

User feedback on SURVTOOL tool applied to *Monitoring of Antimicrobial Resistance and Antibiotic Usage in Animals in the Netherlands (MARAN)*

May 2020

Contact: [Ayla Hesp](#)

General information

Name of evaluation tool: SURVTOOL (evaluation tool)

Name of surveillance programme used in case: MARAN (Monitoring of Antimicrobial Resistance and Antibiotic Usage in Animals in the Netherlands)

Country of programme: the Netherlands

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: Livestock; broilers, layers, slaughter pigs, veal calves, dairy cows, turkeys. Evaluation focuses on randomly isolated commensal indicator E. coli from all monitored species.

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: The original purpose of the Dutch monitoring system was to monitor evolution and trends in AMR in livestock as a threat to public health. In this evaluation we want to investigate how informative the programme is for this purpose.

Main result of evaluation: The handbook of the SURVTOOL is very clear and a pleasure to read and gives the promise of covering many of the required aspects of this evaluation, however the online tool (although it looks very aesthetic) covers much less than the handbook and also in a less instructive way. This makes it hard to draw conclusions from your evaluation in the end.

Time period for evaluation: 28 October - 10 November 2019

Name(s) of evaluator(s): Ayla Hesp^{1,2}, Ursula Bergwerff^{1,3}

Affiliation of evaluator(s):

1. Department of Bacteriology and Epidemiology, Wageningen Bioveterinary Research, Lelystad, The Netherlands;
2. Department of Infectious Diseases and Immunology, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands;
3. Department of Farm Animal Health, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands

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
- 2) **Compliance with evaluation needs/requirements:** 2
- 3) **Efficiency:** 2
- 4) **Use of a step-wise approach to the evaluation:** not scored
- 5) **Overall appearance:** 4
- 6) **Generation of actionable evaluation outputs:** 1
- 7) **Evaluation of One Health aspects:** 2
- 8) **Workability in terms of required data (1: very complex, 4: simple):** 4
- 9) **Workability in terms of required people to include (1: many, 4: few):** 4
- 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) **One thing/key things that I really liked about this tool/that this tool covered really well:** Very accessible and very easy to use
- 2) **One thing/key things I struggled with:** Translating AMR surveillance to this tool (it seemed like it was developed for more animal diseases like ASF)
- 3) **One thing/key things people should be aware of when using this tool:** It was developed for animal health surveillance purposes and could be extended for AMR specifically
- 4) **One thing/key things that this tool is not covering or not good at covering:** The tool did not seem to fit AMR surveillance and there were no conclusions one could formulate in the end

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: SURVTOOL	
	Score	The reasoning for the score
AMR/AMU	Not covered at all	Does not cover AMR/AMU specifically
Collaboration	Not well covered	You have to list stakeholders, but does not really focus on collaboration
Resources	Not well covered	Does not cover financial aspects in the online tool, but in the handbook they are named
Output and use of the information	Not covered at all	The tool seems useful, but does not have big impact for AMR
Integration	Not well covered	The handbook describes integration of aspects of the surveillance system, but the online tool does not. There is no integration of one health aspects
Adaptivity	Not well covered	Tool does not lead to formulation of a conclusion in the end
Technical operations	Not covered at all	Does not cover surveillance technique



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: Ayla Hesp, 5th of June 2020