

Project no. 310806

**Providing a new generation of methodologies and tools for
cost-effective risk-based animal health surveillance systems for the benefit of
livestock producers, decision makers and consumers**

KBBE

Collaborative Project

FP7-KBBE-2012-6

www.fp7-risksur.eu

Deliverable No. 7.29

Surveillance Symposium

WP 7 – Training, dissemination and exploitation

Authors: Ann Lindberg (SVA), Lucy Snow (APHA), Jorge Pinto Ferreira (SAFOSO)

Lead participant: SVA

Delivery date: 27-04-2015

Dissemination level: Public

Nature: Other



This project has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement N°310806.

Contents

1	Objective.....	3
2	Program	3
3	Participants.....	4
4	Output	5
5	Appendix 1 - Programme: Animal Health Surveillance 2.0	6
6	Appendix 2 – List of participants	7

1 Objective

The RISKSUR symposium, “Animal Health Surveillance 2.0” took place 24 March 2015 at Het Pand Convention Centre in Ghent, Belgium, in conjunction with the annual meeting of the Society for Veterinary Epidemiology and Preventive Medicine (SVEPM 2015). The primary objective of the symposium was to present novel ideas and tools for the design and evaluation of cost-effective surveillance to the scientific community and surveillance users, and to provide a forum to discuss the main determinants for how these tools could be taken forward to influence policy.

2 Program

The program contained two sessions presenting RISKSUR outputs. The morning session provided an overview of surveillance activities in Europe, availability and quality of surveillance information and a novel framework to support design and documentation of surveillance activities. The afternoon session presented RISKSUR work on evaluation of surveillance activities, including presentation of the EVA tool, which aims to provide guidance on the evaluation process with links to other tools and methods as well as to give feedback on the feasibility of evaluation and the strengths and limitations of the evaluation.

The program also contained two keynote presentations, one by Laszlo Kuster from DG-Sanco, who talked on “Science-based policy making in the field of animal health surveillance”, and one by Christine Fourichon, Oniris-Nantes, who is also a member of the RISKSUR Scientific Advisory Board. The title of her talk was “From surveillance to action: towards output based standards for disease control.”

The last part of the symposium was dedicated to discussions between surveillance program designers, policy makers, members of the RISKSUR advisory board and RISKSUR consortium members, focusing on seven questions, emerging out of the preceding presentations. The discussions were held in a World Café format (<http://www.theworldcafe.com/principles.html>).

1. The mapping of surveillance systems in Europe showed a large heterogeneity in surveillance designs, public availability of data, funding and reporting. Can you think of practical ways that would promote increased standardisation and high quality surveillance across Europe?
2. There is a substantial variability in the level of expertise within veterinary health services in EU countries. How may this influence the uptake of tools such as the surveillance design framework and the EVA tool? What can be done in order to facilitate uptake? Drivers? Constraints?
3. We present a surveillance design framework that support detailed design and careful documentation. How can this framework best support surveillance redesign to improve surveillance effectiveness? What do we need to make sure that the tool incorporates? Do you believe the tools presented are suitable for all diseases, or which aspects should be differentiated depending on the disease itself?
4. We claim that evaluation should be an intrinsic part of any surveillance system. Do you agree or disagree? What characteristics of a surveillance system, or the surveillance context, define the evaluation scope and -frequency (e.g. objective, duration, history, international disease situation)?
5. We claim that effectiveness attributes (e.g. timeliness, sensitivity, false alarm rate) and economic efficiency criteria (e.g. cost-benefit ratio, cost-effectiveness ratio) should be integral to evaluations of surveillance. Are there other attributes in your experience that you think are more or equally important?

6. Which of the following statements is most in line with what you consider the role of economics to be in the decision process regarding strategic choices for animal health surveillance and control programmes?
- For me, the biggest value of economics lies in the judging the potential impact of a disease, which helps with prioritization.
 - Surveillance must primarily be of high technical performance and economics is of most value to make sure that the costs are as low as possible.
 - I usually do not ask for evidence of the surveillance benefits, as I already know that these are very large.
 - I am interested in the economic value of surveillance, but there are many other factors in the decision process that play a bigger role.
 - None of these statements fit my view (explain).
7. We believe one of the obstacles preventing the adoption of new surveillance approaches is the slow translation of research findings into policy. Do you agree? If so what do you think are the main reasons for this? How do think this translation of scientific findings into policy and implementation of surveillance be improved?

The questions were discussed and the participants’ reflections were documented by a RISKSUR rapporteur. A summary of the discussions were then fed back to the audience.

The full program is shown in Appendix 1.

3 Participants

The symposium attracted almost 50 participants from 17 countries, distributed as described in Table 1. The detailed list of participants is provided in Appendix 2.

Table 1. Country of origin for participants in the RISKSUR Surveillance symposium “Animal Health Surveillance 2.0”

Country	# of participants
Belgium	1
Canada	1
Denmark	4
Estonia	1
Finland	1
France	8
Germany	5
Ireland	3
Italy	1
Netherlands	1
Portugal	2
Spain	1
Sweden	2
Switzerland	4
United Kingdom	10
United States	3
Vietnam	1
Total	49

4 Output

The following output from the surveillance symposium is available from the RISKSUR website (<http://www.fp7-risksur.eu/>).

- Video recordings of the presentations
- Slides, in pdf format
- Electronic proceedings, which include a summary of the symposium contents, the programme, slide copies, the documented output from the discussion session and a list of participants.

