

*The Standing Committee of European Doctors (CPME) represents national medical associations across Europe. We are committed to contributing the medical profession's point of view to EU and European policy-making through pro-active cooperation on a wide range of health and healthcare related issues.*

## **CPME response to the Consultation with the AMR One Health Network on the AMR Preliminary Monitoring Framework Indicators**

On 18 July 2024, the CPME Board adopted the 'CPME response to the Consultation with the AMR One Health Network on the AMR Preliminary Monitoring Framework Indicators' (CPME 2024/088).

Contribution ID: 03d47ca8-840f-495d-9b96-37ee484dcdae

Date: 19/07/2024 13:07:17

# Consultation with the AMR OHN on the AMR Preliminary Monitoring Framework Indicators

Fields marked with \* are mandatory.

The purpose of this survey is to gather feedback from the members of the AMR One Health Network (AMR OHN) on a **preliminary list of indicators** to be included in a **monitoring framework** that will help the Commission to track the progress and results of the EU and Member States' actions to combat AMR.

The survey will not be aimed at collecting data on actions to combat AMR implemented by Member States or other authorities, but only to gather your feedback on the overall appropriateness of the indicators that could be included in the monitoring framework. In particular, the survey will contribute to assessing the extent to which the proposed indicators are **relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust**. Moreover, the survey will collect suggestions of **potential gaps** in the proposed list of indicators, and it will contribute to distinguishing between **core and optional indicators**.

The survey includes four areas of assessment:

- Profiling questions
- Indicators validation questions
- Classification (core/optional) of indicators questions
- Gap-filling questions

We invite you to provide your feedback by answering the survey by **31 July 2024**.

Please note that it is possible to save online a draft version of your responses to the survey questions and finalise your contribution later on, by clicking on '**Save as Draft**'. Alternatively, a PDF version of the survey can be downloaded and shared with relevant colleagues within your organisation. However, please note that we would need to receive only one contribution per invited organisation. For this reason, we would be grateful if you could collect the feedback from your colleagues and then provide the joint response to the online version of the survey.

The survey includes specific filtering questions and routing paths aimed at ensuring that each of you answers the questions that are more relevant for you, based on your expertise and roles or responsibilities. In this context, you will be asked to specify the relevant One Health sector(s) covered within your organisations, as well as what are the most relevant domain(s) of indicators, in line with your expertise and roles.

As detailed in the supporting paper for the consultation, not all the indicators proposed in the draft monitoring framework have been included in this consultation. In particular, indicators linked to obligations that are already set in the legislative framework on AMR have not been included, as well as all the indicators proposed under the "Targets" domain, as already monitored and assessed at Member State or EU level. Please consult the supporting paper to see the indicators proposed in the preliminary monitoring framework, as some of them might have not been included in this written consultation.

The survey is part of a study conducted by Tetra Tech and Intellera Consulting/Economisti Associati on behalf of the European Commission. The information gathered will be used exclusively for this study. **All data will be treated confidentially and reported only in aggregated form, ensuring individual responses remain undisclosed.**

For further information, please contact the survey team at: [sgoffredo@economistiassociati.com](mailto:sgoffredo@economistiassociati.com) (Mr Sergio Goffredo). Please contact this email address if you would like to receive an MS Word version of the questionnaire to more easily collaborate with your colleagues on a joint survey response from your organisation.

Thank you.

Please download and consult **the supporting paper** for additional information on the indicators, including those that are not part of this consultation.

[Supporting\\_paper\\_for\\_consultation\\_AMRMonitoringFwk.pdf](#)

---

## Profiling questions

---

**Please specify in what capacity you are answering this survey.**

- National authorities EU Member States, Iceland or Norway
- EU organisation (NGO, academic/research institute, trade and business association, professional association, etc.)
- EU institution, body or agency
- International / intergovernmental organisation
- Individual expert appointed in his/her personal capacity

**Please include here your name and the name of the organisation you represent (if any).**

Diogo Teixeira Pereira - EU Policy Adviser to the Standing Committee of European Doctors (CPME)

**Please specify the relevant country.**

- Austria
- Belgium
- Bulgaria
- Croatia
- Cyprus
- Czechia
- Denmark
- Estonia
- Finland
- France
- Germany
- Greece
- Hungary
- Iceland
- Ireland
- Italy

- Latvia
- Lithuania
- Luxembourg
- Malta
- Netherlands
- Norway
- Poland
- Portugal
- Romania
- Slovak Republic
- Slovenia
- Spain
- Sweden

**Please select the type of organisation that you represent.**

- Trade and business association
- NGO
- Professional association
- Academia, research institute or think tank

**\*Please specify your relevant One Health sector.**

*Please select all that apply*

- Human health
- Animal health
- Environment
- Food
- Other

**\*Please specify the most relevant domain(s) for you, based on your expertise, specific role or responsibilities.**

*Please select all that apply.*

Please select the most relevant domain(s) to your experience and roles/responsibilities concerning the fight against AMR. The listed domains are linked to specific areas of the 2023 Council Recommendation on stepping up EU actions to combat antimicrobial resistance in a One Health approach ([https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32023H0622\(01\)](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32023H0622(01))).

Based on the response to this question, we will ask you to provide your feedback only on the indicators linked to the selected domain(s).

- Domain: NAPs and National policies against AMR
- Domain: Surveillance
- Domain: Infection Prevention and Control (IPC)
- Domain: Antimicrobial Stewardship (AMS)
- Domain: Awareness
- Domain: R&D&I and access to antimicrobials and countermeasures
- Domain: Cooperation
- Domain: Global

---

## Domain: NAPs and national policies against AMR

---

In this section, we will ask you to provide your assessment on the extent to which each outcome and output indicator proposed is:

- **Relevant**, i.e., it contributes to measuring progress and results of the actions aimed at combating AMR under each specific domain.
- **Credible**, i.e., it is unambiguous and easy to interpret, also for non-experts.
- **Easy to monitor**, i.e., the data for the indicator can be collected at low cost / with acceptable administrative burden.
- **Robust**, i.e., it is reliable and provides meaningful evidence on the progress and/or results of the actions aimed at combating AMR under each specific domain.

The data informing some of the indicators proposed will be collected through existing databases and monitoring tools (i.e., TRACCs). Please consult the supporting paper for the consultation to get more information on the proposed indicators, including those proposed under this Domain that have been omitted from this consultation.

In the table below, please indicate the extent to which each **output indicator** is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust. **Please assign a value between 1 to 5**, with 1 being the lowest possible score (i.e., not relevant, not credible, etc.) and 5 being the highest possible score (i.e., very relevant, very credible etc.). Please include 0 to indicate if you don't know whether a specific indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.

