
Evaluation of the One-Healthness of 'UC-Care' – a One Health research project aiming to generate new knowledge and tools to combat antimicrobial resistance

REFERENCE: Short Term Scientific Mission, COST TD1404 NEOH

Beneficiary

Anais Léger

Resident at the ECVPH (European College for Veterinary Public Health)

SAFOSO

Switzerland

Host

Liza Rosenbaum Nielsen

Professor

Department of Large Animal Sciences, University of Copenhagen

Denmark

Period: from 30.10.2016 to 19.11.2016

Reference code: COST- STSM-TD1404-34642

1. Purpose of the visit

The objective of the collaboration between SAFOSO (home institution) and University of Copenhagen (host) was to apply the evaluation framework and tools developed by working group 1 to evaluate 'the One Healthness' of the UC-Care project. A full evaluation including drivers and outcomes was not feasible within the given timeframe. Hence, we planned to focus on evaluating the One Health elements in UC-Care to assess potential beneficial and counter-productive characteristics that may affect the outcomes of this One Health initiative. Some of these elements could be counted directly from an evaluation report (e.g. number of published papers within different topics), whereas other elements required other methods to describe and assess (e.g. One Health thinking in the UC-Care project). These elements typically required extraction of opinions, experiences and knowledge from project participants and stakeholders. Methods and tools for this are described in the Handbook for Evaluation of One Health currently being revised in the COST Action TD1404 NEOH (Network for Evaluation of One Health).

2. Description of the work carried out

During these 3 weeks of STSM, I conducted the main part of the evaluation of UC-Care using the NEOH tools.

My first task was to adapt the NEOH tools for the purpose of this case study: prepare interviews, prepare an online introductory survey and adapt the questions regarding the different interviewees and external participants and stakeholders to contact electronically. I was particularly attentive to the understandability, comprehensiveness, fluidity and non-redundancy of the questions to ensure the quality and conciseness of the interviews, which had to be performed in no more than one hour per interviewee.

I conducted 14 interviews with 1 to 4 attendees each time. They were conducted among PI, co-PI, WP-leaders, key participants and young researchers in the UC-Care consortium. Contacts were made personally by email after an introductory email of Liza. The interviews lasted around 1 hour and were conducted in face-to-face meetings, except two that took place via Skype, because of the availability of the interviewee.

An online survey was also prepared for the external partners, the stakeholder board and the scientific advisory board of UC-Care. It included 19 questions and took between 15 to 20 minutes to answer. It was sent personally to all members of these three categories.

3. Description of the main results obtained

The evaluation highlighted several points regarding the tools. It was difficult to apply the different tools to evaluate the One-Healthness for different reasons. First of all the 5 different questionnaires were not thought as a whole and a lot of questions are overlapping, requiring adaption and rework the tools. Moreover, most of the questions were too abstract and vague, the concepts driven by the questions were difficult to understand; even after having participated in the NEOH training workshop at Novi Sad. It was therefore difficult to “translate” them for the interviewees and get the information needed. Finally, I encountered difficulties in transferring the qualitative information into a score.

Regarding the case study, several points can be emphasised:

- All the senior partners were interested and willing to participate and be interviewed. It facilitated the evaluation process. However, reaching the young researchers in UC-Care appeared to be more complicated than expected for several reasons (e.g. study already finished, on leave, abroad, busy...).
- Interviewees mentioned that their main benefit of this research project was the increase of their awareness and understanding of the general picture for AMR. It also created new collaborations with closely related disciplines during the project and for future projects or programmes. An example was the creation of a new PhD course on AMR with teachers from many different disciplines. Also several project proposals have been submitted as a follow-up of UC-Care, gathering different disciplines as well. Another example of further collaboration is the implementation of a One Health course among human and veterinary medicine students thanks to the collaboration of several UC-Care partners.
- Stakeholders were involved through a Stakeholder Board, a panel of External partners and a Scientific Advisory Board. Their level of participation and involvement varied between all different partners: from very close collaboration to only participating at one or more annual meetings.

- All interviewees agreed to say that the One-Health approach could have been better. They also mentioned that was the first project of this kind, and “errors” had to be made for better future collaborations.

4. Future collaboration with host institution

The involved institutions both benefitted from the work performed during the STSM, and this may lead to future collaboration on One Health evaluation or other types of work relevant for residents of European College of Veterinary Public Health. Furthermore, other case studies are on-going at the host institution, and these groups will benefit from the experiences from us.

5. Projected publications resulting or anticipated to result from the STSM

The results of this case study will be presented at the NEOH general meeting in January 2017 in Malta.

A peer-review paper is planned as part of a special edition of *Frontiers* about the NEOH case studies.

6. Confirmation by the host of the successful execution of the mission

It was a pleasure to host Anaïs Léger. She planned the work to be done during the STSM well and managed to follow the plan, despite it not being an easy task. She also interacted well with all of the interviewees and the researchers and students in our research section.

7. Financial summary

Expenses	Total expenses in EUR	% covered by NEOH grant (EUR)
Travel (plane, train, buses/metro)	400 EUR	400 EUR (100 %)
Accommodation	1150 EUR	1000 EUR (87 %)
Consumables (meals)	700 EUR	595 EUR (85 %)
Total	2250 euros	2015 EUR (90%)

8. Other comments (if any)

Signatures

Date (Day-Month-Year)

Grantee

5/12/2016

Host

7/12-
2016

