

OH-EpiCap: a semi-quantitative tool for the evaluation of One Health epidemiological surveillance capacities and capabilities

Henok Ayalew Tegegne¹, Carlijn Bogaardt², Lucie Collineau¹, Géraldine Cazeau¹, Renaud Lailier³, Johana Reinhardt¹, Emma L. Taylor², Joaquin Prada², Viviane Hénaux^{1*}

¹University of Lyon - Agence Nationale de Sécurité Sanitaire de L'Alimentation, de L'Environnement et du Travail (ANSES), Laboratory of Lyon, Epidemiology and support to Surveillance Unit, 69007 Lyon, France

²University of Surrey, School of Veterinary Medicine, GU2 7XH Guildford, Surrey, United Kingdom

³University of Paris Est - Agence Nationale de Sécurité Sanitaire de L'Alimentation, de L'Environnement et du Travail (ANSES), Laboratory for Food Safety, Maisons-Alfort, France

* Correspondence:

Viviane Hénaux
viviane.henaux@anses.fr

Keywords: One Health, surveillance, evaluation, multi-sectoral collaboration, epidemiology

Abstract

Although international health agencies encourage the development of One Health (OH) surveillance, many systems remain mostly compartmentalized, with limited collaborations among sectors and disciplines. In the framework of the OH European Joint Programme “MATRIX” project, a generic evaluation tool called OH-EpiCap has been developed to enable individual institutes/governments to characterize, assess and monitor their own OH epidemiological surveillance capacities and capabilities. The tool is organized around three dimensions: organization, operational activities, and impact of the OH surveillance system; each dimension is then divided into four targets, each including four indicators. A semi-quantitative questionnaire enables the scoring of each indicator, with four levels according to the degree of satisfaction in the studied OH surveillance system. The evaluation is conducted by a panel of surveillance representatives (during a half-day workshop or with a back-and-forth process to reach a consensus). An R Shiny-based web application facilitates implementation of the evaluation and visualization of the results, and includes a benchmarking option. The tool was piloted on several foodborne hazards (i.e. *Salmonella*, *Campylobacter*, *Listeria*), emerging threats (e.g. antimicrobial resistance) and other zoonotic hazards (psittacosis) in multiple European countries in 2022. These case studies showed that the OH-EpiCap tool supports the tracing of strengths and weaknesses in epidemiological capacities and the identification of concrete and direct actions to improve collaborative activities at all steps of surveillance. It appears complementary to the existing EU-LabCap tool, designed to assess the capacity and capability of European microbiology laboratories. In addition, it provides opportunity to reinforce trust between surveillance stakeholders from across the system and to build a good foundation for a professional network for further collaboration.

42 1 Introduction

43 In recent years, the One Health (OH) concept has gained momentum, and international efforts
44 have been made to strengthen the implementation of multi-sectoral surveillance to more
45 effectively manage health hazards at the human, animal and environment interface (1). OH
46 surveillance is a collaborative and systematic collection, validation, analysis, interpretation of
47 data, and dissemination of information collected on humans, animals, and the environment
48 from different sectors and disciplines to inform decisions for more effective evidence-based
49 health interventions (2,3). However, in spite of the efforts of the quadripartite alliance
50 between the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO), the World
51 Organisation for Animal Health (WOAH-OIE), the World Health Organisation (WHO), and
52 the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) (4) to promote collaboration in
53 surveillance and laboratory networks and overpass professional silos, most surveillance
54 systems remain compartmentalized, with limited interaction across actors in the system (5).
55 For multiple reasons, implementing OH approaches in practice still proves challenging (6)
56 and collaborations between health sectors occur mostly in crisis times (7).

57 There is a wide range of possible organizational models for collaboration, and its
58 operationalization varies in terms of areas of implementation throughout the surveillance
59 process (8–11). Collaboration is mainly driven by the epidemiological context and
60 surveillance objective and is built according to actors' expectations (5). Regular evaluation of
61 the organization and functionality of collaboration is crucial to assess the surveillance
62 system's capacity and capability to produce relevant information, identify areas for
63 improvement, and optimize added value gained by integrating efforts across sectors.

