



Summary of Proposal (Draft for discussion) **“Expectations and Eligibility Criteria for European Reference Network of Centres of Expertise for Rare Diseases – ERNCoE”**

Yann Le Cam, Eurordis Chief Executive Officer, Rapsody Project Leader



1. Two essential pre-conditions:

1. Professional qualification. Both clinical and scientific experience. Proven qualification documented by publications & grants & already existing certification or accreditation.

2. Commitment to cooperate & share information.

Importance of the general « atmosphere & attitude »: trust rather than competition among experts to ensure effective cooperation.

2. Patient's access to a **multidisciplinary team** of experts:
- not only at CoE level, also at ERN level
 - full competence do not exist in single Member state
 - cross-disciplinary approach needed to tackle RD patients needs
 - for diagnosis, care, treatment, therapeutic research

3. Importance of **coordination between professionals**:
- coordination intra-CoE, between CoE within ERN, between CoE and proximity/primary level of care
 - coordination between care and research activities
 - an intelligent way of circulating the information, organising the continuum of activities (care, follow up care, research) placing the patient at the centre, making better use of existing expertise and resources
 - improve quality of care & reduce patient psy. burden (feeling of being lost in the system, lack of support, language, etc)

4. Importance of **global approach (holistic, comprehensive) between medical and social levels**
- both at CoE level and ERN level; not only a local service
 - social support often overlooked; patient unsatisfaction twice higher than for medical services;
 - need to develop common European approach to social services for given rare diseases and methods to support patients, increased quality of life,
 - specific administrative tasks for ERN to support patient mobility for cross border care & to get reimbursement when travelling, reimbursement of medical services etc.

- 5. Capacity to pool together patients = the critical mass of patients will enhance knowledge** on the disease and allow for meaningful conclusions related to care in a field where scarcity undermines knowledge/quality; identification of unknown disease cause; management of complex or rare disease situation; power of patient number in clinical trials

6. General expectation:

- Elaboration of **agreed best practice, standards and guidelines for diagnosis and treatment** of rare diseases at international level.
- Dissemination of **European reference diagnostic and therapeutic protocols** will ensure **equity** at EU level by reducing the impact of the “postal code lottery” and will increase trust in local services
- Provision of expert opinion, confirmation of diagnostic or therapeutic options

- 7. Participation into **research activities** at European & international levels:**
- linking excellence of care with excellence of research, where the patients are, where is the multidisciplinary expertise on the disease,
 - multi-centre clinical studies; facilitate partnership with pharmaceutical companies
 - shared databases, shared biological resources (DNA, RNA, Tissue, Cells), registries (harmonization of procedures), international epidemiological surveillance, pharmaco-vigilance
 - participation into EU-funded research projects

- 8. Perform education, information, communication** outreach activities towards the public & primary health care professionals (to improve referrals & follow up)
- 9. Perform training** activities for health professionals, including exchange of staff, meetings and conferences to exchange best practices, harmonised processes, disseminate standards & guidelines
- 10. Perform activities to empower patients** at different levels: information, education, training, so to build patient and families capacities in managing the medical & social aspects of their rare disease, enhance their autonomy, increase their compliance, help improving their quality of life. A patient outcome.

11. Collaborate with patient organisations at different levels:

- patient organisation contribution into the management and evaluation of the Networks
- facilitate creation of patient groups
- improve links and exchanges between professionals (care & research) and patients
- could be link to information, communication, educational and training activities of ERN
- need to link more broadly ERN, Research network and patient organisations

12. General agreement that ERN should be:

- **initially evaluated and accredited** at EU level via agreed set of criteria (minimum set of standardised criteria and objectives + additional ones)
- **regularly assessed** on common indicators with soft values and hard values, and « patient outcome measures ».

Need to develop methods and tools to:

- perform regular self-evaluation by ERN
- measure patient outcomes, long term & across ERN.

13. **Financial and management aspects of ERN:**

- are perceived to be cost-effective,
- need proper funding for their specific European & international activities
- need long term sustainable public funding
- share good governance practice (organisation, leadership, regulate, steering committee) and coordination practice between ERN
- ability to disclose procedures and results and to benchmark

14. Importance of **flexibility when selecting the types of centres** belonging to the networks and **flexibility for geography** of the networks.

- Not all Member states; 1 country = 0, 1, 2 or more CoE; to be adapted to the 3 type size of countries; according to reality of the local healthcare organisation; ERN role in accreditation of CoE.
- Patient acceptance to travel (to be confirmed and detailed).
- Different suggestions were made such as two level of CoE with identification of “leading centres” and “associated centres”; and possible “sub-national networks” with “centres of competence”.
- Different typology of centres to be grouped within a European network e.g. CoE embedded in different medical specialities, children/adult CoE, specialised health care professionals.
- Large networks complemented by “sub-networks” with different very rare diseases to be grouped within the same EU network, etc.
- Excellent contribution of new Member states to ERN.

Further comments by EU patients

Overall positive comment: the ENCR will generate greater awareness of differences between Member State healthcare systems (benchmark) and will put pressure on Member States to **close gaps** in access to and quality of care for rare disease patients.

Risk identified: create networks may generate disproportionate **bureaucracy** for accreditation and evaluation mechanisms. Adaptation & sustainability of mechanisms for expenditures and reimbursement will have to be agreed at EU level. Political commitment of Member states to financially support CoE. This will need Member states **political willingness** to defer national autonomy in pursuit of pan-European equity.