QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ADMINISTRATIONS, ASSOCIATIONS AND OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

INTRODUCTION

GENERAL CONTEXT

In recent years a number of Member States have introduced so-called health technology assessments (HTA). Typically HTA measures the added value of a new technology in comparison with existing technologies. For the purpose of this survey, health technologies include, pharmaceuticals, medical devices, medical and surgical procedures and other measures for disease prevention, diagnosis or treatment used in healthcare. More information on health technologies is available at [http://ec.europa.eu/health/technology_assessment/policy/index_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/health/technology_assessment/policy/index_en.htm).

HTA is a very useful tool, as it helps Member States to decide which health technology to favour at national/regional level. It also helps Member States to keep their health budgets under control, as products with no or limited added value cannot expect to be reimbursed or to obtain high prices. Last but not least HTA encourages industry to invest in innovation with substantial added benefits for patients.

Traditionally two types of assessments have been distinguished, namely (1) assessments focusing on clinical/medical benefits of the new technology (does a given technology work better than an existing one) and (2) assessments focusing on the economic benefits of the new technology (value for money). These assessments can be carried out jointly or consecutively, by dedicated HTA bodies or other organisations (e.g. regulators for pharmaceuticals).
At this stage, the vast majority of HTA are carried at national/regional level, i.e. EU Member States assess the new technology according to its national legislation. This leads to duplications of efforts for Member States and industry which translate in unnecessary costs throughout the HTA process. It can also lead to diverging results/outcomes (i.e. health technologies available earlier in some countries compared with others), which in turn can result in limited business predictability for industry and delayed access for patients.

Several projects funded by the EU have allowed Member States to share best practices on how HTA is carried out at national and/or regional and local level. Also a limited number of joint HTA reports have been prepared, but the use of these results is still decided at national level. In practice this has meant that the joint reports have not (yet) been used on a large scale.

There is consensus that HTA requires significant scientific, technical and economic expertise, and is costly. Currently not all Member States have such expertise at their disposal. Budget constraints also mean that even advanced Member States considered to be more advanced in this field cannot assess all new technologies. This has triggered the question whether there is a need to strengthen EU cooperation for HTA, in particular for the period beyond 2020 when the current financing of EU cooperation ends (so-called EUnetHTA Joint Action 3[3]).

For further details please refer to the Inception Impact Assessment on strengthening EU cooperation on Health Technology Assessment (HTA)[4].

OBJECTIVE OF THE CURRENT SURVEY

The aim of this public consultation is to gather detailed views and opinions regarding the future of the EU cooperation on HTA. The results of this public consultation will feed into the envisaged impact assessment which the Commission services are currently preparing on strengthening the EU cooperation on HTA.

This questionnaire is addressed to administrations, associations and other organisations. Citizens are asked to fill in a separate non-specialised questionnaire.

[1] For the purpose of this survey, administrations refer to both public administrations, as well as private administrations with public service obligation

[2] For the purpose of this survey, associations and other organisations refer to trade associations, professional associations, academia and scientific societies and organisations representing the interests of specific stakeholders

[3] European Network for Health Technology Assessment (EUnetHTA) is a Joint Action, co-funded by the Health Programme of the European Commissions (DG SANCO) and participating organisations. It gathers mainly national and regional HTA bodies. Its scope of activities is on scientific and technical issues. www.EUnetHTA.eu

1. INFORMATION ABOUT THE RESPONDENT

Please provide the following data on your organisation/association/administration:

*1.1. Please indicate the name of your organisation/association/administration

Association Internationale de la Mutualité

*1.2. Please enter the country where your organisation/association/administration is based

Belgium

*1.3. Please indicate whether your organisation/association/administration is listed in the Transparency Register?*

Yes, AIM is listed in the Transparency Register

* In the interest of transparency, organisations and associations have been invited to provide the public with relevant information about themselves by registering in Transparency Register and subscribing to its Code of Conduct. If the organisation or association is not registered, the submission will be published separately from the registered organisations/associations.

*1.4. Please enter your e-mail address (this data will not be made public).

menno.aarnout@aim-mutual.org

*1.5. The name of a contact person (please note that the name will not be made public and is meant for follow-up clarification only)

Menno Aarnout

*1.6. Do you consent to the Commission publishing your replies?

a) Yes (On behalf of my organisation/association/administration I consent to the publication of our replies and any other information provided, and declare that none of it is subject to copyright restrictions that prevent publication)

b) Yes, only anonymously (The replies of my organisation/association/administration can be published, but not any information identifying it as respondent)

c) No (The replies provided by my of my organisation/association/administration will not be published but may be used internally within the Commission. Note that even if this option is chosen, your contribution may still be subject to ‘access to documents’ requests)
* As set out in Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001, any EU citizen, natural, or legal person has a right of access to documents of the EU institutions, including those which they receive, subject to the principles, conditions and limits defined in this Regulation.

2. IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDENT

*2.1. Main field of work of the responding organisation/association/administration *(one answer possible)*:

- a) Public administration (other than payers)
- b) Patients and consumers
- c) Healthcare provider
- d) Payer (irrespective of status i.e. public or private)
- e) Industry or service provider
- f) Academia or scientific society
- g) Other

* Small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) are defined in the Commission Recommendation 2003/361. The category of micro, small and medium-sized enterprises is made up of enterprises which employ fewer than 250 persons and which have an annual turnover not exceeding EUR 50 million, and/or an annual balance sheet total not exceeding EUR 43 million.

*2.2. Please specify the geographic coverage of your organisation/association/administration *(one answer possible)*:

- International/European
- National
- Regional/local

*2.3. Are you an organisation/association/administration representing the interests of the stakeholders mentioned in question 2.1 *(one answer possible)*:

- Yes
- No

*2.4. Please specify which health technologies are of interest for your organisation/association/administration *(one or more answers possible)*:

- a) Pharmaceuticals
- b) Medical devices[*]
- c) Other
* "Medical device" means any instrument, apparatus, appliance, material or other article, whether used alone or in combination, including the software necessary for its proper application intended by the manufacturer to be used for human beings for the purpose of: diagnosis, prevention, monitoring, treatment or alleviation of disease; diagnosis, monitoring, treatment, alleviation of or compensation for an injury or handicap; investigation, replacement or modification of the anatomy or of a physiological process; control of conception, and which does not achieve its principal intended action in or on the human body by pharmacological, immunological or metabolic means, but which may be assisted in its function by such means (Council Directive 93/42/EEC of 14 June 1993 concerning medical devices). Please note that the current legislation has been revised and the new requirements will be published soon.

2.4.c. Please specify 'Other':

Medical and surgical procedures and other measures for disease prevention, diagnosis or treatment used in healthcare.

3. STATE OF PLAY
3.1. Please indicate your opinion on the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>I don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*a) There are differences between HTA procedures among EU Member States (e.g. responsibilities of authorities, including advisory vs decision-making role and product scope; prioritisation /selection of health technologies to be assessed; duration of procedures; rights/obligations of sponsors during the procedure)</td>
<td>![Circle]</td>
<td>![Circle]</td>
<td></td>
<td>![Circle]</td>
<td>![Circle]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) There are differences between HTA methodologies for the clinical assessment (REA [= relative effectiveness assessment]) among EU Member States (e.g. different data requirements for the submission dossier; choice of comparator; endpoints accepted; way of expressing added therapeutic value).
c) There are differences between HTA methodologies for the economic assessment among EU Member States (e.g. different approaches for economic models, budget impact and health-related outcomes; importance of local economic context).
3.1.a. For a) please provide concrete examples of the differences you are aware of and their effects for your organisation:

There are, according to AIM members, differences in HTA procedure in the different EU member states, not only in terms of responsibilities and product scope, but also in terms of dialogue with relevant stakeholders, the timing of the assessment (early, to support a P&R-decision, and later, on the basis of more/better data). It is obvious to AIM members that not all HTA bodies have a similar relation with appraisal committees and/or payer organisations. Not all HTA bodies select the same technologies for assessment, and thus the procedure to come to a selection/prioritization differs. The same counts for the duration of the process, the rights and obligations of sponsors (but also other stakeholders) during the procedure.

3.1.b. For b) please provide concrete examples of the differences you are aware of and their effects for your organisation:

There are significant differences between HTA methodologies for the clinical assessment (REA) among EU member states. This is, to a certain extent, not surprising, as the national contexts differ and therefore have an impact on the methodology. The extent to which relevant alternative treatment options are being used in the country, would have an impact on the choice of the comparator. The acceptance of endpoints differences from country to country and is based on availability. Surrogate endpoints are only acceptable if they are sufficiently validated.
3.1.c. For c) please provide concrete examples of the differences you are aware of and their effects for your organisation:

AIM is of the impression that differences between member states in the methodologies for the economic assessment are even larger than the differences in the clinical assessment and broader HTA procedures. Collaboration in this field would be possible, but methodologies and outcomes will depend on the local economic (and social) context. The lack of transparency concerning the costs of medicines makes it difficult to undertake valuable economic assessments on national level and even more difficult to compare between member states.