64 In recent years, several methods have been developed to assess whether collaborative efforts
65 are appropriate and functional and whether it improves the impact of surveillance systems
66 (12,13). The Evaluation of Collaboration for Surveillance (ECoSur) tool targets the
67 organization and functioning of multi-sectoral collaborations in a surveillance system (5). It
68 relies on a semi-quantitative approach, with data collection based on interviews of the
69 coordinators of the programs included in the surveillance system, requiring a one-to-two-week
70 evaluation period on average (5). The Network for Evaluation of One Health (NEOH) relies
71 on the theory of change to identify the necessary preconditions and actions to be taken to
72 reach long-term goals (14). The whole process is estimated to take one to two months and
73 requires interviews of essential actors and stakeholders (13). The OH Assessment for
74 Planning and Performance (OH-APP) focuses on multi-sectoral coordination mechanisms to
75 inform planning and development assistance. The OH-APP complements the WHO Joint
76 External Evaluation by providing specific indicators to measure the maturity of a multi-
77 sectoral coordination mechanism and benchmark its progress toward a sustainable mechanism
78 capable of coordinating multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder collaboration for preparedness
79 and response to public health threats (<https://www.onehealthapp.org/about>). Other tools were
80 developed specifically for antimicrobial resistance (AMR) surveillance activities: the
81 Progressive Management Pathway tool for AMR (PMP-AMR), the AMR integrated
82 surveillance system evaluation project (ISSEP) tool, the Assessment Tool for Laboratories
83 and AMR Surveillance Systems (ATLASS) (13) and the Integrated Surveillance System
84 Evaluation (ISSE) framework (2). The different tools appear complementary in terms of
85 evaluation objectives and provide generic science-based guidance for the evaluation of
86 collaboration in surveillance systems. Yet, they also appear quite complex and require a lot of
87 data, time, and human resources (13), limiting their (regular) implementation.

88 The OH European Joint Programme MATRIX project aims to produce guidelines and tools
89 applicable at the national level to connect existing surveillance structures and resources, and

90 strengthen integrated surveillance initiatives, ultimately adding value by building on existing
91 resources, and creating synergies among sectors. In this context, we developed a generic
92 evaluation and benchmarking tool (OH-EpiCap), implemented through an interactive online
93 web application, for characterizing, monitoring, and evaluating epidemiological national
94 surveillance capacities and capabilities for OH surveillance. This tool was designed to enable
95 representatives of any surveillance system to conduct an evaluation of the multiple aspects of
96 OH surveillance, in a short time and without requiring an external evaluation team. The
97 evaluation addresses the multisectoral and multidisciplinary efforts to ensure communication,
98 collaboration, and coordination among all relevant actors of the surveillance working locally,
99 nationally, and globally to attain optimal health for people, animals, and our environment
100 (<https://extranet.who.int/sph/one-health-operations>). Besides identifying areas that could lead
101 to improvements in existing OH epidemiological surveillance capacities, the tool was
102 designed to allow benchmarking (i.e. comparisons) with results from previous evaluations of
103 that surveillance system, or other relevant systems, for example in other countries.

104 **2 Methods**

105 **2.1 Identification, definition and validation of indicators**

106 Existing evaluation tools focusing on multi-sectoral and interdisciplinary collaboration
107 aspects in epidemiological surveillance were used as a basis for the development of the OH-
108 EpiCap tool. Besides, to structure our tool, we considered the format of the EU-LabCap tool,
109 developed to assess bi-annually the capacity and capabilities of European microbiology
110 laboratories (15).

111 Three dimensions of evaluation were considered in our tool: the organization of the
112 collaborative system, the nature and functioning of collaborations for operational activities,
113 and the impact of collaborations on surveillance. Each dimension was then divided into
114 several targets focusing on specific features of multi-sectoral collaborations, building from the
115 existing evaluation frameworks. Finally, we established standardized indicators defining more
116 accurately each target and we singled out the necessary criteria to support their evaluation.

117 The organization and definition of the targets and indicators were consolidated and validated
118 through expert consultation. Experts were selected based on previous and ongoing
119 involvement in research activities on OH aspects (e.g. One Health - European Joint Project
120 (OH-EJP) program; Convergence in evaluation frameworks for integrated surveillance of
121 AMR (CoEvalAMR) project) in national veterinary and / or public health institutes and from
122 EFSA. The experts were asked to review and comment on all the proposed indicators and
123 identify missing information. The initial list of indicators was refined based on experts'
124 comments and validated with them through a back and forth process. Additional specific
125 modifications were also carried out based on feedback from participants in case studies during
126 the pilot phase (see below).

