

Group 2

Key Objectives

Group was largely in agreement with listed objectives

Emphasis was however suggested to emphasize importance of:

- ✓ topic prioritisation and selection,
- ✓ Quality assurance,
- ✓ standardization
- ✓ Transparency
- ✓ Sustainable training models

Key activities

Importance of training, and a sustainable model for continued EUnetHTA education

- 'training the trainers'
- Suggestion of 'benchmark' for partners ie, list of items on activities of each agency has expertise

Group 2

Key activities

Quality Assurance →

- suggestion for a subgroup focused only on this
- Instruments and tools such as methodological guidelines should be encouraged, and when not used, motivation should be provided

Topic selection highly important in next JA.

- Utility for partners is important, model for topic selection that ensures relevance to national needs.
- POP database can be useful tool here.
- The unique needs of work in pharmaceuticals vs other medical technologies was noted.

Joint work

- Importance of having not only top down selection of topics and cooperation such as the current mode of topic selection, but also bottom up, ie, partners are also able to produce national work to EUnetHTA standards and share through EUnetHTA

Group 2

Key activities

Joint Work

- How to select authors? Ideas such as brokering projects
- conditional reimbursement/horizon scanning/ additional evidence generation
- How does real world evidence fit into joint work? MAPPS and ADAPTSMART
- Disinvestment & post evaluation evidence collection – standardisation of evidence collection

Engaging with regulators, stakeholders and academic institutions

- EMA: Early access to information (EPARs), streamline process of HTA & data sharing. Confidentiality issue noted. Need to be careful not to get swallowed by EMA.
- Stakeholders: subcontracting some stakeholder expertise such as patient groups
- Registry EU level. Maintain SF, but need way to reach out to specific SF topics/expertise. Guidelines and rules of engagement needed.

Group 2

Engaging with regulators, stakeholders and academic institutions

- The decision maker as stakeholder: input to topic selection.
- No role in assessment, but perhaps scoping – input in process but not science. Space to have comments acknowledged – such as minutes in appendix. Opening some meetings to SF

Additional ideas and concerns

- 60/40 model of financing is concern – we need to think of flexible ways we can accommodate this – ie, not all activities should be 60/40 idea of for profit EUnetHTA training given as example
- When can we have summer holidays? ie, when can we expect meetings and information on timelines so that we can plan accordingly
- Where is the place of stakeholders in development of the joint action?
- The number of Joint Assessments is a concern
- The future of beyond 2020 should be taken up by EUnetHTA, and not left only to HTA network**