3.2. In your opinion, differences among EU Member States regarding HTA procedures and/or methodologies may contribute to (one or more answers possible):

- [ ] a) Duplication of work for your organisation
- [ ] b) Less work for your organisation
- [ ] c) High costs/expenses for your organisation
- [ ] d) No influence on costs/expenses for your organisation
- [x] e) Diverging outcomes of HTA reports
- [ ] f) No influence on the outcomes of HTA reports
- [ ] g) Decrease in business predictability
- [ ] h) No influence on business predictability
- [ ] i) Incentive for innovation
- [ ] j) Disincentive for innovation
- [ ] k) No influence on innovation
- [ ] l) Other
- [ ] m) None of the above
- [ ] n) I don't know/No opinion
3.3. In recent years EU-funded projects and two Joint Actions have been carried out which aimed at strengthening cooperation on HTA across the EU. Are you aware of these initiatives? (one answer possible):

- a) Yes, I have participated in one or more of these
- b) Yes, I am aware of them, but did not participate
- c) No, I am not aware

3.3.1. In general terms do you think the EU cooperation on HTA (e.g. projects, joint actions) has been

- a) Useful
- b) To some extent useful
- c) Not useful
- d) I don’t know/No opinion

3.3.1.1. Please indicate which of the following factors concerning projects and Joint Actions were relevant for your reply (more than one answer possible)

- a) Allowed for sharing best practices
- b) Allowed for better knowledge of procedures and methodologies in other EU Member States
- c) Allowed for savings in your organisation
- d) Contributed to building trust between organisations and professionals involved
- e) Contributed to HTA capacity building
- f) Provided access to joint work[*]
- g) Provided access to work done by other HTA bodies
- h) Provided access to expertise not available in my organisation
- i) Reduced workload for my organisation
- j) Contributed to increasing awareness and knowledge on HTA issues in my organisation
- k) Promoted involvement of patients' representatives in HTA activities
- l) Other

* "Joint Work" refers to activities in which countries and/or organisations work together in order to prepare shared products or agreed outcomes. These may include, for example, literature reviews, structured information for rapid or full HTAs, early dialogues or scientific advice on R&D planning and study design. Joint work aims at supporting Member States in providing objective, reliable, timely, transparent, comparable and transferable information and enable an effective exchange of this information (according to HTA Network’s “Strategy for EU Cooperation on Health Technology Assessment” adopted in October 2014)” (according to HTA Network’s “Strategy for EU Cooperation on Health Technology Assessment” adopted in October 2014)
3.3.1.1. Please provide additional explanations and, if available, evidence supporting your answers to question 3.3.1.1. (please provide a link to supporting documents in English)

EU cooperation on HTA should encourage HTA-bodies to engage, at national and EU level, in collaboration and interaction with stakeholders (including appraisal bodies, decision makers, payers)

3.3.1.1.2. Please indicate to the best of your knowledge to which degree joint work from EU-funded projects or Joint Actions was used by HTA bodies at national/regional level as part of their decision-making process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>To a limited extent</th>
<th>Not used</th>
<th>I don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Joint tools (templates, databases, etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Guidelines (e.g. for clinical and/or economic evaluations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Early dialogues*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Joint reports on clinical assessments (REA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Joint full HTA (clinical and economic assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Other (please specify below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Early Dialogue (ED or early scientific advice) aims to provide prospective, transparent and timely advice by regulators or HTA body/bodies (multi-HTA) or both (parallel) to product' sponsors so that they may integrate their specific needs in the product development and generate evidence appropriate for HTA purposes (definition proposed by the EU-funded study SEED)
3.3.1.1.3. Please indicate which shortcomings – if any - you identified in the EU-funded projects and/or Joint Actions

Within EU projects on HTA, the interaction with stakeholders could have been better. When we talk for example about “use” of the EU core HTA model or the joint assessment, we talk about the use by HTA bodies, where use by decision makers, appraisal bodies, payers, of HTAs is at least as important as the use by HTA bodies themselves.

4. EU COOPERATION ON HTA BEYOND 2020

4.1. In your opinion is there a need to continue EU cooperation on HTA after 2020 (when the EUnetHTA Joint Action 3 will end)?

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) I don't know / No opinion

4.1.a. If yes, please specify:

Although there might be differences between countries and HTA bodies, due to different preferences and differences in national context, transparency and collaboration can increase the quality and efficiency of the work on HTA at national level. Where possible joint work should be supported. The HTA collaboration should lead to strengthening and increase of so called re-assessments after a product has been reimbursed for a certain period. On the basis of additional data, for example through observational studies and by comparison with newly available comparators, re-assessments can contribute to sustainable access to high quality medical products and interventions, procedures, measures, diagnosis and treatments.