127 **2.2 Questionnaire and semi-quantitative scoring options**

128 A questionnaire was developed to facilitate the collection of information for the scoring of the
129 indicators, with one question per indicator. A semi-quantitative scale was defined with four
130 levels, describing the level of compliance of the system under examination compared to an
131 ideal situation: higher values suggest better adherence to the OH principle targeted by the
132 indicator (i.e. better integration of sectors) and lower values indicate improvements may be
133 beneficial. In addition, the option of "Not applicable" (NA) was included to take into
134 consideration the case where the indicator would not be relevant to the OH surveillance

135 system under evaluation. The scoring defined for each indicator is available at the end of the
136 user guide (16).

137 **2.3 Data visualization and web application**

138 A web application was developed (using R *shiny* and *shinydashboard* packages) (17),
139 (18) with a user guide describing the different steps for completing the questionnaire and
140 visualizing the results (16). The link to the application is:
141 <https://freddietafreeth.shinyapps.io/OH-EpiCap/>. The interface enables users to complete the
142 questionnaire interactively (and also to upload the answers from a questionnaire completed
143 previously). Below each question, free text space is provided to add notes or justify the
144 answer provided. These comments are saved and can be also visualized when reviewing the
145 results of the evaluation. The application allows the user to save partially completed
146 questionnaires in .csv (human-readable) format, to revisit or complete the answers at a later
147 time. The OH-EpiCap web application does not keep any data, to comply with the European
148 General Data Protection Regulation. Users must save their work locally (i.e. in the machine
149 they are using) before closing the application (to avoid any data loss).

150 The application facilitates the exploration of the completed (and/or uploaded) assessment and
151 of the results of the evaluation by way of multiple visualizations. The answers to the OH-
152 EpiCap questionnaire are analyzed at the target level for each dimension by averaging the
153 scores across the indicators to get a final score (between 1 and 4), and at the dimension level
154 by averaging target-level outputs (the mean scores over all questions are expressed as a
155 percentage). Results are displayed in the form of interactive radar charts and lollipop plots to
156 identify strengths and weaknesses at both dimension and target levels. Users may hover over
157 data points to explore the breakdown of scores for each target and indicator. At the target
158 level, this option displays for each data point the comments provided by the evaluators during
159 the filling of the related question. Finally, users can download a two-page report (in Html
160 format) comprising the graphic outputs and comments highlighting the main strengths and
161 weaknesses of the surveillance system examined. Moreover, the tool also includes a
162 benchmarking functionality to compare results from the ongoing evaluation with a reference
163 set based on results from previous OH-EpiCap evaluations. This reference dataset can be
164 generated from other evaluations that the user has access to, using a specific tab of the web
165 application. This function allows the integration of multiple evaluations (for example, from
166 other countries for the same hazard), thus anonymizing the results for a given system/hazard.

167 **2.4 Evaluation Process**

168 The OH-EpiCap tool was designed to serve as a support for discussion and scoring of the OH
169 aspects by a panel of representatives from the different sectors across the entire surveillance
170 system of a specific hazard. The selected surveillance representatives form an evaluation
171 panel, which gathers during a four-hour workshop to complete the questionnaire. For each
172 question, the panel must provide one answer after reaching a consensus. In the case where it is
173 not possible to organize a workshop to conduct the evaluation, the questionnaire may be filled
174 sequentially by the surveillance representatives from each sector, with a back-and-forth
175 process to reach a consensus. Once completed, the online application allows the panel to
176 visualize the outcomes in real-time and to generate a OH-ness profile for the studied system.

177 **2.5 Pilot Phase**

178 The OH-EpiCap tool was piloted through several applications on surveillance systems of
179 specific hazards targeted by the MATRIX consortium, including foodborne and other
180 emerging zoonotic hazards. As a first step, for each surveillance system, a representative was

181 identified directly within the MATRIX participants or their professional networks. Then, a
182 one-hour meeting with the identified surveillance representatives was organized to present the
183 tool and the evaluation process, and to answer questions. Participants were then asked to
184 identify additional surveillance representatives to include in the evaluation panel. The choice
185 of conducting a workshop or completing the questionnaire sequentially by representatives was
186 left to the participants.

187 The OH-EpiCap evaluations conducted through a workshop were conducted in the language
188 of the country to facilitate discussions. One or two persons from the MATRIX research team
189 also participated as observers, to identify areas for improvement in the questionnaire and the
190 evaluation process, and to provide additional explanations if needed during the completion of
191 the questionnaire by participants.

192 At the end of the workshop, participants were asked to share their thoughts on the evaluation
193 process, the relevance of the evaluation, and any feedback and comments to improve the tool.
194 A checklist was provided for collecting this information regarding the questionnaire and its
195 implementation (Supplementary file S1). The checklist was also provided to participants who
196 conducted the evaluation through a sequential completion of the questionnaire; the time
197 dedicated to the evaluation (for completing the questionnaire and analyzing results) was also
198 requested. Based on the participants' comments, the questionnaire and scoring options were
199 further improved.