**For each of the proposed output indicators, please indicate whether they are...**

	<b>...relevant</b>	<b>...credible</b>	<b>...easy to monitor</b>	<b>...robust</b>
Extent of NAP development and/or implementation in each Member State	5	4	4	4
Extent to which NAP outcomes are evaluated at least every 3 years & evaluation publicly available in each Member State	5	3	3	3
Extent of intersectoral coordination in the implementation of NAPs; sectors involved in the coordination in each Member State	5	5	5	5
Number of Member States whose NAP includes monitoring mechanisms, and the characteristics of their monitoring mechanism	4	4	4	4
Number of Member States whose NAP includes evidence-based measures to prevent, monitor and reduce the spread of AMR in the environment	5	5	4	5
Extent of human and financial resources allocated for the effective implementation of NAP	5	5	5	5

All the output indicators presented above are expected to contribute to achieving this specific **outcome indicator**: **Increase in the number of Member States implementing high quality NAPs.**

N.B. A high quality NAPs is one that meets the criteria mentioned above (i.e. its outcomes are evaluated every 3 years, there is intersectoral coordination for its implementation, it includes monitoring mechanisms, etc.).

**To what extent the outcome indicator "Increase in the number of Member States implementing high quality NAPs" is...**

Please select one box per each column (assessment criteria) included, specifying the extent to which the outcome indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.

	...relevant?	...credible?	...easy to monitor?	...robust?
To a large extent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To some extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
To a moderate extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a very limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The following question will ask you to indicate which indicators you consider to be core indicators to measure progress and results in this domain, while the others can be considered as optional indicators.

- Core indicators are critical and central for monitoring progress and results of actions to combat AMR under each specific domain.
- Optional indicators may not be considered central today, but could be measured in the future, allowing the monitoring framework to adapt to new circumstances or data available in relation to combating AMR.

**Among the indicators proposed under “Domain: NAP and National Policies against AMR”, which one(s) do you think should be considered to be core or optional indicator(s) for monitoring progress and results achieved under this domain?**

	Co re	Opti onal
Output indicator 1: Extent of NAP development and/or implementation in each Member State	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Output indicator 2: Extent to which NAP outcomes are evaluated at least every 3 years & evaluation publicly available in each Member State	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Output indicator 3: Extent of intersectoral coordination in the implementation of NAPs; sectors involved in the coordination in each Member State	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Output indicator 4: Number of Member States whose NAP includes monitoring mechanisms, and the characteristics of their monitoring mechanism	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Output indicator 5: Number of Member States whose NAP includes evidence-based measures to prevent, monitor and reduce the spread of AMR in the environment	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Output indicator 6: Extent of human and financial resources allocated for the effective implementation of NAP	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Are there any indicators missing under this domain?**

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

**Please indicate if any of the proposed indicators under this domain should be defined more precisely and/or how it can be revised to be more relevant, credible, easy to monitor and/or robust?**

N/A

**Do you have any additional comments or remarks?**

N/A

## Domain: Surveillance

In this section, we will ask you to provide your assessment on the extent to which each outcome and output indicator proposed is:

- **Relevant**, i.e., it contributes to measuring progress and results of the actions aimed at combating AMR under each specific domain.
- **Credible**, i.e., it is unambiguous and easy to interpret, also for non-experts.
- **Easy to monitor**, i.e., the data for the indicator can be collected at low cost / with acceptable administrative burden.
- **Robust**, i.e., it is reliable and provides meaningful evidence on the progress and/or results of the actions aimed at combating AMR under each specific domain.

The data informing some of the indicators proposed will be collected through existing databases and other sources (i.e., TRACCs, ECDC, EFSA, EMA, etc.). Please consult the supporting paper for the consultation to get more information on the proposed indicators, including those proposed under this Domain that have been omitted from this consultation.

### Surveillance of AMR in human health

In the table below, please indicate the extent to which each **output indicator** is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust. **Please assign a value between 1 to 5**, with 1 being the lowest possible score (i.e., not relevant, not credible, etc.) and 5 being the highest possible score (i.e., very relevant, very credible etc.). Please include 0 to indicate if you don't know whether a specific indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.

**For each of the proposed output indicators, please indicate whether they are...**

	...r ele va nt	...C re di bl e	...ea sy to mon itor	...r ob us t
Number of Member States whose AMR surveillance of bacteria in humans includes all isolates from clinical microbiology laboratories (in addition to bloodstream and cerebrospinal fluid isolates (invasive isolates))	5	3	3	3

Number of Member States with national legislation requiring that infections caused by critical (high negative human health impact) multidrug-resistant organisms resistant to last line treatments are notifiable diseases (e.g. carbapenem-resistant Acinetobacter baumannii, carbapenem-resistant Enterobacteriaceae (e.g. Klebsiella pneumoniae, Escherichia coli) and Candida auris)	5	5	5	5
Number of Member States with expanded surveillance in humans to pathogens with emerging or established AMR due to their exposure to substances in the environment, in particular those used in plant protection products or biocidal products	0	0	0	0

All the output indicators presented above are expected to contribute to achieving this specific **outcome indicator**: **Extent of AMR surveillance in humans in each Member State**.

**To what extent the outcome indicator "Extent of AMR surveillance in humans in each Member State." is...**

Please select one box per each column (assessment criteria) included, specifying the extent to which the outcome indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.

	...relevant?	...credible?	...easy to monitor?	...robust?
To a large extent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To some extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a moderate extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
To a limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a very limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The following question will ask you to indicate which indicators you consider to be core indicators to measure progress and results in this domain, while the others can be considered as optional indicators.

- **Core indicators** are critical and central for monitoring progress and results of actions to combat AMR under each specific domain.
- **Optional indicators** may not be considered central today, but could be measured in the future, allowing the monitoring framework to adapt to new circumstances or data available in relation to combating AMR.

**Among the indicators proposed under "Domain: Surveillance of AMR in human health", which one(s) do you think should be considered to be core or optional indicator(s) for monitoring progress and results achieved under this domain?**

	C o r e	O p t i o n a l
Output indicator 1: Number of Member States whose AMR surveillance of bacteria in humans includes all isolates from clinical microbiology laboratories (in addition to bloodstream and cerebrospinal fluid isolates (invasive isolates))	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>



Output indicator 2: Number of Member States with national legislation requiring that infections caused by critical (high negative human health impact) multidrug-resistant organisms resistant to last line treatments are notifiable diseases (e.g. carbapenem-resistant Acinetobacter baumannii, carbapenem-resistant Enterobacteriaceae (e.g. Klebsiella pneumoniae, Escherichia coli) and Candida auris)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Output indicator 3: Number of Member States with expanded surveillance in humans to pathogens with emerging or established AMR due to their exposure to substances in the environment, in particular those used in plant protection products or biocidal products	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

**Surveillance of antimicrobial consumption (AMC) in human health**

In the table below, please indicate the extent to which each **output indicator** is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust. **Please assign a value between 1 to 5**, with 1 being the lowest possible score (i.e., not relevant, not credible, etc.) and 5 being the highest possible score (i.e., very relevant, very credible etc.). Please include 0 to indicate if you don't know whether a specific indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.

**For each of the proposed output indicators, please indicate whether they are...**

	<b>...relevant</b>	<b>...credible</b>	<b>...easy to monitor</b>	<b>...robust</b>
Extent (i.e., coverage, frequency, types of antimicrobials) of AMC surveillance implementation in Member States at: i) Community level; ii) Hospital level; iii) Long-term care facilities	5	3	3	3
Number of Member States which collect prescribing and/ or dispensing data on antimicrobials in humans	5	5	4	5

All the output indicators presented above are expected to contribute to achieving this specific **outcome indicator: Extent of AMC surveillance in humans in each Member State**

**To what extent the outcome indicator "Extent of AMC surveillance in humans in each Member State (with the aim of achieving complete collection of AMC data for human health by 2030)" is...**

*Please select one box per each column (assessment criteria) included, specifying the extent to which the outcome indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.*

	<b>...relevant?</b>	<b>...credible?</b>	<b>...easy to monitor?</b>	<b>...robust?</b>
To a large extent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
To some extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a moderate extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a very limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The following question will ask you to indicate which indicators you consider to be core indicators to measure progress and results in this domain, while the others can be considered as optional indicators.

- **Core indicators** are critical and central for monitoring progress and results of actions to combat AMR under each specific domain.
- **Optional indicators** may not be considered central today, but could be measured in the future, allowing the monitoring framework to adapt to new circumstances or data available in relation to combating AMR.

Among the indicators proposed under “Domain: Surveillance of antimicrobial consumption (AMC) in human health”, which one(s) do you think should be considered to be **core** or **optional** indicator(s) for monitoring progress and results achieved under this domain?

	Core	Optional
Output indicator 1: Extent (i.e., coverage, frequency, types of antimicrobials) of AMC surveillance implementation in Member States at: i) Community level; ii) Hospital level; iii) Long-term care facilities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Output indicator 2: Number of Member States which collect prescribing and/or dispensing data on antimicrobials in humans from prescribers, pharmacists and other interested parties	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Surveillance of AMR in the environment**

In the table below, please indicate the extent to which the **output indicator** is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust. **Please assign a value between 1 to 5**, with 1 being the lowest possible score (i.e., not relevant, not credible, etc.) and 5 being the highest possible score (i.e., very relevant, very credible etc.). Please include 0 to indicate if you don’t know whether a specific indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.

For each of the proposed output indicators, please indicate whether they are...

	...relevant	...credible	...easy to monitor	...robust
Levels of pollution in surface water caused by antibiotics, antifungal, fungicide and plant protection products included in the Watch List under the Water Framework Directive	N/A			
Extent to which national regulatory frameworks of plant protection & biocidal products considers risk of AMR	N/A			

The output indicator presented above is expected to contribute to achieving this specific **outcome indicator: Improved surveillance of AMR in the environment (water and/or soil) at EU level.**

To what extent the outcome indicator **"Improved surveillance of AMR in the environment (water and/or soil) at EU level"** is...

Please select one box per each column (assessment criteria) included, specifying the extent to which the outcome indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.

	...relevant?	...credible?	...easy to monitor?	...robust?
--	--------------	--------------	---------------------	------------

To a large extent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
To some extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a moderate extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a very limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The following question will ask you to indicate which indicators you consider to be core indicators to measure progress and results in this domain, while the others can be considered as optional indicators.

- Core indicators are critical and central for monitoring progress and results of actions to combat AMR under each specific domain.
- Optional indicators may not be considered central today, but could be measured in the future, allowing the monitoring framework to adapt to new circumstances or data available in relation to combating AMR.

**Among the indicators proposed under “Domain: Surveillance in the environment”, which one(s) do you think should be considered to be core or optional indicator(s) for monitoring progress and results achieved under this domain?**

	Core	Optional
Output indicator 1: Levels of pollution in surface water caused by antibiotics, antifungal, fungicide and plant protection products included in the Watch List under the Water Framework Directive	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Output indicator 2: Extent to which national regulatory frameworks of plant protection & biocidal products considers risk of AMR	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Integrated surveillance of AMR & AMC**

In the table below, please indicate the extent to which the **output indicator** is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust. **Please assign a value between 1 to 5**, with 1 being the lowest possible score (i.e., not relevant, not credible, etc.) and 5 being the highest possible score (i.e., very relevant, very credible etc.). Please include 0 to indicate if you don’t know whether a specific indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.

**For the proposed output indicator, please indicate whether it is...**

	...relevant	...credible	...easy to monitor	...robust
Number of Member States with some form of integrated and continuous systems of surveillance of AMR and AMC encompassing human health, animal health, plant health, food, wastewater and the environment	5	5	4	5

The output indicator presented above is expected to contribute to achieving this specific **outcome indicator**: **Extent to which integrated surveillance of AMC & AMR is achieved at EU level.**

**To what extent the outcome indicator "Extent to which integrated surveillance of AMC & AMR is achieved at EU level" is...**

Please select one box per each column (assessment criteria) included, specifying the extent to which the outcome indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.

	...relevant?	...credible?	...easy to monitor?	...robust?
To a large extent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To some extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
To a moderate extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a very limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The following question will ask you to indicate which indicators you consider to be core indicators to measure progress and results in this domain, while the others can be considered as optional indicators.

- Core indicators are critical and central for monitoring progress and results of actions to combat AMR under each specific domain.
- Optional indicators may not be considered central today, but could be measured in the future, allowing the monitoring framework to adapt to new circumstances or data available in relation to combating AMR.

**Do you think the indicator proposed under "Domain: Integrated surveillance of AMR & AMC" should be considered a core or optional indicator for monitoring progress and results achieved under this domain?**

	Core	Optional
Output indicator 1: Number of Member States with some form of integrated and continuous systems of surveillance of AMR and AMC encompassing human health, animal health, plant health, food, wastewater and the environment	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Are there any indicators missing under this domain?**

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

**Please specify here any other indicator that could be considered under this domain.**

It may be useful having an indicator with percentage of member states implementing standardized protocols for AMC and AMR data collection, to ensure consistency and comparability of data across member states, enhancing the overall robustness and reliability of the surveillance system. Also, a new indicator on "number of healthcare facilities that have implemented electronic health records (EHRs) for tracking antibiotic prescriptions and resistance patterns" should be considered. This would ensure precise monitoring of antibiotic use and resistance, facilitating timely interventions.

**Please indicate if any of the proposed indicators under this domain should be defined more precisely and/or how it can be revised to be more relevant, credible, easy to monitor and/or robust?**

The definition of indicators is not specified, I do not believe that we should define the metrics, but there is a consensus that antibiotic use should be possibly surveilled in at least two metrics (per DDD, in DOT, in DID, per admissions) <https://pubmed-ncbi-nlm-nih-gov.nukweb.nuk.uni-lj.si/29878222/>

**Do you have any additional comments or remarks?**

## Domain: Infection Prevention and Control (IPC)

In this section, we will ask you to provide your assessment on the extent to which each outcome and output indicator proposed is:

- **Relevant**, i.e., it contributes to measuring progress and results of the actions aimed at combating AMR under each specific domain.
- **Credible**, i.e., it is unambiguous and easy to interpret, also for non-experts.
- **Easy to monitor**, i.e., the data for the indicator can be collected at low cost / with acceptable administrative burden.
- **Robust**, i.e., it is reliable and provides meaningful evidence on the progress and/or results of the actions aimed at combating AMR under each specific domain.