5 Appendix 1 - Programme: Animal Health Surveillance 2.0

08.00-09.00	Registration	
9.00-09.15	Welcome and objectives	Dirk Pfeiffer
Session 1	Chair: Dirk Pfeiffer, RVC	
09.15-10.00	Science-based policy making in the field of animal health surveillance	Laszlo Kuster, DG-Sanco
10.00-10.30	Coffee	
Session 2	Chair: Ulrich Sperling, SAFOSO and Marisa Peyre, CIRAD	
10.30-10.50	Mapping of surveillance and livestock systems, infrastructure, trade flows and decision-making processes: Gaps and opportunities for improvements in surveillance.	Barbara Häsler, RVC
10.50-11.10	Towards a harmonized and transparent way to describe surveillance activities to enable output-based standards for surveillance: Lessons learned in terms of information availability, transparency, standardised surveillance description, and terminology.	Arianna Comin, SVA
11.10-11.30	Surveillance design framework	Fernanda Dórea, SVA
11.30-11.45	Getting more from passive surveillance: an example applying the RISKSUR framework to avian influenza in the UK	Lucy Snow, APHA
11.45-12.00	Tools to improve the performance of African swine fever surveillance in free countries	Marta Martinez Aviles, UCM
12.00 -13.00	Lunch	
Session 3	Chair: Lucy Snow, APHA and Christoph Staubach, FLI	
13.00-13.20	Challenges behind the evaluation of animal health surveillance and control strategies	Daniel Traon, Arcadia
13.20-13.40	The EVA tool: a decision support tool for the evaluation of surveillance systems	Marisa Peyre, CIRAD
13.40-14.00	The value of animal health information: the economic evaluation challenge	Barbara Häsler, RVC Alexis Delabougliise, CIRAD
14.00-14.45	From surveillance to action – towards output based standards for disease control.	Christine Fourichon, BioEpAR, Oniris-Nantes
14.45-15.10	Coffee	
Session 4	Chair: Ulrich Sperling, SAFOSO	
15.10-16.20	Round table discussions: AHS 2.0 – how do we move into the new era?	
16.20-17.20	Feedback from the discussions	Invited rapporteurs
17.20-17.30	Summary and conclusions	Dirk Pfeiffer

6 Appendix 2 – List of participants

Title	First name	Name	Affiliation	Country
Prof	Lis	Alban	Danish Agriculture & Food Council	Denmark
Ms	Ana Carolina	Antunes	National Veterinary Institute - Technical University of Denmark	Denmark
Dr	Pascale	Aubry	Canadian Food Inspection Agency	Canada
Mr	John	Berezowski	Veterinary Public Health Institute, University of Bern	Switzerland
Dr	Laure	Bournez	Anses	France
Dr	Adam	Brouwer	APHA	UK
Mr	Arjen	Brouwer	Office of the Chief Veterinary Officer, Welsh Government	UK
Ms	Clémentine	Calba	CIRAD	France
Ms	Lucie	Collineau	SAFOSO AG	Switzerland
Dr	Arianna	Comin	National Veterinary Institute	Sweden
Mr	Jürg	Danuser	Swiss Federal Food Safety and Veterinary Office FSVO	Switzerland
Mr	Alexis	Delabouglise	CIRAD	France
Dr	Fernanda	Dórea	National Veterinary Institute	Sweden
Dr	Christine	Fourichon	Oniris - INRA, UMR1300 BioEpar	France
Mr	Jesus	Gallego	Scottish Government Animal Health and Welfare Division	UK
Prof	Eduarda	Gomes-Neves	ICBAS Universidade do Porto	Portugal
Dr	John	Griffin	Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine, Ireland	Ireland
Ms	Barbara	Häsler	Royal Veterinary College	UK
Ms	Lisbeth	Harm Nielsen	Veterinarian	Denmark
Ms	Claire	Hautefeuille	Cirad	France
Ms	Linda	Hoinville	RVC	UK
Dr	Laszlo	Kuster	European Commission	Belgium
Dr	Coralie	Lupo	Ifremer	France
Dr	Aurelien	Madouasse	INRA - Oniris	France
Dr	Marta	Martinez Aviles	UCM	Spain
Ms	Roswitha	Merle	Freie Universität Berlin, Inst. F. Vet. Epid. and Biostatistics	Germany
Prof	Simon	More	University College Dublin	Ireland
Dr	Petra	Muellner	Epi-interactive GER/NZ	Germany
Dr	Lina	Mur	Institute for Infectious Animal Diseases	United States
Dr	Alexandra	Müller	ICBAS-UP	Portugal
Mr	Jarlath	O'Connor	Dept of Agriculture, Dublin, Ireland	Ireland
Ms	Giulia	Paternoster	IZSLER	Italy
Prof	Dustin	Pendell	Colorado State University	United States
Dr	Marisa	Peyre	CIRAD	Vietnam
Prof	Dirk	Pfeiffer	Royal Veterinary College	UK
Dr	Fernando	Sanchez-Vizcaino	University of Liverpool	United Kingdom
Dr	Birgit	Schauer	FLI	Germany
Ms	Kitty	Schulman	Finnish Food Safety Authority Evira	Finland
Ms	Katja	Schulz	FLI	Germany
Dr	Lucy	Snow	APHA	United Kingdom
Dr	Ulrich	Sperling	SAFOSO AG	Switzerland

Title	First name	Name	Affiliation	Country
Dr	Christoph	Staubach	FLI	Germany
Ms	Jada	Thompson	Colorado State University	United States
Prof	Nils	Toft	DTU vet	Denmark
Dr	Sue	Tongue	SRUC	United Kingdom
Mr	Gregorio	Torres	OIE	France
Dr	Gerdien	van Schaik	GD Animal Health	Netherlands
Mr	Timothée	Vergne	RVC	United Kingdom
Prof	Arvo	Viltrop	Estonian University of Life Sciences	Estonia