



eunethta

EUnetHTA Project (2006-2008)

Internal evaluation

EUnetHTA Conference, Paris, November 20th 2008
Professor Lise Lund Håheim
Norwegian Knowledge Centre for the Health Service



Work Package 3 members: 11 organisations

Lead Partner: Lise Lund Håheim, NOKC, Norway, Project leader
Berit Mørland, NOKC, Norway

Associated Partners: Iñaki Imaz Iglesia, AETS, Spain

Jesús González-Enríquez, AETS, Spain

Teresa Gasparetto, Direzione Piani e Programmi Socio Sanitari, Regione Veneto, Italy

Igors Trofimovs, VSMTVA, Latvia

Alessandro Liberati, ASSR, Regione Emilia-Romagna, Italy, and the Cochrane Collaboration

Elena Berti, ASSR, Regione Emilia-Romagna, Italy; from January 2008

Helena Dahlgren, SBU, Sweden

Hans-Peter Dauben, DAHTA@DIMDI, Germany; until June 2008

Collaborating Partners:

Marlène Läubli, SNHTA (CP), Switzerland

MSAC, Australia

OECD Biotechnology Division, France

Working plan

1. Interviews of Work Package (WP) leaders
2. Surveys of WP participants
3. Surveys of the Project Secretariat, the Steering Committee and the participants of the Stakeholder meeting
4. Data from key project documents (e.g. SOP, minutes of WPs and Executive Committee meetings, Three year work plan, Technical reports, Project proposal, etc.)

Criterion a) Production of deliverables in a timely manner

- With few exceptions, the deliverables were produced as scheduled.
- The tools were designed to facilitate networking in preparing HTA-reports.
- Timely production; but still room for adjustments and development of ideas.
- EUnetHTA maintained its organisational structure.

Criterion b) Effective working collaboration between Work Packages

- Establishing effective collaboration between WPs was very important as the development of tools were interconnected.
- Effective collaboration was very interesting, but also proved to be a demanding task in terms of timing and cooperation.

Criterion c) Degree of participation within Work Packages

- The large number of participants involved in the working groups, coupled with a heavy workload were reported to be the main cause for any delays to deliverables.
- Some WPs reported that sustained participation in their work had come from a small core group whilst other members were much less actively involved.
- The benefit of working in the WPs was highly considered, particularly in terms of international experience, knowledge exchange, and developing the tools.

Criterion d) Effective communication

- Different ways of communication were used, E-mails being the most popular.
- Meetings were organized in different formats; as face-to-face, telephone, and E-meetings.
- The diverse and high numbers of organisations, and especially language itself presented a complicating and challenging aspect.
- There was variation in the degree of success of the methods of communication.

Criterion e) Sustained commitment to the project

- One organisation left the network; four organisations joined EUnetHTA during the project period.
- Commitment was present throughout; the input from participants and organisations has, in many instances, been greater than planned.
- Some member organisations put in extra funding into the project in order to complete making the tools.

Criterion f) User and stakeholder satisfaction with new routines and practice

- There was marked increase in participant's positive attitude towards the project over the period.
- However, since the tools and processes have not as yet been tested in real work settings, it is too early to judge the project's performance against this criterium.

Criterion g) Perceived added value

- The participants expressed belief that their agency's involvement in EUnetHTA was positive.
- They were adamant, however, that the EUnetHTA should remain a network and should not become a centralized organisation as inevitably, this would result in undermining local/national autonomy.
- Dedicated leaders and the secretariat were considered instrumental in helping EUnetHTA achieve its objectives to date.

Recommendations

1. Secure funding, and maintain a dedicated coordinating secretariat.
2. Assure efficiency through an organisational structure made up of Work Packages managed by a core of dedicated partners, with less committed partners taking part as a wider review group.

Recommendations cont.

3. Continue developing and evaluating the tools as necessary, and in real settings.
4. Involve people in the work to ensure commitment, a high level of knowledge, and a broad basis for decision making processes.

Recommendations cont.

5. Encourage collaboration and communication among all parties to ensure coherence within groups and within EUnetHTA.

6. Continue developing the communication platform and clearinghouse functionality to make EUnetHTA the central reference point for HTA in Europe.

Recommendations cont.

7. Arrange face-to-face meetings at start of group or committee work to strengthen social coherence and reach a common understanding of the work.

8. Evaluate the technical communication platform.

9. English has been the main language and should continue to be so.

Why evaluate?

What was said:

Surveys: "It's a good idea"

Interviews: " Yes, I am glad we do the ongoing evaluation because it makes you think and reflect on what you do. The interview helps me to keep on track."

What was not said:

Nobody said to stop EUnetHTA



eunethta





eunethta

EUROPEAN NETWORK FOR HEALTH TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT