



# **Internal evaluation of EUnetHTA project 2006-2008** **– structure of evaluation and overall results**

**HTAi Conference Singapore 2009**

**Lise Lund Håheim, Iñaki Imaz , Marlène Läubli, Teresa Gasparetto, Helena Dahlgren, Berit Mørland,**



# Work Package 3 members

1LP, 7AP, 3 CP

- LP:
  - Lise Lund Håheim, NOKC, Norway
  - Berit Mørland, NOKC, Norway
- AP:
  - Iñaki Imaz Iglesia, AETS, Spain
  - Teresa Gasparetto, Direzione Piani e Programmi Socio Sanitari, Regione Veneto, Italy
  - Jesús González-Enríquez, AETS, Spain
  - Igors Trofimovs, VSMTVA, Latvia
  - Alessandro Liberati, ASSR, Italy, and the Cochrane Collaboration
  - Helena Dahlgren, SBU, Sweden
  - Hans-Peter Dauben, DAHTA@DIMDI, Germany; until June 2008
  - Elena Berti, ASSR, Italy; from January 2008
- CP:
  - Marlène Läubli, SNHTA (CP), Switzerland
- CP organizations: SNHTA Switzerland, MSAC (Australia), OECD Biotechnology Division (France),

# Why an internal evaluation?

---

- The internal evaluation was a prerequisite from the EU commission for their co-funding
- Organized as a separate Work Package (WP3)

# Aim of evaluation

---

- Evaluation is to assess the EUNetHTA project goal achievement by studying the progress and the results.
- Make a systematic approach in following the progress of the project
- Hear the participants views and give feedback to the participants
- Evaluate the lessons learnt from the project in terms of recommendations for a future network and collaboration
- Produce information about the project to the EU commission

# Definition of evaluation

---

Evaluation is the *systematic assessment* of the *operation* and / or the *outcomes* of a program or policy, compared to a set of *explicit or implicit standards*, as a means of contributing to the *improvement* of the program or policy.

Ref. CH Weiss. Evaluation.1998

# General objective

---

Ref.: Standard Operating Procedures (SOP)

*“The general objective of the EUnetHTA is to establish an effective and sustainable European network of Health Technology Assessment to inform policy decisions. The overall strategic objective is to connect public national health technology assessment (HTA) agencies, research institutions and health ministries, enabling an effective exchange of information and support to policy decisions by Member States.”*

# Working plan

---

- 5 biannual interviews of Work Package (WP) leaders
- 3 annual surveys of WP participants
- 1 survey of the Project Secretariat, the Steering Committee and the participants of the Stakeholder meeting at end of project
- Data from key project documents (e.g. Project proposal, Standard operating procedures (SOP), minutes of WPs and Executive Committee meetings, Three year work plan, Technical reports,)

# Response in WP-leader interviews and Participant surveys

- WP leader interviews
  - 100 % participation
- Participant surveys
  - Questionnaires were sent to individuals
  - Responses were by individuals or agencies
- The results were presented on the EUnetHTA intranet in order to give information to the participants
- 2006:
  - received questionnaires 45 /193
  - by European country 16/29
  - by agency 24/64
- 2007:
  - received questionnaires 41 / 181
  - by European country 13/29
  - by agency 17/64
- 2008:
  - received questionnaires 63 / 243
  - by European country 15/29
  - by agency 22/64

# Criteria of the evaluation

---

- Production of deliverables in a timely manner
- Effective working collaboration between Work Packages
- Degree of participation within Work Packages
- Effective communication
- Sustained commitment to the project
- User and stakeholder satisfaction with new routines and practice
- Perceived added value

# 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

# Concluding remark

---

- EUnetHTA has remained a viable network and is continuing as the EUnetHTA Collaboration
- New application for Joint Action on HTA between member states and EU commission
- Nobody said no to EUnetHTA



eunethta