

User feedback on NEOH tool applied to the ClassyFarm programme in Italy

April 2020

Contact: [Laura Tomassone](#)

General information

Name of evaluation tool: Network for Evaluation of One Health (NEOH) One Health-ness Assessment Tool

Name of surveillance programme used in case: ClassyFarm. Its main focus is a risk categorization of farms according to an integrated approach: biosecurity, welfare, AMU/AMR, animal health and lesions at slaughterhouse. Our case study focuses on the 'Implementation of the ClassyFarm system in swine production in Piedmont region'.

Country of programme: Italy

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 result of evaluation: We used the OH-ness assessment tool within NEOH framework. To complete the tool, we interviewed the representatives of: ClassyFarm project (IZS Brescia), national health system veterinarians, private farm veterinarians, farmers, swine industry.

Based on the results (spider diagram and OH-index/ratio), the evaluation highlighted a limited degree of OH implementation, in particular:

- OPERATIONAL ASPECTS had lower scores, due to the prevalence of the 'animal health' component in our initiative (versus the human/environmental components), and to the coordination at national level (not fully translated into practice at regional level).
- INFRASTRUCTURAL ASPECTS had higher scores. 'Sharing' methods were good; but sharing was found to be compartmentalised (privileged access to data according to actors/stakeholders categories). 'Learning' is still an ongoing process (i.e. generative learning is expected to happen, but it will likely take long time).

Time period for evaluation: June-October 2019

Name(s) of evaluator(s): Laura Tomassone, Daniele De Meneghi

Affiliation of evaluator(s): University of Turin, Dept. of Veterinary Sciences

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

- Owner
- Developer (partial contribution in development/testing of the tool in its earlier versions)
- 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: 1 - Complex and long, sometimes exhausting

2) Compliance with evaluation needs/requirements: 4 - Very comprehensive and efficient for the evaluation of One Health initiatives

3) Efficiency: 3 - Improvements of the tool are quite difficult to apply without disrupting the original structure of the tool itself

4) Use of a step-wise approach to the evaluation: 2 - Limited, it requires repeated evaluations

5) Overall appearance: 1 - The Microsoft Excel spreadsheets are stuffed with a lot of information and not easy to browse through

6) Generation of actionable evaluation outputs: 3 - Scores of the evaluation outputs could be affected by the subjectivity bias of the tool

7) Evaluation of One Health aspects: 4 - Very comprehensive and efficient for the evaluation of One Health initiatives

8) Workability in terms of required data (1: very complex, 4: simple): 1 to 2 - Some of the six OH aspects are very complex to evaluate - e.g. learning and systemic organization

9) Workability in terms of required people to include (1: many, 4: few): 3 - The evaluation can be carried out by a single external evaluator, but he/she may need to consult different actors/stakeholders to compile the tool)

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

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

Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats

- 1) Things that I really liked about this tool/that this tool covered really well:** Very comprehensive, multi-faceted, it fits well for a transversal analysis of OH initiatives. The degree of OH implementation within an initiative, multi-inter-trans-disciplinarity.
- 2) Things I struggled with:** Cumbersome, too long, it requires a training/background on social sciences to be used at its best, it requires a specific glossary.
- 3) Things people should be aware of when using this tool:** It requires time and patience, as it's not a straightforward approach; the evaluation tends to be biased by the subjectivity of the respondent(s).
- 4) Things that this tool is not covering or not good at covering:** It has not a progressive/ step-by-step approach (NEOH as compared to the FAO PMP tool is less efficient in measuring the progress/steps of the initiative)

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: NEOH	
	Score	The reasoning for the score
AMU/AMR	Not well covered	Tool not designed for this purpose, but can be adapted
Collaboration	Well covered	Collaboration included in all aspects of the OH-ness evaluation
Resources	Not well covered	Only covered in 'planning' and 'sharing' aspects of the OH-ness evaluation
Output and use of information	Not covered at all	Impact evaluation has to be done additionally to OH-ness evaluation
Integration	Well covered	Integration included in all aspects of the OH-ness evaluation
Adaptivity	Not well covered	Progress can be assessed through repeated evaluations
Technical operations	Not covered at all	Not among the evaluation objectives



Disclaimer (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: L.Tomassone, on behalf of the authors – 17/04/2020