4.1.1. In your opinion, for which health technologies an EU cooperation on HTA would be more useful and respond to your needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very useful</th>
<th>To some extent useful</th>
<th>Not useful</th>
<th>I don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*a) Pharmaceuticals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*b) Medical devices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Other (please specify below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1.1.2. For which activities and if so to which degree do you consider that continuing EU cooperation on HTA beyond 2020 would respond to your needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responds very much to your needs</th>
<th>Responds to some extent to your needs</th>
<th>Does not respond to your needs</th>
<th>I don't know / No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*a) Joint tools (templates, databases, etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*b) Guidelines (e.g. for clinical or economic evaluations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*c) Early dialogues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*d) Joint clinical assessment (REA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*e) Joint full HTA (clinical and economic assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Other (please specify below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.1.2.1. Please comment on the potential advantages and disadvantages of an EU initiative including the activities you consider useful for your organisation (e.g. workload, long-term sustainability of national healthcare systems, patients’ accessibility to new technologies, business predictability, innovation)

To reduce workload in EU member states, in HTA bodies and in other related organisations collaboration in the field of HTA is highly relevant. With ageing populations, technological developments, the increase in chronic multi-morbidity all efforts need to be aimed at increasing both efficiency and effectiveness of healthcare systems. Increasing transparency of the system and insight in the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness is then vital. Efficiency in HTA is of utmost importance. The proof of the concept will be the implementation of the recommendations and whether this leads to a better resource allocation in the health care systems in order to keep the systems affordable.
4.1.1.3. In case EU cooperation on HTA will continue beyond 2020, in your opinion, what type of financing system should be envisaged? (*one possible answer*):

- [ ] a) EU budget
- [ ] b) Member States
- [ ] c) Industry fees
- [ ] d) A mix of A to C
- [ ] e) Other

4.1.1.3.1. Please explain your answer and comment on issues such as feasibility, advantages and disadvantages

2000 character(s) maximum

It goes without saying that the introduction of an industry fee for HTA related activities would jeopardize the independence of the HTA organization.

Although financing through EU budget or contributions directly from EU member states is in essence similar (EU member states contribute to the EU budget), there is good reason to consider direct member state contribution to this activity, to ensure their commitment to the process. At the same time AIM would not want to exclude financing through the EU budget as an option or a mix of a) and b).

4.1.1.4. In case EU cooperation on HTA will continue beyond 2020, in your opinion, the secretarial /organisation support should be ensured by (*one or more answers are possible*)

- [x] a) European Commission
- [ ] b) Existing EU agency(ies)
- [ ] c) New EU agency
- [x] d) Member States HTA bodies on rotational basis
- [ ] e) Other

4.1.1.4.1. Please explain your answer(s) and comment on issues such as feasibility, advantages and disadvantages

2000 character(s) maximum

The organisation of the activities should depend on the intensity of the collaboration. The national HTA bodies should play the pivotal role in HTA cooperation beyond 2020, particularly in terms of managing and organizing coordination. The coordination should be led by a national HTA body on a rotating basis in order to ensure alignment with the needs of the different national health systems. The European Commission can provide organisational support. AIM is not in favor of funding collaboration on HTA through industry fees, to prevent conflict of interest.
4.1.1.5. In your opinion, regarding an initiative on EU cooperation on HTA beyond 2020, which type of cooperation would respond to your needs? Please rank the following options from the most to the least preferable option).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a) Most preferred option</th>
<th>b)</th>
<th>c)</th>
<th>d)</th>
<th>e) Least preferred option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*a)</td>
<td>Voluntary participation with voluntary uptake of joint work (i.e. as carried out by EUnetHTA Joint Actions)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*b)</td>
<td>Voluntary participation with mandatory uptake of joint work for the participants</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*c)</td>
<td>Mandatory participation with mandatory uptake of joint work</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Other (please specify below)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*4.1.1.5.1. Please explain your answer(s) and comment on issues such as feasibility, advantages and disadvantages

2000 character(s) maximum

It is according to the treaty the responsibility of the member state to organize their own healthcare system. Collaboration can only take place on a voluntary basis. At the same time, if joint work is of good quality, it should not be difficult to convince (most) member states to use joint work in national HTA studies.

5. Any other comments. Uploading relevant documents is also possible.

2000 character(s) maximum

Please upload your file (2Mb max)

Contact
SANTE-HTA@ec.europa.eu