The data informing some of the indicators proposed will be collected through existing databases and other sources (i.e., TRACCs, ECDC, SPAR, WHO, etc.). Please consult the supporting paper for the consultation to get more information on the proposed indicators, including those proposed under this Domain that have been omitted from this consultation.

### **Infection prevention and control (IPC) in the human health sector**

In the table below, please indicate the extent to which the **output indicator** is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust. **Please assign a value between 1 to 5**, with 1 being the lowest possible score (i.e., not relevant, not credible, etc.) and 5 being the highest possible score (i.e., very relevant, very credible etc.). Please include 0 to indicate if you don't know whether a specific indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.

**To what extent the outcome indicator "Extent of AMR surveillance in humans in each Member State (with the aim of obtaining AMR data for all levels of care by 2030 i.e. community, hospitals and in long-term care facilities)" is...**

Please select one box per each column (assessment criteria) included, specifying the extent to which the outcome indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.

	...relevant?	...credible?	...easy to monitor?	...robust?
To a large extent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
To some extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a moderate extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a very limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

For each of the proposed output indicators, please indicate whether they are...

	...relevant	...credible	...easy to monitor	...robust
Extent to which Member States guarantee/ continuously provide training on IPC core competences for healthcare professionals in hospitals and in long-term care facilities	5	5	4	5
Level of financial resources for IPC programmes in hospitals and long-term care facilities in each Member State	5	4	4	4
Number of Member States conducting quality control of IPC measures in hospitals and in long-term care facilities	4	4	3	4
State of infrastructure in healthcare facilities (to track improvement over time in infrastructure, materials and equipment for IPC in MS)	5	5	4	5
Extent to which clinical laboratories are able to provide microbiological support to healthcare facilities	5	4	3	4

All the output indicators presented above are expected to contribute to achieving this specific **outcome indicator: Reduction in prevalence of infections acquired in healthcare settings (acute settings, long-term care facilities).**

**To what extent the outcome indicator "Reduction in prevalence of infections acquired in healthcare settings (acute settings, long-term care facilities)." is...**

Please select one box per each column (assessment criteria) included, specifying the extent to which the outcome indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.

	...relevant?	...credible?	...easy to monitor?	...robust?
To a large extent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
To some extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a moderate extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a very limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

I don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The following question will ask you to indicate which indicators you consider to be core indicators to measure progress and results in this domain, while the others can be considered as optional indicators.

- **Core indicators** are critical and central for monitoring progress and results of actions to combat AMR under each specific domain.
- **Optional indicators** may not be considered central today, but could be measured in the future, allowing the monitoring framework to adapt to new circumstances or data available in relation to combating AMR.

**Among the following indicators proposed under “Domain: IPC – human health”, which one(s) do you think should be considered to be core or optional indicator(s) for monitoring progress and results achieved under this domain?**

	Core	Optional
Output indicator 1: Extent to which Member States guarantee/ continuously provide training on IPC core competences for healthcare professionals in hospitals and in long-term care facilities	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Output indicator 2: Level of financial resources for IPC programmes in hospitals and in long-term care facilities in each Member State	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Output indicator 3: Number of Member States conducting quality control of IPC measures in hospitals and in long-term care facilities	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Output indicator 4: State of infrastructure in healthcare facilities (to track improvement over time in infrastructure, materials and equipment for IPC in MS)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Output indicator 5: Extent to which clinical laboratories are able to provide microbiological support to healthcare facilities	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Vaccination programmes**

In the table below, please indicate the extent to which the **output indicator** is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust. **Please assign a value between 1 to 5**, with 1 being the lowest possible score (i.e., not relevant, not credible, etc.) and 5 being the highest possible score (i.e., very relevant, very credible etc.). Please include 0 to indicate if you don't know whether a specific indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.

**For the proposed output indicator, please indicate whether it is...**

	...relevant	...credible	...easy to monitor	...robust
National immunisation programmes are fully developed and implemented (on the basis of Council Recommendation of 7 December 2018 on Strengthened Cooperation against Vaccine Preventable Disease) in all Member States	5	5	4	5

The output indicator presented above is expected to contribute to achieving this specific **outcome indicator**: **Percentage of target population covered by vaccines included in Member States' national vaccination programmes.**

**To what extent the outcome indicator "Percentage of target population covered by vaccines included in Member States' national vaccination programmes" is...**

Please select one box per each column (assessment criteria) included, specifying the extent to which the outcome indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.

	...relevant?	...credible?	...easy to monitor?	...robust?
To a large extent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
To some extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a moderate extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a very limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The following question will ask you to indicate which indicators you consider to be core indicators to measure progress and results in this domain, while the others can be considered as optional indicators.

- **Core indicators** are critical and central for monitoring progress and results of actions to combat AMR under each specific domain.
- **Optional indicators** may not be considered central today, but could be measured in the future, allowing the monitoring framework to adapt to new circumstances or data available in relation to combating AMR.

**Do you think the indicator proposed under "Domain IPC – vaccination programmes" should be considered a core or optional indicator for monitoring progress and results achieved under this domain?**

	Core	Optional
Output indicator 1: National immunisation programmes are fully developed and implemented (on the basis of Council Recommendation of 7 December 2018 on Strengthened Cooperation against Vaccine Preventable Disease) in all Member States	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**AMR exposure in the environment**

In the table below, please indicate the extent to which the **output indicator** is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust. **Please assign a value between 1 to 5**, with 1 being the lowest possible score (i.e., not relevant, not credible, etc.) and 5 being the highest possible score (i.e., very relevant, very credible etc.). Please include 0 to indicate if you don't know whether a specific indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.

**For each of the proposed output indicators, please indicate whether they are...**

	...relevant	...credible	...easy to monitor	...robust



Uptake of good evidence-based manure management practices in agriculture in each Member State	N/A			
Uptake of good evidence-based sewage sludge management practices in agriculture in each Member State	N/A			

All the output indicators presented above are expected to contribute to achieving this specific **outcome indicator**: **Extent to which farms implement measures for good manure and sewage sludge management in each Member State.**

**To what extent the outcome indicator "Extent to which farms implement measures for good manure and sewage sludge management in each Member State" is...**

Please select one box per each column (assessment criteria) included, specifying the extent to which the outcome indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.

	...relevant?	...credible?	...easy to monitor?	...robust?
To a large extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To some extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a moderate extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a very limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The following question will ask you to indicate which indicators you consider to be core indicators to measure progress and results in this domain, while the others can be considered as optional indicators.

- **Core indicators** are critical and central for monitoring progress and results of actions to combat AMR under each specific domain.
- **Optional indicators** may not be considered central today, but could be measured in the future, allowing the monitoring framework to adapt to new circumstances or data available in relation to combating AMR.