200 **2.6 Ethical approval**

201 The MATRIX project went to ethical approval by the ethical advisors of the One Health
202 European Joint Programme. We informed verbally and through email the participants about
203 the following points: 1) the use of the OH-EpiCap tool and application is voluntary; 2) the
204 OH-EpiCap tool does not collect personal information, to comply with the European General
205 Data Protection Regulation; 3) the web application does not keep the data regarding the OH
206 surveillance system evaluated, and does not store them outside of the user's computer.

207 **3 Results**

208 **3.1 OH-EpiCap Structure**

209 The organization of the OH-EpiCap tool is described in Figure 1. The first dimension, is
210 related to the organization of the OH surveillance system: Target 1.1 *Formalization* focuses
211 on the common aim of the system, support documentations, coordination roles, and
212 leadership in the OH surveillance system; Target 1.2 *Coverage* addresses whether the
213 surveillance covers all relevant sectors, disciplines, actors, geography, populations and
214 hazards; Target 1.3 *Resources* addresses aspects related to financial and human resources,
215 sharing of the available operational resources, and training; and Target 1.4 *Evaluation*
216 focuses on internal and external evaluations, implementation of corrective measures, and the
217 capacity of the OH surveillance system to adapt to changes.

218 The second dimension deals with OH aspects in operational activities: Target 2.1 *Data*
219 *collection and methods sharing* concerns the level of multi-sectoral collaboration in the design
220 of surveillance protocols, data collection, harmonization of laboratory techniques and data
221 warehousing; Target 2.2 *Data sharing* addresses data sharing agreements, evaluation of data
222 quality, use of shared data, and the compliance of data with the FAIR principle; Target 2.3
223 *Data analysis and interpretation* addresses multi-sectoral integration for data analysis, sharing
224 of statistical analysis techniques, sharing of scientific expertise, and harmonization of
225 indicators; and Target 2.4 *Communication* focuses on both internal and external

226 communication processes, dissemination to decision-makers, and information sharing in case
227 of suspicion.

228 The third dimension deals with the impact of the OH surveillance system: Target 3.1
229 *Technical outputs* concerns the timely detection of emergence, knowledge improvement on
230 hazard epidemiological situations, increased effectiveness of surveillance, and reduction of
231 operational costs.; Target 3.2 *Collaborative added value* addresses strengthening of the OH
232 team and network, international collaboration and common strategy (road map) design; Target
233 3.3 *Immediate and intermediate outcomes* addresses advocacy, awareness, preparedness and
234 interventions based on the information generated by the OH surveillance system; and Target
235 3.4 *Ultimate outcomes* focuses on research opportunities, policy changes, behavioral changes
236 and better health outcomes that are attributed to the OH surveillance system.

237 The list of indicators in each target and the standardized scoring guide detailing, for each
238 individual score, the situation in which that score should be awarded, is available in Hénaux et
239 al. (16).

240

241 **3.2 Pilot OH-EpiCap applications**

242 Eight evaluations were conducted during the pilot phase of the OH-EpiCap tool; these
243 assessments targeted the multi-sectoral surveillance system for antimicrobial resistance
244 (AMR) in France and in Portugal, *Salmonella* in France, Germany, and the Netherlands,
245 *Listeria* in the Netherlands, *Campylobacter* in Sweden, and psittacosis in Denmark
246 (https://icahs4.org/fileadmin/user_upload/ICAHS4_2020/abstractbook_10maj.pdf, p. 211).

247 Evaluations of the surveillance systems for psittacosis in Denmark, *Campylobacter* in Sweden
248 and *Salmonella* in Germany were conducted through a half-day workshop. The workshop in
249 Denmark was held in person, and gathered seven surveillance representatives, from the public
250 health sector with expertise in laboratory/bacteriology and epidemiology, and from the animal
251 health sector from the official sampling, laboratory, and risk management unit. The workshop
252 lasted three hours (including a participants and workshop introduction, the filling of the three
253 dimensions of the questionnaire, the results analysis, and debriefing). The workshop in
254 Germany was held online and gathered ten representatives, from the public health (Robert
255 Koch Institute), animal health (Friedrich Loeffler Institute), and food safety (German Federal
256 Institute for Risk Assessment - BfR) sectors. The workshop lasted four hours; the two last
257 targets of the third dimension were not completed during the workshop because of time
258 constraints (and scoring for these indicators was provided at a later stage). The workshop in
259 Sweden was held online and gathered five representatives from the public health
260 (Folkhalsomyndigheten), animal health (National Veterinary Institute - SVA), and food safety
261 (Swedish National Food Agency - SLV; Swedish Board of Agriculture) sectors. The
262 workshop lasted three hours.

