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Why there is a need for NAP prioritization?

- Countries have developed National Action Plans on AMR
  - Ambitious, comprehensive, multi-sectoral, costed up to activity level; but not adequately backed by **funds** or **political buy-in**

- Therefore, appropriate resource allocation based on ground realities of funds, infrastructure, capacity, sectoral importance w.r.t. AMR is limited. **On-the-ground implementation is lagging behind**

- **Challenges and solutions are more relevant for low-and middle-income countries**, who may be less prepared to address all aspects of the problem at one go

- Opportunities for a **mid-course correction** for better multi-sectoral involvement, focusing of strategies etc.

It is therefore important to prioritize actions, which not only have maximum impact but are also feasible in view of the available resources and ground realities across different sectors.
Need for prioritization is reflected in global guidance

• Report of the WHO Director General on AMR, during 72\textsuperscript{nd} World Health Assembly (2019)
  – Identifies the need for ‘careful prioritization” based on risk/reward analysis as an in each country for effective implementation of NAP-AMRs

• Report of the United Nations Interagency Coordination Group on AMR to the UN Secretary General (2019)
  – Highlights that few NAPs have focused on understanding AMR investment cases or returns on investment and costs of inaction
  – Recommends prioritization of NAPs based on capacity, infrastructure, domestic resource allocations to accelerate implementation

• CSE’s earlier experience of engaging with African nations reflect that lack of prioritization as a challenge limiting NAP-AMR operationalization
Zambia’s step towards prioritization

- Key elements
  - Prioritization and allocation of timelines as per different sectors (e.g., environment related understanding on AMR are quite different, therefore timelines were revised)
  - Filling of gaps through addition of new activities (e.g., increased focus on limiting antibiotic misuse in animals)
  - Policy level activities segregated from implementation level activities (law-making is the first and important step; requires lesser investments or funds)

(released August 2019)
Learnings

- National Action Plans need to be implementable. A well planned NAP may not be executed if there are no resources or funds

- Realistic assessment of where we stand – policy, capacity, funds, infrastructure, resources across each sector

- Opportunity for understanding what needs to be done and what would be a realistic timeline, and planning towards it

- Recognition of the multi-sectoral nature of the AMR issue and merit of multi-sectoral involvement in NAP implementation
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