

## CoEvalAMR updated user's methodology

### General information about the case study

Name of evaluation tool: EcoSur\_\_\_\_\_

Name of surveillance programme used in case: Surveillance system for AMR, AMU and antimicrobial residues\_\_\_\_\_

Country of action: France\_\_\_\_\_

Surveillance component or programme covers (tick at least one):

AMU,  AMR,  Both,  Other : antibiotic residues

Please describe: What is covered by (part of) the 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 X One Health-ness / the strength of One Health,  Impact,  Other - please describe

Main result of evaluation: The French surveillance system was fragmented with multiple surveillance programmes and limited collaboration, although two sub-systems facilitated integration between human/animal sectors, and between AMU/AMR in human medicine. A total of 12 recommendations were shared with policy makers to improve One Health collaborations within the French system for surveillance of AMR, AMU and AM residues.

Time period for evaluation: February 2021 – January 2022

Name(s) of evaluator(s): Léo Rousset, Lucie Collineau, Clémence Bourély, Mélanie Colomb-Cotinat\_\_\_\_\_

Affiliation of evaluator(s): French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety (ANSES), French Ministry of Agriculture and Food Sovereignty, Santé Publique France

Relationship of evaluator(s) with tool (tick at least one)

- Owner  Developer  User without involvement in development or ownership of tool, but developer did facilitate the evaluation process  Other, please describe: \_\_\_\_\_

Citation of work, if published: Collineau, L., Rousset, L., Colomb-Cotinat, M., Bordier, M., Bourély, C. Moving towards One Health surveillance of antimicrobial resistance in France: an evaluation of the level of collaboration within the surveillance system. *Proceedings of the ESCAIDE conference*; Stockholm and online, 23-25 November 2022

Contact (email address): lucie.collineau@anses.fr \_\_\_\_\_

## Description of the tool

Sector covered:

- Human,  animal,  environmental,  food domain or  combinations thereof

Number of languages for which the tool is developed:

English \_\_\_\_\_

Type of approach

- tool,  framework

Type of scoring system

- Quantitative  semi-quantitative or  qualitative

Use of a stepwise approach to scoring the surveillance programme

- Yes or  No

Purpose of the tool

- Performance,  collaboration,  OH-ness,  planning,  others.

Target users

- Scientists,  donors,  surveillance programme coordinators,  others;

Resources available about the tool

X Scientific articles, X reports, X tool itself,  repository of case studies

Accessibility

X Freely available online or  not

## SWOT-like approach

**Strengths**                      The strengths of this tool are:

The tool provides a comprehensive evaluation of collaborations within a surveillance system, including both governance and operational aspects.

It is flexible and can be adapted to very diverse surveillance system.

Visual outputs nicely summarize the results of the evaluation, and make it easier to communicate the results (especially figure 1 and 3).

The tool facilitates the formulation of practical recommendations for improvement.

**Weaknesses**                      The weaknesses of this tool are:

The terminology used in the tool is complex, making certain criteria difficult to understand or differentiate between each other.

There are many criteria to be scored. Filling in the evaluation grids can be very time consuming for complex systems with many surveillance programmes (e.g. numerous interviews for data collection).

The tool focuses on collaboration, but some other aspects of integration, e.g. data interoperability are not covered in details.

**Opportunities**                      The added value(s) of using this tool is:

The tool provides a deep understanding of the surveillance system itself (via a preliminary mapping and characterization of its various components), as well as collaborations within the surveillance system.

Robustness and acceptability of the evaluation is high, since actors are involved throughout the process (data collection, validation of the results).

**Threats**                              This tool might be criticized because of:

For large and complex systems like the one we evaluated, data collection and analysis is cumbersome. We had to adapt the tool to three levels of observations (collaborations

between two programmes, within a sub-system and within the whole system) to make it easier to score the criteria. We only focused on programmes and left out the collaborations between actors since they were too numerous.

While the tool provides output figures describing the level of collaboration, it does not allow to visualize the actual system or collaboration between actors/programmes (e.g. via social network analysis). Adding this feature would be an asset.

### **Open comments**

Use this space to provide further observations, e.g. other aspects of importance such as general AMU/AMR governance