**Among the following indicators proposed under "Domain: IPC – AMR exposure in the environment", which one(s) do you think should be considered to be core or optional indicator(s) for monitoring progress and results achieved under this domain?**

	Core	Optional
Output indicator 1: Uptake of good evidence-based manure management practices in agriculture in each Member State	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Output indicator 2: Uptake of good evidence-based sewage sludge management practices in agriculture in each Member State	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Are there any indicators missing under this domain?**

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

**Please indicate if any of the proposed indicators under this domain should be defined more precisely and/or how it can be revised to be more relevant, credible, easy to monitor and/or robust?**

**Do you have any additional comments or remarks?**

## Domain: Antimicrobial Stewardship (AMS)

In this section, we will ask you to provide your assessment on the extent to which each outcome and output indicator proposed is:

- **Relevant**, i.e., it contributes to measuring progress and results of the actions aimed at combating AMR under each specific domain.
- **Credible**, i.e., it is unambiguous and easy to interpret, also for non-experts.
- **Easy to monitor**, i.e., the data for the indicator can be collected at low cost / with acceptable administrative burden.
- **Robust**, i.e., it is reliable and provides meaningful evidence on the progress and/or results of the actions aimed at combating AMR under each specific domain.

The data informing some of the indicators proposed will be collected through existing databases and monitoring tools (i.e., TRACCs, etc.). Please consult the supporting paper for the consultation to get more information on the proposed indicators, including those proposed under this Domain that have been omitted from this consultation.

### Antimicrobial stewardship (AMS) in the human health sector

In the table below, please indicate the extent to which each **output indicator** is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust. **Please assign a value between 1 to 5**, with 1 being the lowest possible score (i.e., not relevant, not credible, etc.) and 5 being the highest possible score (i.e., very relevant, very credible etc.). Please include 0 to indicate if you don't know whether a specific indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.

**For each of the proposed output indicators, please indicate whether they are...**

	<b>...relevant</b>	<b>...credible</b>	<b>...easy to monitor</b>	<b>...robust</b>
Extent of implementation of AMS measures addressed to health professionals in each Member State	5	5	4	5
Extent of implementation of AMS measures addressed to community and hospital pharmacies in each Member State	4	5	4	4
Extent to which diagnostic testing is available in medical practice in each Member State	5	5	4	5

All the output indicators presented above are expected to contribute to achieving this specific **outcome indicator**: **Extent to which AMS & prudent use of antimicrobials across healthcare settings has improved in each Member State.**

**To what extent the outcome indicator "Extent to which AMS & prudent use of antimicrobials across healthcare settings has improved in each Member State" is...**

Please select one box per each column (assessment criteria) included, specifying the extent to which the outcome indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.

	...relevant?	...credible?	...easy to monitor?	...robust?
To a large extent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
To some extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a moderate extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a very limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The following question will ask you to indicate which indicators you consider to be core indicators to measure progress and results in this domain, while the others can be considered as optional indicators.

- Core indicators are critical and central for monitoring progress and results of actions to combat AMR under each specific domain.
- Optional indicators may not be considered central today, but could be measured in the future, allowing the monitoring framework to adapt to new circumstances or data available in relation to combating AMR.

**Among the indicators proposed under "Domain: AMS - human health", which one(s) do you think should be considered to be core or optional indicator(s) for monitoring progress and results achieved under this domain?**

	Core	Optional
Output indicator 1: Extent of implementation of AMS measures addressed to health professionals in each Member State	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Output indicator 2: Extent of implementation of AMS measures addressed to community and hospital pharmacies in each Member State	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Output indicator 3: Extent to which diagnostic testing is available in medical practice in each Member State	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Collection & safe disposal of antimicrobials**

In the table below, please indicate the extent to which each output indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust. **Please assign a value between 1 to 5**, with 1 being the lowest possible score (i.e., not relevant, not credible, etc.) and 5 being the highest possible score (i.e., very relevant, very credible etc.). Please include 0 to indicate if you don't know whether a specific indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.

**For the proposed output indicator, please indicate whether it is...**

	...relevant	...credible	...easy to monitor	...robust
Number of Member States having developed national programmes for the collection & safe disposal of antimicrobials from all relevant settings; uptake of the programme (where measured)	N/A			

All the output indicators presented above are expected to contribute to achieving this specific **outcome indicator**: **Improved collection & safe disposal of antimicrobials in relevant settings**.

**To what extent the outcome indicator "Improved collection & safe disposal of antimicrobials in relevant settings" is...**

Please select one box per each column (assessment criteria) included, specifying the extent to which the outcome indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.

	...relevant?	...credible?	...easy to monitor?	...robust?
To a large extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To some extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a moderate extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a very limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The following question will ask you to indicate which indicators you consider to be core indicators to measure progress and results in this domain, while the others can be considered as optional indicators.

- **Core indicators** are critical and central for monitoring progress and results of actions to combat AMR under each specific domain.
- **Optional indicators** may not be considered central today, but could be measured in the future, allowing the monitoring framework to adapt to new circumstances or data available in relation to combating AMR.

**Do you think the indicator proposed under "Domain: AMS - collection & safe disposal of antimicrobials" should be considered a core or optional indicator for monitoring progress and results achieved under this domain?**

	Core	Optional
Output indicator 1: Number of Member States having developed national programmes for the collection & safe disposal of antimicrobials from all relevant settings; uptake of the programme (where measured)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Are there any indicators missing under this domain?**

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

**Please specify here any other indicator that could be considered under this domain.**

Number of healthcare facilities with an established AMS programmes  
 Number of countries with allocated resources for AMS programmes

**Please indicate if any of the proposed indicators under this domain should be defined more precisely and/or how it can be revised to be more relevant, credible, easy to monitor and/or robust?**

**Do you have any additional comments or remarks?**

## Domain: Awareness

In this section, we will ask you to provide your assessment on the extent to which each outcome and output indicator proposed is:

- **Relevant**, i.e., it contributes to measuring progress and results of the actions aimed at combating AMR under each specific domain.
- **Credible**, i.e., it is unambiguous and easy to interpret, also for non-experts.
- **Easy to monitor**, i.e., the data for the indicator can be collected at low cost / with acceptable administrative burden.
- **Robust**, i.e., it is reliable and provides meaningful evidence on the progress and/or results of the actions aimed at combating AMR under each specific domain.

The data informing some of the indicators proposed will be collected through existing databases and other sources (i.e., TRACCs, Eurobarometer, ECDC, etc.). Please consult the supporting paper for the consultation to get more information on the proposed indicators, including those proposed under Domain 5 that have been omitted from this consultation.

### Education and training

In the table below, please indicate the extent to which each output indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust. **Please assign a value between 1 to 5**, with 1 being the lowest possible score (i.e., not relevant, not credible, etc.) and 5 being the highest possible score (i.e., very relevant, very credible etc.). Please include 0 to indicate if you don't know whether a specific indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.

**For each of the proposed output indicators, please indicate whether they are...**

	...r ele va nt	...C re di bl e	...ea sy to moni tor	...r ob us t

Extent to which national continuous education programmes and curricula for the disciplines below cover topics: i. AMR, ii. IPC, iii. Environmental risks, iv. Biosecurity, v. Antimicrobial stewardship [Disciplines: a. medicine, b. nursing, c. midwifery, d. pharmacy, e. dentistry, f. veterinary medicine, g. agriculture and agronomics, h. environmental and ecological sciences]	5	5	4	5
Number (and, where available, reach) of communication campaign(s) on the collection of safe disposals of antimicrobials targeting human health and veterinary professionals in each Member State	5	5	4	5
Number and, where available, reach of information campaigns on AMR related issues conducted for professionals in human health, veterinary and agronomy sectors in each Member State	5	5	4	5

All the output indicators presented above are expected to contribute to achieving this specific **outcome indicator: Improved provision of AMR education and training to relevant professionals in human health, veterinary and agronomy.**

**To what extent the outcome indicator "Improved provision of AMR education and training to relevant professionals in human health, veterinary and agronomy" is...**

Please select one box per each column (assessment criteria) included, specifying the extent to which the outcome indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.