263 Other study cases were conducted through completion of the questionnaire (in a Word format)
264 either by one representative from each sector of surveillance, sequentially (AMR in Portugal
265 and AMR in France), or by one-to-two representatives from one sector only but with a good
266 knowledge of surveillance across sectors and existing multi-sectoral collaborations
267 (*Salmonella* in France, *Listeria* and *Salmonella* in the Netherlands). Then, the OH-EpiCap
268 team recorded the scores in the web application to generate the final report (displaying the
269 results; Supplementary file S2), that was sent to the surveillance representatives. In those
270 study cases, each evaluator spent between two and three hours completing the questionnaire
271 or reviewing and completing a pre-filled questionnaire (in the case of sequential completion).

272 As observers during the two workshops, we received comments and questions from the panel
273 of the evaluation. Similarly, for the evaluations conducted separately by surveillance
274 representatives, many comments were provided directly in the document (Word
275 questionnaire) to justify the choice of the scores and propose some evolutions of the system
276 for the aspects with a low score. The comments from the panels and suggestions from the
277 MATRIX team are summarized in the table below (Table 1).

278 **4 Discussion**

279 The OH-EpiCap tool is a semi-quantitative evaluation tool developed for macro analysis of
280 the OH capacities and capabilities of a system for surveillance of a specific hazard. This tool
281 helps, without a priori consideration, characterize how multi-sectoral collaborations operate
282 within surveillance systems. It facilitates the identification of strengths and weaknesses,
283 focusing on the organization and functioning of existing collaborations, and of their impacts
284 on the effectiveness of surveillance.

285 The OH-EpiCap tool is generic and can be applied to the surveillance of any hazard.
286 Accordingly, the tool was applied to a large range of hazards, including food-borne hazards
287 (*Salmonella*, *Listeria* and *Campylobacter*), other zoonotic hazards (psittacosis) and AMR. The
288 questionnaire includes specific indicators oriented towards OH preparedness and response and
289 is therefore of interest for surveillance systems targeting emerging or exotic zoonoses. The
290 pilot phase was beneficial to make the questionnaire more flexible to the diversity of contexts
291 of surveillance, depending on hazards and countries, and to the level of integration of the
292 system. Given that the tool is generic, the importance of clearly specifying the outline of the
293 system under study and the levels of integration considered (e.g. inter-program
294 collaborations), in addition to multi-sectoral integration, is a priority.

295 Besides, the tool can address any surveillance system, whether they are well formalized or at a
296 low level of integration, as long as some multi-sectoral collaborations exist at any step of the
297 surveillance, even if they are not supported by official regulations, nor formalized through
298 specific agreements and procedures. The formalization of the organization and functioning of
299 the collaborations between sectors is considered an important aspect for OH surveillance (11),
300 and therefore a lack of formalization will lead to low scores in some indicators of the OH-
301 EpiCap tool (in particular in dimension 1). Depending on the aim of the OH surveillance
302 system and if this lack of formalization is considered as an issue, surveillance representatives
303 are encouraged to determine what elements would elevate the current multi-sectoral
304 collaboration level to an official OH surveillance system.

305 The first step of an OH-EpiCap evaluation process is the identification of the panel of
306 representatives of the surveillance system under study, i.e. who will conduct the evaluation.
307 The composition of the evaluation team must be representative of the whole surveillance
308 system (as much as possible). Thus, the panel should include experts from all sectors involved
309 in the surveillance of the hazard under evaluation, and would encompass a large range of
310 disciplines and experiences regarding the functioning of collaborations among institutes and
311 programs. A mapping of the surveillance system under study, characterizing the programs and
312 institutes involved in the surveillance for each sector, would help identify surveillance
313 representatives. This panel will then work closely together during the evaluation workshop,
314 with ideally all representatives having the opportunity to express their views during the
315 scoring of the indicators. Therefore, identifying respected and well-known members of the
316 surveillance system under study is an asset to moderate respectful discussion and prevent any
317 stronger opinions from monopolizing the exchanges over the quieter contributors.

