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## Introduction

- NAP AMR 2015-2019
- actions in all domains
- research in domain environment largely finalised


## Where are the threats coming from?



## Spread of resistant bacteria



## Background

- <2015 policy advice reports highlight uncertainties
- Message `more research needed’ not desirable
- Therefore commisioned RIVM to:
- Conduct baseline / 'zero' measurements in wastewater and manure
- Advice on effective no-regret policy measures



## Selection of Wastewater Treatment Plants



- Selection of 100 WWTP (approx. $1 / 3$ of all Dutch WWTP)
- Inventory of water volumes across NL


## Concentrations of E. coli, ESBL and CPE

- $\log 2-\log 3$ removal of bacteria
- No selection for ESBL or CPE
- CPE detected in $89 \%$ of the WWTP ( $87 \%$ of the influents, $55 \%$ of the effluents)


## Loads to the aquatic environment

Residues: around 900 kg/a for 4 most prevalent substances

|  | Volume | ESBL E.coli | CRE | ermB | sul1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & {\left[10^{6}\right.} \\ & \left.\mathrm{m}^{3} / \text { year }\right] \end{aligned}$ | Load [CFU / year] |  | Load [copies / year] |  |
| WWTP | 1900 | $3,2 \times 10^{15}$ | $1,8 \times 10^{13}$ | $1,9 \times 10^{19}$ | $2,4 \times 10^{20}$ |

## Other sources of resistant bacteria in surface water

- WWTP effluent
- Sewage overflows
- Separated sewers (rain to surface water, faulty connections: wastewater to surface water)
- Animal husbandry (manure, stables)



## Loads to the aquatic environment

Overflows and separate sewer systems possibly equally important

|  | Volume | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ESBL } \\ & \text { E.coた } \end{aligned}$ | CRE | ermB | sul1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} {\left[10^{6}\right.} \\ \mathrm{m} 3 / \text { year }] \end{gathered}$ | Load [CFU / year] |  | Load [copies / year] |  |
| WWTP | 1900 | $3 \times 10^{15}$ <br> (8×1014 - <br> $2 \times 10^{16}$ ) | $1,8 \times 10^{13}$ | $1,9 \times 10^{19}$ | $2,4 \times 10^{20}$ |
| Overflows | 29 | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \times 10^{15} \\ & \left(1 \times 10^{15}\right. \\ & \left.5 \times 10^{15}\right) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2,8 \times 10^{11}- \\ 1,4 \times 10^{14} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,9 \times 10^{17} \\ & 9,2 \times 10^{19} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,7 \times 10^{18} \\ & 2,9 \times 10^{20} \end{aligned}$ |
| Separate sewer systems | 2,7 | $\begin{gathered} 3 \times 10^{15} \\ \left(1 \times 10^{15}-\right. \\ \left.5 \times 10^{15}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $1,3 \times 10^{13}$ | $8,5 \times 10^{18}$ | $2,7 \times 10^{19}$ |

## Manure - loads to the terrestrial environment

- Less precise estimates
- All, volumes, concentrations and prevalence matters
- Overall similar to wastewater (but: human exposure to manured soil?)

|  | Volume | ESBL E.coli |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | [106 m³/year] | [CFU load year] |
| Dairy cattle | 44.9 | $\begin{gathered} 10^{15} \\ ( \pm 1 \mathrm{log}) \end{gathered}$ |
| Veal calves | 3.9 | $\begin{gathered} 10^{15} \\ ( \pm 1 \mathrm{log}) \end{gathered}$ |
| Pork | 10 | $\begin{gathered} 10^{15} \\ ( \pm 1 \mathrm{log}) \end{gathered}$ |
| Layers / broilers | 0.15 | $\begin{gathered} 10^{14} \\ ( \pm 1 \mathrm{log}) \end{gathered}$ |

## Knowledge gaps?



- Environmental exposure to AMR and health outcomes
- Efficiency management options
- Horizontal gene transfer and selection of resistance traits


