

National Workshop reports

Question 3: Cooperation with other countries and recommendations for European reference networks

Birthe Byskov Holm



How do you see your centres cooperating at the EU level?

- Elements to establish European cooperation:
 - National/regional networks of specialised care centres/centres of reference (G, I)
 - Already established networks (Cz, F, UK)
 - Patient hosted networks and voluntary activity (UK)
 - Specialised health care professionals(LUX)
 - Fora like meetings/conferences(NI,UK,Sw)
 - Websites/information,databases/registries(UK,F,Dk, I,P,Sp)



How do you see your centres cooperating at the EU Level

- Remarks and recommendations:
- Expert teams for very rare diseases/different approach needed (F, Dk, Sp)
- Holistic approach (social aspects/quality of life) (F, Dk, Cz)
- Reimbursement systems to be adapted (I, Sp, F, Sw)
- Interaction with stakeholders including patients' org. (Dk, P)
- European research projects to be developed to networks (F, P, LUX)
- Risk of creation of a disproportionate bureaucracy relative to numbers of patients (UK)



What role would play European reference networks?

- Improve knowledge by sharing information/databases (Dk, Cz, NI, P, F,UK)
- Establish research projects, studies, trials(increase cohorts) and develop registries and databases (P, Sp, Dk, I, G, F, Sw)
- Develop best practices / protocols (P, Cz, Dk, Sw, F, Sp, G, I)
- Grouping disorders (UK, I)
- Defining quality / recommendations for care services/ standard of care (NI, P, F, UK)



What role would play European reference networks?

- Remarks and recommendations:
- Expertise should "travel" to the patients, but it should be possible for patients to travel to centres if necessary (P, Dk)
- Accrediting national centres of expertise (recognised centres of expertise) / list of centres (UK, Sp)



Which specific added value can you identify when your national centres of expertise belongs to a European network?

- Creation of the critical mass for research and clinical trials (G, Sw, F, P, Cz, UK, Sp)
- Shared databases and registries (F, Cz, Dk, LUX, Sp)
- Creation of a multidisciplinary approach (I,F)
- Pool knowledge for protocols and state of the art treatment (I, NI,P, Cz, LUX, UK, Sp)



Which specific added value can you identify when your national centres of expertise belongs to a European network?

- Remarks and recommendations:
- Long term resources/funding needed, as it takes at least 10-15 years to build a register (F)
- Improvement of care and services on national level when benchmarking on European level (UK, G, P, F, Cz, Dk)
- Uniform approach might better integrate rare patients in the healthy population (Cz)
- Support network for travellers (Cz, F)
- For very rare diseases substitute a missing national centre (Cz)



On which criteria to identify/designate European reference networks?

- Flexible criteria pending on complexity, rarity and the development in the single country (F, Cz, Dk)
- Clear objectives and visions for each network (Sw, Dk)
- Ability to share information and to benchmark (disclose procedures and results) (G, Sw, Cz)
- Groups of disorders rather than single diseases (I, UK)
- Minimum standards and common procedures (Dk)
- Same criteria as national centres of expertise (G, P, NI)
- Quality of care, number of patients, publications issued (Sp)



On which criteria to identify/designate European reference networks?

Remarks and recommendations:

"Leading" centres and "associate centres" should be identified on the basis of acquired and proved experience (I)

- Clear leadership needed (Sw)
- Each member state should identify its experts for rare diseases
 (F)
- Some networks regulate themselves (EuroWilson) (F)
- Creation of a European monitoring body (F)
- Credits should be allocated to criteria e.g. effective cooperation
 (F)



What would the expected specific benefits for patients be?

- Improved quality of information, care and services (Sp, Lux, UK, CH, F, P, I)
- Earlier diagnosis and recognition of the importance (Sp, Lux)
- Creation of multi- diciplinary teams (UK)
- Harmonisation and standardisation of best practices / guidelines (Sp, Lux, Cz, P, Sw, I)
- Access to the best European resources for rare diseases (Cz)
- Better incentives for research by pooling patients / registries (Sp, Lux, Cz, Sw, I)
- Recognition of rare diseases and thus of their specific features as regards care (F)
- Less peregrination (Sp)



What would the expected specific benefits for the patients be?

- Remarks and recommendations?
- Opportunity for a second opinion (I)
- Improved quality of life (Lux, NI, Cz)
- Better access to care in the poorest countries (F)
- Contacts between patients on the European level (Cz, NI)
- Reimbursable care when travel in Europe (F)
- Progress by comparison of systems and cultures (F, Dk)
- Better access to Orphan Drugs (Sw)



Complementary aspects

How do you see your centres cooperating at the EU level?

- Elements to establish European cooperation:
 - EU networks basis for experts and expertise to travel to the patient (UK, Sw)
 - Equal access for patients to services from EU Networks (G, Dk)
 - Long term funding needed (F)



What role would play European reference networks?

- Training, exchanging resources, twinning between centres (Cz, Dk, Sp, I, P, Sw)
- Encourage networks between patients (NI) educating patients and families (P)



Which specific added value can you identify when your national centres of expertise belongs to a European network?

- Training of professionals (Sw, P, Cz, Dk, Lux)
- Better surveillance on medicines concerning efficacy and safety
 (I)
- Creation of a greater and better link between health care professionals and patients (UK)



On which criteria to identify/designate European reference networks?

Cz: Czech Republic, Dk: Denmark, F: France, G: Germany, I: Italy, Lux: Luxembourg,

NI: Netherlands, P: Portugal, Sp: Spain, Sw: Sweden, UK: United Kingdom