318 The second step consists in the evaluation of the OH epidemiological capacities and
319 capabilities following the three dimensions, through the web app. The evaluation is based on a
320 semi-quantitative method; this is certainly marked by subjectivity, especially in the case of a
321 limited panel of evaluators. Indeed, some indicators might be scored very differently across
322 surveillance representatives with various backgrounds, perceptions, and expectations. Yet, we
323 stress that only one answer can be provided to each question; therefore the surveillance
324 representatives of the evaluation panel must reach a consensus to answer each question (based
325 on their backgrounds, perceptions, and expectations). This constraint of having to reach a
326 consensus for each question, within a standardized set of answers, limits the bias of
327 subjectivity. Another limitation of this tool is that the current implementation assumes that all
328 indicators are of equal importance (i.e. have the same weight). This is obviously a
329 simplification and depending on the context of surveillance and the overall aim of the
330 collaborations among sectors, some aspects of the evaluation may appear more important and
331 should therefore get more focus during the result analysis and interpretation, as well as for
332 prioritizing recommendations.

333 The organization of the evaluation in three distinct parts (one per dimension) helps the panel
334 to articulate its reflection regarding the OH-ness of their surveillance system. It supports a
335 collective and transparent evaluation approach, and facilitates identification of weaknesses
336 and alternatives. Recommendations and concrete actions to improve the global systems can
337 emerge from this process, facilitating in a second step prioritization among actions to improve
338 OH-ness. The user-friendly web app provides a set of classical graphs (gauges, radar charts,
339 lollipop plots) that enables users to easily visualize and analyze the strengths and weaknesses
340 at the level of the indicators, and also of each target within the three dimensions. We
341 underline the importance of taking careful notes during the workshop. Justifications provided
342 by the panel in the comment spaces during questionnaire completion are displayed on the
343 graph, facilitating the interpretation of the results at the end of the evaluation workshop, and
344 also at a later stage as needed (thanks to the options to save and upload results in the web
345 application). A careful documentation of how the questions were interpreted and answered is
346 also recommended to follow changes in the monitoring system over time, through new
347 evaluations by the same panel or by another panel of evaluators.

348 Securing a half-day window for the workshop would enable the evaluation to be conducted, a
349 report to be generated, and results to be analyzed. However, we stress that further discussions
350 regarding prioritization and planning of actions to improve identified weaknesses, should be
351 scheduled at another time. Based on the evaluations conducted, we observed that the tool
352 provides a manageable "first step for action" where there is an interest in upgrading or
353 renewing existing collaborations across surveillance systems. The OH-EpiCap tool provides a
354 macroscopic analysis of the overall organization, functioning and impact of multi-sectoral
355 collaborations. In some cases, it may be relevant to complement the OH-EpiCap approach
356 with a more thorough evaluation of the weaker OH aspects, using evaluation tools dedicated
357 to the functioning and performance of surveillance (19) and/or OH aspects (13). Besides, the
358 OH-EpiCap tool does not assess OH capacities related to laboratory activities; we recommend
359 to consider applying the OH-LabCap tool (developed within the OH-HARMONY-CAP;
360 <https://onehealthjp.eu/jip-oh-harmony-cap/>) for such aspects.

361 Evaluations with the OH-EpiCap tool require little human and time resources; the evaluation
362 can be conducted through a half-day (3-4 hours) workshop, and we recommend limiting the
363 evaluator panel to 8-10 representatives. Evaluations with ECoSur or NEOH require numerous
364 individual interviews with actors of the surveillance, followed by a full-day meeting to
365 validate the results (5,14). A Delphi-like approach (i.e. each representative completes the
366 questionnaire, then a facilitator collates and summarizes all responses, and provides the

367 summary back to the participants for cross-checking/validation) is an alternative option to
368 conduct the evaluation (20). This approach does not enable surveillance representatives to
369 share their views and experiences regarding OH surveillance, in contrast to a roundtable
370 discussion. Therefore such an approach should be preferred in situations where an evaluation
371 would be requested by policymakers within a short delay, for example during surveys
372 assessing the OH epidemiological capacities of EU countries for a specific hazard, or within a
373 country for a large range of related hazards. As such, the tool will be very complementary to
374 the existing EU-LabCap tool, designed to assess the capacity and capability of European
375 microbiology laboratories (15). We emphasize that the benchmarking module of the OH-
376 EpiCap web app enables each country to compare their results to a reference set that could be
377 generated by the policymakers using a compilation of evaluation results for the same hazard
378 from other countries, or for other hazards from the same country, depending on the context.