	...relevant?	...credible?	...easy to monitor?	...robust?
To a large extent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
To some extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a moderate extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a very limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The following question will ask you to indicate which indicators you consider to be core indicators to measure progress and results in this domain, while the others can be considered as optional indicators.

- **Core indicators** are critical and central for monitoring progress and results of actions to combat AMR under each specific domain.
- **Optional indicators** may not be considered central today, but could be measured in the future, allowing the monitoring framework to adapt to new circumstances or data available in relation to combating AMR.

**Among the indicators proposed under "Domain: Awareness - Education and training", which one(s) do you think should be considered to be core or optional indicator(s) for monitoring progress and results achieved under this domain?**

	C o r e	O p t i o n a l
--	------------------	--------------------------------------

Output indicator 1: Extent to which national continuous education programmes and curricula for the disciplines below cover topics: i. AMR, ii. IPC, iii. Environmental risks, iv. Biosecurity, v. Antimicrobial stewardship [Disciplines: a. medicine, b. nursing, c. midwifery, d. pharmacy, e. dentistry, f. veterinary medicine, g. agriculture and agronomics, h. environmental and ecological sciences]	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Output indicator 2: Number (and, where available, reach) of communication campaign(s) on the collection and safe disposal of antimicrobials targeting human health and veterinary professionals in each Member State	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Output indicator 3: Number and, where available, reach of information campaigns on AMR related issues conducted for professionals in human health, veterinary and agronomy sectors in each Member State	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

**AMR awareness raising activities for the general public**

In the table below, please indicate the extent to which each output indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust. **Please assign a value between 1 to 5**, with 1 being the lowest possible score (i.e., not relevant, not credible, etc.) and 5 being the highest possible score (i.e., very relevant, very credible etc.). Please include 0 to indicate if you don't know whether a specific indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.

**For each of the proposed output indicators, please indicate whether they are...**

	...r ele van t	...C red ible	...eas y to monit or	...r ob ust
Number and, where available, reach of communication campaign(s) on AMR related issues for the public on the existence of programmes for the collection and safe disposal of antimicrobials in each Member State	4	4	4	4
Number of awareness raising activities or communication campaigns on AMR related issues conducted at national level in each Member State for: i) large-scale for the general public; ii) targeted for the general public; iii) targeted for specific groups	3	4	4	4
Extent to which Member States coordinate national awareness raising activities and communication campaigns on AMR related issues with other Member States, EC and EU agencies	3	4	4	4

All the output indicators presented above are expected to contribute to achieving this specific **outcome indicator: Increase in the general public's knowledge of AMR in each Member State.**

**To what extent the outcome indicator "Increase in the general public's knowledge of AMR in each Member State" is...**

Please select one box per each column (assessment criteria) included, specifying the extent to which the outcome indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.

	...relevant?	...credible?	...easy to monitor?	...robust?
To a large extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To some extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

To a moderate extent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a very limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The following question will ask you to indicate which indicators you consider to be core indicators to measure progress and results in this domain, while the others can be considered as optional indicators.

- Core indicators are critical and central for monitoring progress and results of actions to combat AMR under each specific domain.
- Optional indicators may not be considered central today, but could be measured in the future, allowing the monitoring framework to adapt to new circumstances or data available in relation to combating AMR.

**Among the indicators proposed under “Domain: Awareness - Education and training”, which one(s) do you think should be considered to be core or optional indicator(s) for monitoring progress and results achieved under this domain?**

	Core	Optional
Output indicator 1: Number and, where available, reach of communication campaign(s) on AMR related issues for the public on the existence of programmes for the collection and safe disposal of antimicrobials in each Member State	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Output indicator 2: Number of awareness raising activities or communication campaigns on AMR related issues conducted at national level in each Member State for: i) large-scale for the general public; ii) targeted for the general public; iii) targeted for specific groups	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Output indicator 3: Extent to which Member States coordinate national awareness raising activities and communication campaigns on AMR related issues with other Member States, EC and EU agencies	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

**Are there any indicators missing under this domain?**

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

**Please specify here any other indicator that could be considered under this domain.**

An indicator should be considered to evaluate the impact of the European Antibiotic Awareness Day (EAAD), measured by stakeholder engagement: (i) number of stakeholder engagement activities conducted as part of EAAD and (ii) reports or studies performed to measure changes in public awareness and understanding of AMR before and after the EAAD.

Also, building on Eurobarometer indicators to measure public awareness could be worth pursuing: <https://europa.eu/eurobarometer/surveys/detail/2632>



**Please indicate if any of the proposed indicators under this domain should be defined more precisely and/or how it can be revised to be more relevant, credible, easy to monitor and/or robust?**

The indicator "Extent to which national continuous education programmes and curricula for the disciplines below cover topics: i. AMR, ii. IPC, iii. Environmental risks, iv. Biosecurity, v. Antimicrobial stewardship, One Health approach, vi. Interprofessional cooperation [Disciplines: a. medicine, b. nursing, c. midwifery, d. pharmacy, e. dentistry, f. veterinary medicine, g. agriculture and agronomics, h. environmental and ecological sciences] and vi. Responsible prescribing [Disciplines: medicine]" should be refined to include the themes "One Health approach, Interprofessional cooperational and Responsible prescribing [Disciplines: medicine]", as proposed above, so that future doctors and other healthcare professionals have the appropriate knowledge and skills.

**Do you have any additional comments or remarks?**

None

**Domain: R&D&I and access to antimicrobials and countermeasures**

In this section, we will ask you to provide your assessment on the extent to which each outcome and output indicator proposed is:

- **Relevant**, i.e., it contributes to measuring progress and results of the actions aimed at combating AMR under each specific domain.
- **Credible**, i.e., it is unambiguous and easy to interpret, also for non-experts.
- **Easy to monitor**, i.e., the data for the indicator can be collected at low cost / with acceptable administrative burden.
- **Robust**, i.e., it is reliable and provides meaningful evidence on the progress and/or results of the actions aimed at combating AMR under each specific domain.

Please consult the supporting paper for the consultation to get more information on the proposed indicators, including those proposed under this Domain that have been omitted from this consultation.

**R&D&I for antimicrobials and other AMR medical countermeasures in the human health sector**

In the table below, please indicate the extent to which each **output indicator** is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust. **Please assign a value between 1 to 5**, with 1 being the lowest possible score (i.e., not relevant, not credible, etc.) and 5 being the highest possible score (i.e., very relevant, very credible etc.). Please include 0 to indicate if you don't know whether a specific indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.

