farm animals (e.g. use/resistance in human, situation in companion animals)
Collaboration	Not well covered	Promotes knowledge but does not focus on collaboration. It positions itself as a self-assessment tool. Social and gender components are not considered
Resources	More or less covered	Financial aspects sufficiently covered in 'governance'. In the 'awareness' section, financial aspects are not covered, but it could benefit stage 4 (i.e. training, awareness campaigns)
Output and use of the information	More or less covered	Outputs are evaluated (better than impacts), e.g. production of guidelines on prudent use of AM, data reporting to organisations
Integration	More or less covered	The tool prioritises data integration within organisations. Interoperation between sectors is acknowledged (but the focus remains predominantly in the domain of farm animal medicine). Guidelines, tools and additional links can aid the contextualization of the surveillance system and point out the need to adhere to data standards. Integration of the surveillance system in the decision-making process is not considered.
Technical operations	Not well covered	If PMP is used as intended (a self-assessment that occurs periodically to identify changes) answering the questions systematically will surely help the participating group and the evaluator as well.



## Open comments

This tool covers well the governance of AMU/AMR. Stages are well defined, the additional information column facilitates the evaluation and it covers all.

The tool was purposely designed for guidance to countries for operationalising their NAPs on 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: Chantziaras I., Filippitzi M. – 08/05/2020*