379 **5 Conclusion**

380 OH-EpiCap is a generic (i.e. applicable to multi-sectoral surveillance systems of any hazard),
381 interactive (facilitating and supporting discussions among stakeholders from diverse sectors
382 and disciplines), and standalone (thanks to the user-friendly web application) tool developed
383 to conduct macro-level evaluation of epidemiological national capacities and capabilities for
384 OH surveillance. It supports the diagnostic of strengths and weaknesses in multi-sectoral
385 collaborations and helps to identify concrete and direct actions to improve collaborative
386 activities at all steps of surveillance. Besides, this evaluation framework strengthens trust
387 between stakeholders across the systems, building a foundation for professional networks,
388 acculturation to practices in other health sectors and disciplines, and long-term collaborations.

389 **6 Acknowledgments**

390 We thank the OH-EJP MATRIX consortium, experts from other OH-EJP projects, the
391 CoEvalAMR project, and the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) and the participants to
392 the OH-EpiCap evaluations for their feedback and support to consolidate and validate the
393 organization of the tool and the definition of the targets and indicators.

394 **7 Funding**

395 This work was supported by funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and
396 Innovation programme under grant agreement No 773830: One Health European Joint
397 Programme. Funding sources did not affect the design of this study, data collection, data
398 analysis, decisions on publication, or preparation of the manuscript.

399 **8 References**

- 400 1. Johnson I, Hansen A, Bi P. The challenges of implementing an integrated One Health
401 surveillance system in Australia. *Zoonoses Public Health*. févr 2018;65(1):e229–36.
- 402 2. Aenishaenslin C, Häsler B, Ravel A, Parmley EJ, Mediouni S, Bennani H, et al. Evaluating
403 the Integration of One Health in Surveillance Systems for Antimicrobial Use and
404 Resistance: A Conceptual Framework. *Front Vet Sci*. 24 mars 2021;8:611931.
- 405 3. Stärk KDC, Arroyo Kuribreña M, Dauphin G, Vokaty S, Ward MP, Wieland B, et al. One
406 Health surveillance – More than a buzz word? *Prev Vet Med*. juin 2015;120(1):124–30.

- 407 4. One Health Joint Plan of Action, 2022–2026 [Internet]. FAO; UNEP; WHO; World
408 Organisation for Animal Health (WOAH) (founded as OIE); 2022 [cité 28 oct 2022].
409 Disponible sur: <http://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/cc2289en>
- 410 5. Bordier M, Delavenne C, Nguyen DTT, Goutard FL, Hendrikx P. One Health Surveillance:
411 A Matrix to Evaluate Multisectoral Collaboration. *Front Vet Sci.* 24 avr 2019;6:109.
- 412 6. PREDICT Consortium, Kelly TR, Machalaba C, Karesh WB, Crook PZ, Gilardi K, et al.
413 Implementing One Health approaches to confront emerging and re-emerging zoonotic
414 disease threats: lessons from PREDICT. *One Health Outlook.* déc 2020;2(1):1.
- 415 7. Mackenzie JS, McKinnon M, Jeggo M. One Health: From Concept to Practice. In: Yamada
416 A, Kahn LH, Kaplan B, Monath TP, Woodall J, Conti L, éditeurs. *Confronting Emerging*
417 *Zoonoses* [Internet]. Tokyo: Springer Japan; 2014 [cité 23 sept 2022]. p. 163–89.
418 Disponible sur: http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-4-431-55120-1_8
- 419 8. Dente MG, Riccardo F, Nacca G, Ranghiasi A, Manuguerra JC, Escadafal C, et al.
420 Strengthening integrated surveillance for arboviruses in the Mediterranean and Black Sea
421 regions in the framework of the One Health approach. 2016;1:41–8.
- 422 9. Hattendorf J, Bardosh KL, Zinsstag J. One Health and its practical implications for
423 surveillance of endemic zoonotic diseases in resource limited settings. *Acta Trop.* janv
424 2017;165:268–73.
- 425 10. Babo Martins S, Rushton J, Stärk KDC. Economics of zoonoses surveillance in a ‘One
426 Health’ context: an assessment of *Campylobacter* surveillance in Switzerland. *Epidemiol*
427 *Infect.* avr 2017;145(6):1148–58.
- 428 11. Bordier M, Uea-Anuwong T, Binot A, Hendrikx P, Goutard FL. Characteristics of
429 One Health surveillance systems: A systematic literature review. *Prev Vet Med.* août
430 2020;181:104560.
- 431 12. Nielsen LR, Alban L, Ellis-Iversen J, Mintiens K, Sandberg M. Evaluating integrated
432 surveillance of antimicrobial resistance: experiences from use of three evaluation tools.
433 *Clin Microbiol Infect.* déc 2020;26(12):1606–11.
- 434 13. Sandberg M, Hesp A, Aenishaenslin C, Bordier M, Bennani H, Bergwerff U, et al.
435 Assessment of Evaluation Tools for Integrated Surveillance of Antimicrobial Use and
436 Resistance Based on Selected Case Studies. *Front Vet Sci.* 8 juill 2021;8:620998.
- 437 14. Rüegg SR, Nielsen LR, Buttigieg SC, Santa M, Aragrande M, Canali M, et al. A
438 Systems Approach to Evaluate One Health Initiatives. *Front Vet Sci.* 9 mars 2018;5:23.
- 439 15. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. EU laboratory capability
440 monitoring system (EULabCap): report on 2018 survey of EU/EEA country capabilities
441 and capacities. [Internet]. LU: Publications Office; 2020 [cité 23 sept 2022]. Disponible
442 sur: <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2900/914596>
- 443 16. Henaux V, Henok Tegegne, Bogaardt C, Lailier R, Collineau L, Joaquin Prada.
444 Deliverable D-JIP-MATRIX-WP4.2 OH-EpiCap tool and tutorial. 18 août 2022 [cité 23
445 sept 2022]; Disponible sur: <https://zenodo.org/record/7006654>