**For each of the proposed output indicators, please indicate whether they are...**

	...r ele van t	...c red ible	...eas y to monit or	...r ob ust

Amount of EU funding (and type of funding instrument) allocated to projects supporting research and technological innovation with push incentives for the detection, prevention and treatment of infections in humans caused by antimicrobial resistant pathogens	5	5	5	5
Amount of EU funding allocated for translational research and late-stage development of AMR medical countermeasures, including clinical trials for antimicrobials	5	5	5	5

All the output indicators presented above are expected to contribute to achieving this specific **outcome indicator**: **Number of new antimicrobials and AMR medical countermeasures for human health in the R&D pipeline or brought to market supported by EU funding instruments.**

**To what extent the outcome indicator "Number of new antimicrobials and AMR medical countermeasures for human health in the R&D pipeline or brought to market supported by EU funding instruments" is...**

Please select one box per each column (assessment criteria) included, specifying the extent to which the outcome indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.

	...relevant?	...credible?	...easy to monitor?	...robust?
To a large extent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
To some extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a moderate extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a very limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The following question will ask you to indicate which indicators you consider to be core indicators to measure progress and results in this domain, while the others can be considered as optional indicators.

- **Core indicators** are critical and central for monitoring progress and results of actions to combat AMR under each specific domain.
- **Optional indicators** may not be considered central today, but could be measured in the future, allowing the monitoring framework to adapt to new circumstances or data available in relation to combating AMR.

**Among the indicators proposed under "Domain RD&I for antimicrobials and other AMR medical countermeasures in the human health sector", which one(s) do you think should be considered to be core or optional indicator(s) for monitoring progress and results achieved under this domain?**

	Core	Optional
Output indicator 1: Amount of EU funding (and type of funding instrument) allocated to projects supporting research and technological innovation with push incentives for the detection, prevention and treatment of infections in humans caused by antimicrobial resistant pathogens	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Output indicator 2: Amount of EU funding allocated for translational research and late-stage development of AMR medical countermeasures, including clinical trials for antimicrobials	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
---	----------------------------------	-----------------------

**Access to antimicrobials**

In the table below, please indicate the extent to which each **output indicator** is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust. **Please assign a value between 1 to 5**, with 1 being the lowest possible score (i.e., not relevant, not credible, etc.) and 5 being the highest possible score (i.e., very relevant, very credible etc.). Please include 0 to indicate if you don't know whether a specific indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.

**For the proposed output indicator, please indicate whether it is...**

	<b>...relevant</b>	<b>...credible</b>	<b>...easy to monitor</b>	<b>...robust</b>
Extent of support provided by EU bodies and agencies to Member States for the coordination of initiatives on manufacturing, procurement and stockpiling of antimicrobials	5	5	3	3

All the output indicators presented above are expected to contribute to achieving this specific **outcome indicator: Expanded and stable access to antimicrobials in Member States.**

**To what extent the outcome indicator "Expanded and stable access to antimicrobials in Member States" is...**

*Please select one box per each column (assessment criteria) included, specifying the extent to which the outcome indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.*

	<b>...relevant?</b>	<b>...credible?</b>	<b>...easy to monitor?</b>	<b>...robust?</b>
To a large extent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
To some extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a moderate extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a very limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The following question will ask you to indicate which indicators you consider to be core indicators to measure progress and results in this domain, while the others can be considered as optional indicators.

- **Core indicators** are critical and central for monitoring progress and results of actions to combat AMR under each specific domain.
- **Optional indicators** may not be considered central today, but could be measured in the future, allowing the monitoring framework to adapt to new circumstances or data available in relation to combating AMR.

**Do you think the indicator proposed under “Domain RD&I - Access to antimicrobials” should be considered a core or optional indicator for monitoring progress and results achieved under this domain?**

	Co re	Opti onal
Output indicator 1: Extent of support provided by EU bodies and agencies to Member States for the coordination of initiatives on manufacturing, procurement and stockpiling of antimicrobials	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**AMR in the environment**

In the table below, please indicate the extent to which each **output indicator** is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust. **Please assign a value between 1 to 5**, with 1 being the lowest possible score (i.e., not relevant, not credible, etc.) and 5 being the highest possible score (i.e., very relevant, very credible etc.). Please include 0 to indicate if you don’t know whether a specific indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.

**For the proposed output indicator, please indicate whether it is...**

	...rel evan t	...cre dible	...easy to monitor	...ro bust
Amount of funds made available (by type of funding instrument) to support research on antimicrobials and AMR pathogens in the environment	0	0	0	0

All the output indicators presented above are expected to contribute to achieving this specific **outcome indicator: Improved understanding of AMR in the environment & approaches to its reduction.**

**To what extent the outcome indicator "Improved understanding of AMR in the environment & approaches to its reduction" is...**

*Please select one box per each column (assessment criteria) included, specifying the extent to which the outcome indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.*

	...relevant?	...credible?	...easy to monitor?	...robust?
To a large extent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
To some extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a moderate extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a very limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The following question will ask you to indicate which indicators you consider to be core indicators to measure progress and results in this domain, while the others can be considered as optional indicators.

- **Core indicators** are critical and central for monitoring progress and results of actions to combat AMR under each specific domain.

- Optional indicators may not be considered central today, but could be measured in the future, allowing the monitoring framework to adapt to new circumstances or data available in relation to combating AMR.

**Do you think the indicator proposed under “Domain RD&I - AMR in the environment” should be considered a core or optional indicator for monitoring progress and results achieved under this domain?**

	Co re	Optio nal
Output indicator 1: Amount of funds made available (by type of funding instrument) to support research on antimicrobials and AMR pathogens in the environment	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Are there any indicators missing under this domain?**

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

**Please indicate if any of the proposed indicators under this domain should be defined more precisely and/or how it can be revised to be more relevant, credible, easy to monitor and/or robust?**

**Do you have any additional comments or remarks?**

## Domain: Cooperation

In this section, we will ask you to provide your assessment on the extent to which each outcome and output indicator proposed is:

- **Relevant**, i.e., it contributes to measuring progress and results of the actions aimed at combating AMR under each specific domain.
- **Credible**, i.e., it is unambiguous and easy to interpret, also for non-experts.
- **Easy to monitor**, i.e., the data for the indicator can be collected at low cost / with acceptable administrative burden.
- **Robust**, i.e., it is reliable and provides meaningful evidence on the progress and/or results of the actions aimed at combating AMR under each specific domain.

Please consult the supporting paper for the consultation to get more information on the proposed indicators, including those proposed under this Domain that have been omitted from this consultation.

In the table below, please indicate the extent to which each **output indicator** is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust. **Please assign a value between 1 to 5**, with 1 being the lowest possible score (i.e., not relevant, not credible, etc.) and 5 being the highest possible score (i.e., very relevant, very credible etc.). Please include 0 to indicate if you don't know whether a specific indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.

**For the proposed output indicator, please indicate whether it is...**

	...relevant	...credible	...easy to monitor	...robust
Number of best practice exchange opportunities in the context of One Health AMR Network meetings or other relevant committees and working groups	5	5	4	5

All the output indicators presented above are expected to contribute to achieving this specific **outcome indicator**: **Improved coordination of One Health responses to AMR among Member States and between Member States and EU agencies/bodies.**

**To what extent the outcome indicator "Improved coordination of One Health responses to AMR among Member States and between Member States and EU agencies/bodies" is...**

Please select one box per each column (assessment criteria) included, specifying the extent to which the outcome indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.