## Possible interventions - Advanced treatment

 processes and ABR- Less data on AMR removal than on removal of pharmaceuticals
- Efficiency of treatment in lab studies > pilot / field
- Techniques that are currently considered for removal of pharmaceuticals differ in their removal efficiency for bacteria
 (GAC lower than $\mathrm{O}_{3}$ )


## ABR in hospital wastewater

- Separated treatment of hospital wastewater?
- 7 (4) hospital / WWTP pairs, 3-4 samplings
- Contribution of hospital wastewater to ESBL and CPE mostly <10\%
E. coli

| C | 1.9 | 5.3 | $\mathbf{1 0 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 . 4}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| C | 0.5 | 9.1 | 3.4 | 3.0 |
| C | 0.4 | 9.6 | 7.1 | 7.0 |
| C | 1.9 | 7.6 | $\mathbf{1 4 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 . 9}$ |
| Da | 0.4 | 0.4 | 5.5 | $\mathbf{1 0 . 6}$ |
| Da | 0.0 | 0.0 | $<0.1$ | $<0.1$ |
| Da | 0.6 | 1.8 | 3.3 | 1.0 |
| Da | 0.1 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.4 |
| Db | 0.3 | 0.6 | $<0.1$ | $<0.1$ |
| Db | 0.1 | 0.8 | $<0.1$ | $<0.1$ |
| E | 0.4 | 0.3 | 4.7 | 4.9 |
| E | 1.0 | 0.8 | 7.0 | $\mathbf{1 1 1 . 2}$ |
| E | 0.7 | 1.0 | $\mathbf{1 6 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 . 3}$ |
| E | 1.8 | 5.8 | $\mathbf{1 8 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 . 8}$ |
| G | 1.4 | 14.0 | $<0.1$ | $<0.1$ |
| G | 0.6 | 8.3 | 8.5 | 1.1 |
| G | 1.5 | 10.4 | 1.8 | $\mathbf{3 4 . 9}$ |

## Exposure to ABR through the environment

Possible transmission routes

- Recreation (swimming, surfing,


Exposure probability to ESBL-EC from modelled concentrations (Inactivation~0.6 $\log _{10}$, after 10 days at $20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ )

- Occupational exposures

Estimates of ESBL E. coli uptake (NL):

- Uptake through swimming likely
- Uptake through meat consumption and swimming possibly lower than direct human-human contact
- UK: 3GC-resistant E. coli increased in surfers (9\%) versus controls
( $3 \%, n=140$ )


## Current studies NL

JPI AWARE-WWTP (2017-2020)
ESBL E. coli in WWTP workers as compared to controls
"Zwemmersstudie" (2017-2019)
ESBL E. coli in participants of city swims before / after participation ( $\mathrm{n}=300$ )


RIVM O Divem - 1 das
Doe je mere san cen fecityswim? Help ons bij onderzoek nast antitioticweesistente bacterien fiven nl/ivernmerstud


## Conclusions

- Prevalence of resistant bacteria and antibiotic residue in wastewater and manure is now known
- In contradiction to what we expected, hospitals do not contribute more than residential areas
- AMR loads in wastewater and manure are equal
- Effective measures are possible
- Certain techniques to treat wastewater and manure are more effective than those currently applied
- Manure is not often treated, and if treated has another purpose
- Possible measures are expensive and for manure even not realistic


## Dilemma's



- End of current NAP
- decide on policy development environmental domain
- is it necessary and realistic to reduce spread of AMR via the environment?
- On the one hand
- Exposure of humans to AMR in the environment likely occurs
- precautionary principle
- international attention AMR in the environment
- On the other hand:
- NL takes extensive measures at source (health care and veterinary domain)
- disease burden probably low
- exposure to specific resistant pathogens largely unquantified
- no clear indication where to start (wastewater or manure)
- measures are expensive
- responsibility of others than Ministry of Health