- 446 17. Chang W, Cheng J, Allaire J, Xie Y, McPherson J, Dipert A et al. Shiny: web
447 application framework for R. R package version, 1.7.1., 2021a. [https://CRAN.R-](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=shiny)
448 [project.org/package=shiny](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=shiny).
- 449 18. Chang W, Ribeiro BB. Shinydashboard: create dashboards with 'Shiny'. R package
450 version 0.7, 2 (2021b). <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=shinydashboard>
- 451 19. Calba C, Goutard FL, Hoinville L, Hendrikx P, Lindberg A, Saegerman C, et al.
452 Surveillance systems evaluation: a systematic review of the existing approaches. BMC
453 Public Health. déc 2015;15(1):448.
- 454 20. Delbecq AL, Van de Ven AH, Gustafson DH. Group techniques for program planning:
455 A guide to nominal group and Delphi processes. Scott, Foresman, 1975.

456

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469


470

471

472

473

474



475

Figure 1. Structural overview of the OH-EpiCap targets, grouped by dimension.

476 **Table 1.** Comments and questions from the surveillance representatives who conducted a OH-
 477 EpiCap evaluation and answers from the MATRIX team

478

Comments / Questions	Answers
<p>Answers proposed for a question may not fit the OH surveillance system under evaluation.</p>	<p>The feedback from the evaluators helps refine and complete the answers proposed for some indicators to consider specific OH surveillance contexts and situations not envisaged initially. In addition, the “NA” answer can be used if the question is not relevant for the OH surveillance system under evaluation.</p> <p>If the answers proposed for a question do not fit the OH surveillance system under evaluation, the panel should define what would be the ideal situation and score the question accordingly by comparing the current situation to the ideal one. The panel can specify in the free comment space which alternative answer(s) were considered, for result interpretation and dissemination.</p>
<p>Questions about the amount of data that can be saved in the web application and whether the data is accessible by stakeholders not involved in the evaluation, arguing that some information could be potentially confidential.</p>	<p>The web application does not keep any data, to comply with the European General Data Protection Regulation. Users must save their work locally (i.e. in the machine they are using) before closing the application (to avoid any data loss).</p>
<p>A question whether the surveillance system under evaluation could be considered as an OH surveillance system in spite of a lack of formalisation or applicable legislation regarding the collaborations between sectors.</p>	<p>The OH-EpiCap tool was developed for any surveillance system where some collaborations between sectors exist (at any step of the surveillance) even if those ones are not formalised or occur occasionally.</p>

<p>Integration could be considered from a system-wide perspective, including multi-sectoral collaborations but also inter-program collaborations even within the same sector (e.g. collaborations between a surveillance program targeting AMR and another one on antimicrobial use, in a specific sector)</p>	<p>Although this vision appears different from the OH approach, the tool allows different levels of integration to be considered; however, such specificity should be clearly stated and understood by all surveillance representatives before the start of the evaluation.</p>
<p>Need more time to further discuss and map the actions to be taken to improve identified weaknesses</p>	<p>Participants are encouraged to further discuss and investigate underlying issues to improve collaboration in the system, during a dedicated workshop</p>

479

480