	...relevant?	...credible?	...easy to monitor?	...robust?
To a large extent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
To some extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a moderate extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a very limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The following question will ask you to indicate which indicators you consider to be core indicators to measure progress and results in this domain, while the others can be considered as optional indicators.

- **Core indicators** are critical and central for monitoring progress and results of actions to combat AMR under each specific domain.
- **Optional indicators** may not be considered central today, but could be measured in the future, allowing the monitoring framework to adapt to new circumstances or data available in relation to combating AMR.

**Do you think the indicator proposed under "Domain: Cooperation" should be considered a core or optional indicator(s) for monitoring progress and results achieved under this domain?**

	Core	Optional
Output indicator 1: Number of best practice exchange opportunities in the context of One Health AMR Network meetings or other relevant committees and working groups	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Are there any indicators missing under this domain?**

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

**Please indicate if any of the proposed indicators under this domain should be defined more precisely and/or how it can be revised to be more relevant, credible, easy to monitor and/or robust?**

**Do you have any additional comments or remarks?**

## Domain: Global

In this section, we will ask you to provide your assessment on the extent to which each outcome and output indicator proposed is:

- **Relevant**, i.e., it contributes to measuring progress and results of the actions aimed at combating AMR under each specific domain.
- **Credible**, i.e., it is unambiguous and easy to interpret, also for non-experts.
- **Easy to monitor**, i.e., the data for the indicator can be collected at low cost / with acceptable administrative burden.
- **Robust**, i.e., it is reliable and provides meaningful evidence on the progress and/or results of the actions aimed at combating AMR under each specific domain.

Please consult the supporting paper for the consultation to get more information on the proposed indicators, including those proposed under this Domain that have been omitted from this consultation.

### Global commitments

In the table below, please indicate the extent to which each **output indicator** is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust. **Please assign a value between 1 to 5**, with 1 being the lowest possible score (i.e., not relevant, not credible, etc.) and 5 being the highest possible score (i.e., very relevant, very credible etc.). Please include 0 to indicate if you don't know whether a specific indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.

**For the proposed output indicator, please indicate whether it is...**

	<b>...relevant</b>	<b>...credible</b>	<b>...easy to monitor</b>	<b>...robust</b>
Active EU participation in drafting and negotiating international standards and agreements relevant to AMR	N/A			

All the output indicators presented above are expected to contribute to achieving this specific **outcome indicator: Extent to which global commitments and strengthened normative framework to tackle AMR are raised in line with EU positions and priorities.**

**To what extent the outcome indicator "Extent to which global commitments and strengthened normative framework to tackle AMR are raised in line with EU positions and priorities" is...**

*Please select one box per each column (assessment criteria) included, specifying the extent to which the outcome indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.*

	<b>...relevant?</b>	<b>...credible?</b>	<b>...easy to monitor?</b>	<b>...robust?</b>

To a large extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To some extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a moderate extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a very limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**International cooperation**

In the table below, please indicate the extent to which each **output indicator** is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust. **Please assign a value between 1 to 5**, with 1 being the lowest possible score (i.e., not relevant, not credible, etc.) and 5 being the highest possible score (i.e., very relevant, very credible etc.). Please include 0 to indicate if you don't know whether a specific indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.

**For the proposed output indicator, please indicate whether it is...**

	<b>...relevant</b>	<b>...credible</b>	<b>...easy to monitor</b>	<b>...robust</b>
Active EU participation in international fora aimed at cooperating/coordinating a global response to AMR	N/A			

All the output indicators presented above are expected to contribute to achieving this specific **outcome indicator**: **Strengthened international cooperation and coordinated global response to AMR**.

**To what extent the outcome indicator "Strengthened international cooperation and coordinated global response to AMR" is...**

*Please select one box per each column (assessment criteria) included, specifying the extent to which the outcome indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.*

	<b>...relevant?</b>	<b>...credible?</b>	<b>...easy to monitor?</b>	<b>...robust?</b>
To a large extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To some extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a moderate extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a very limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Capacity to address AMR**

In the table below, please indicate the extent to which each **output indicator** is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust. **Please assign a value between 1 to 5**, with 1 being the lowest possible score (i.e., not relevant, not credible, etc.) and 5 being the highest possible score (i.e., very relevant, very credible etc.).



Please include 0 to indicate if you don't know whether a specific indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.

**For the proposed output indicator, please indicate whether it is...**

	...relevant	...credible	...easy to monitor	...robust
Amount of funding and extent of technical support provided to third countries to build capacities to address AMR through support for implementation of international standards and action plans and trainings				

All the output indicators presented above are expected to contribute to achieving this specific **outcome indicator**: **Contribution of the EU to strengthening capacities of third countries to tackle AMR**

**To what extent the outcome indicator "Contribution of the EU to strengthening capacities of third countries to tackle AMR" is...**

Please select one box per each column (assessment criteria) included, specifying the extent to which the outcome indicator is relevant, credible, easy to monitor and robust.

	...relevant?	...credible?	...easy to monitor?	...robust?
To a large extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To some extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a moderate extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To a very limited extent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The following question will ask you to indicate which indicators you consider to be core indicators to measure progress and results in this domain, while the others can be considered as optional indicators.

- Core indicators are critical and central for monitoring progress and results of actions to combat AMR under each specific domain.
- Optional indicators may not be considered central today, but could be measured in the future, allowing the monitoring framework to adapt to new circumstances or data available in relation to combating AMR.

**Among the indicators proposed under "Domain: Global", which one(s) do you think should be considered to be core or optional indicator(s) for monitoring progress and results achieved under this domain?**

	Core	Optional
Output indicator 1 (global commitments): Active EU participation in drafting and negotiating international standards and agreements relevant to AMR	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Output Indicator 2 (international cooperation): Active EU participation in international fora aimed at cooperating/coordinating a global response to AMR	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Output indicator 3 (capacity to address AMR): Amount of funding and extent of technical support provided to third countries to build capacities to address AMR through support for implementation of international standards and action plans and trainings	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Are there any indicators missing under this domain?**

- Yes  
 No  
 I don't know

**Please indicate if any of the proposed indicators under this domain should be defined more precisely and/or how it can be revised to be more relevant, credible, easy to monitor and/or robust?****Do you have any additional comments or remarks?**

## Closing questions

---

**Please let us know if you have any additional general comment or remark.**

It is important that all proposed indicators are reported as percentages to ensure comparability and facilitate tracking over time.

**Would you like to share your contact details with the research team?**

The research team might contact you during the survey analysis stage, in case of follow-up questions relating to the responses provided to this consultation.

- Yes  
 No

**Please include here your email address.**

diogo.teixeira.pereira@cpme.eu

**Thank you for your contribution!**

## Contact

Contact Form (/eusurvey/runner/contactform/ConsultationAMRMonitoringFwk)

---