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Discussion points

1. Use of surveillance data for policy making
2. Approaches to assess AMR burden of disease
3. Approaches to monitor development & implementation of national AMR/AMU surveillance systems
Results 1: Use of surveillance data for policy making

- Data: from local to global
  - For benchmarking, guide improvements, development of national guidelines and other policy decisions at various levels.
- Capacity for communication has to be strengthened
  - how to convey timely key messages from surveillance results to health care facilities and policy makers
Results 1: Use of surveillance data for policy making

- The base is good quality data collected locally
  - Routine and active surveillance
  - Different aspects of quality; demands different metrics
    - From specimen collection, laboratory testing and turn around time, to data entry and analysis, and to the final reporting to GLASS
- Reference laboratory networks
Results 1: Use of surveillance data for policy making

- A strong need for support for training and capacity building
  - Developing, implementing and improving national surveillance systems
  - Panels of experts in countries; local to national
  - External experts and consultants to support
    - WHO Collaborating Centre network
    - WHO academy course curriculum
  - Regional work and sharing of country experiences; similar epidemiology and challenges.
Results 1: Use of surveillance data for policy making

- Stakeholders in a broader way
  - All sectors; MOH, private sectors, other ministries including finance
    - National One Health AMR coordination structure
  - Clinical societies, industries, scientific groups, media groups
  - Local stakeholders, health practitioners and end users to help to community to implement and enforce the activities
Results 1: Use of surveillance data for policy making

- Feedback of data locally and at facility level
  - to ensure engagement in the surveillance and use of data
- Feedback to persuade senior authorities and policy makers for action and support
  - data on the burden of disease
    - including mortality and economic consequences of AMR
    - Cost of in-action
  - data from GLASS needed for country-level advocacy
- National reports
- Success stories
- Need for a two-way communication between implementers and policymakers
Use of surveillance Data

Polls results
1 - What are the priorities for use of the AMR surveillance data at the national level?

- To inform definition, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of national policy goals to control AMR
- To inform advocacy
- To inform and assess effectiveness of actions to contain AMR
- To inform estimates of the burden of AMR
- To inform national essential medicines list, regulatory and procurement policies
- To inform national infection prevention and control policies
- To identification and contain novel AMR phenotypes
- Other purposes
2 - What are the priorities for use of the AMC/U surveillance data at the national level?

- To inform definition, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of national policy goals to control AMR
- To inform national essential medicines list, regulatory and procurement policies (Access)
- To inform rational antibiotic use policies
- To inform national infection prevention and control policies
- To inform and assess supply of antimicrobials in health facilities
- To inform overall use of antimicrobials across sectors
- Other purposes
| Consensus on the utility of the WHO AMR BoD protocol as a guideline for countries |
| Different challenges to be addressed |
| Ethical aspects - related to medical prescription |
| Need for laboratory capacity building for accurate estimation of AMR BoD |
| Surveys generally easier to implement |
| SDG indicators accepted |
| Protocol can be adapted by countries for their prioritized pathogens |
| BSI and HAI are good targets |
Results 2: Approaches to assess AMR burden of disease

- Learn from ongoing initiatives on the early implementation of the GLASS attributable mortality supported by WHO
  - PAHO
    - piloting a protocol in Uruguay (not yet started) on how to assess BOD (PPS in several sites)
  - South-east Asia
  - Africa
AMR burden

Polls results
3 - Are you collecting information on attributable mortality due to AMR?
4 - Would you agree that GLASS should focus on the SDG indicators to assess AMR BOD?

- Yes
- Yes, but should add at least another indicator
- No
- Don’t know
Results 3: Approaches to monitor the development and implementation of national AMR/AMU surveillance systems

- Unanimous acceptance of the *Progressive Surveillance Pathway* as a useful tool for countries
  - Guide use of data and Guide understanding of the data produced
  - Need governance structure and leadership for implementation
  - Assessment and monitoring should cover critical aspects of governance, epidemiology and diagnostic capacity

- Helps WHO understanding of the quality of the data reported and therefore a better visualization in GLASS
  - FAO a similar framework; importance to provide close guidance to stakeholders
Results 3: Approaches to monitor the development and implementation of national AMR/AMU surveillance systems

- On a regional level: ROs coordinate the work between countries
  - Having these framework steps in mind will facilitate the communication
    - To conduct situation analysis on implementation
    - To guide reporting
    - For support between countries in the regions
      - Capacity building or regional programs for dialogue with donors, sharing experiences.
  - A request to WHO RO for follow up with regional workshops and regular annual meetings on AMR/U surveillance.
Considerations for the PSP implementation

- Data verification through WGS can be a progress parameter, depending on country priorities and existing capacity
- HAI monitoring could be integrated into AMR/AMU surveillance
- Assessment should include all programmatic components for AMR/AMU
  - for surveillance, laboratory, diagnostic and antibiotic stewardship, etc.
- A rooster of experts/consultants to support countries
  - Need more guidance on how to conduct the PSP assessment
Progressive
AMR Pathway
Polls results
5 - Do you use indicators to monitor the quality of your national surveillance system?

Yes

No

Don’t know
6 - Would you agree to share information with GLASS on the stage of development according to a Progressive Surveillance Pathway framework?
“Success of AMR control depends on good leadership and good policy making at all levels”

Quote from a Group facilitator