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- Institute of Health and Work North Rhine-Westphalia (LIGA.NRW), Department of Prevention and Innovation
- Since 2008, appointed WHO Collaborating Center (CC) on “Regional Health Policy and Public Health”

http://inthehealth.eu
- Maastricht University, Faculty of Health, Medicine and Life Sciences - School for Public Health and Primary Care (CAPHRI), Department of International Health

Both institutions: Active at the interface of health science and health policy, and involved in EC-funded projects, many of them dealing with health policy
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Micro study based on existing EC-funded projects

- **Overall objective**: Assisting (regional) health policy-making in Europe, espec. with respect to “health science – health policy” interface

- **Specific objective**: Synthesizing outcomes from selected projects in order to assist each component of the Public Health policy cycle

Acknowledgement: Study is based on published materials of projects funded by EC, 2001-2007
Public Health policy cycle: 4 components

**Health Assessment:**
“How do we stand, and where are we drifting?” (Status quo and trends analysis)

**Health Policy Evaluation:**
“How effective and efficient is / was it?” (Evaluative analysis)

**Health Policy Development:**
“What options for action, and what implications?” (Impact analysis)

**Health Policy Assurance:**
“How to implement / make it happen?” (Implementation and dissemination analysis)

Scientific (science-based) analysis: supporting each component of policy cycle
2. Study method

Basic approach
- Characterizing selected EC-funded projects on Public Health policy
- “Synthesizing” outcomes from individual projects into broader perspective

“Synthetic” analysis
- Aimed at harnessing additional insights from completed projects
- Comparative and integrating, largely qualitative analysis of attributes from project *commissioning* (funding) and *management* perspective

*Not an evaluation of these projects*
3. Study material: EC-funded public health projects

Directorate-General for Health and Consumer Protection (DG Sanco):
- Continually provides funding for public health projects
- 2003-2008: approx. 375 projects funded

From the pool of EC-funded PH projects: ad hoc selection of five related projects; criteria:
- Topicality: Dealing with the science-policy interface in policy-making (beyond “indicator” issues)
- Recency; existence of successor projects; project involvement of the authors (RF, HB)

This set includes both “general” public health and environment-focussed projects
## Project life times, relations (predecessors, successors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eva PHR</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN I</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPHIA</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN II</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENHIS I</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUREGIO I</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENHIS II</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIA NMAC</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIA PHR</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAPID</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUREGIO II</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUREGIO III</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Predecessor of PIA PHR project
2 may be interpreted as a successor of EPHIA project
3 may be interpreted as a successor of EPHIA and HIA NMAC projects
### Project names and overall objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEN II</th>
<th>ENHIS II</th>
<th>EPHIA</th>
<th>EUREGIO</th>
<th>PIA PHR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benchmarking Regional Health Management II</td>
<td>Environment &amp; Health Information System supporting Policy-making in Europe</td>
<td>European Policy Health Impact Assessment [i.e. impact of policies]</td>
<td>Evaluation of cross-border activities</td>
<td>Policy Impact Assessment of Public Health Reporting [i.e. impact on policies]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producing more transparency between the regional health systems; establishing a platform allowing the regions to learn from each other</td>
<td>Setting up a comprehensive information and knowledge system (“ENHIS”) enabling analysis to support policies in Europe</td>
<td>Developing and testing a HIA methodology for use by the European Community and its institutions in EU policy development</td>
<td>Promoting cross-border cooperation of regions, espec. “Euregios”</td>
<td>(implicit:) Optimizing the policy impact of PH reporting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 according to EC website / funding contract
4. Study results

4.1 Project results conc. “Health assessment”

Specific approaches of science-based support:

- Explicit **“Causal web”** analysis and visualization (EPHIA project)
- **“Standardized health assessments”** (ENHIS II project): indicator-based assessments as “fact sheets”, providing analyses of core issues across the pan-European Region
- **Health assessment presentations** (PIA PHR project) using Geo-demographic software / InstantAtlas (Geowise)
- **Checklists for enhancing the policy impact** of health assessments, incl. topics, data & (comparative) analyses, report format & layout, stimulation of interest, dissemination (PIA PHR project)
Sample approaches for “Health assessment”

**EPHIA project: Causal web (following DPSEEA model)**

- **Driving forces**
- **Pressures**
- **State**
- **Exposures**
- **Effect**

**PIA PHR project: Health assessment presentation using Geo-demographic software**

- Mortality
- Mortality
- Disability
- Musculoskeletal disorders
- Psychosomatic diseases: Stress, Depression, Burnout
4.2 Project results conc. “Health policy development”

Specific approaches of science-based support:

- Network analyses of structures and processes; **Organigraphs** “intended to map processes in order to understand critical interactions, ... how information spreads through the organisation ...” (BEN II project)

- Policy analyses incl. inventories of policies, methodology for identification of **information needs for policies**, guidelines for generating **information for policy support** (ENHIS II project)

- Prospective impact analysis of policies, plans, programs, projects: **Generic HIA methodology** (“What if...”) (EPHIA project)
Sample approaches for “Health policy development”

BEN II project: Organigraph

**Organigraph for Measles – Sicily**

- **Screening**
  - Policy analysis
  - Profiling of communities
  - Qualitative and quantitative data collection
  - Impact analysis
  - Establish priority impacts
  - Recommendations developed
  - Process evaluation

- **Scoping**
- **Conduct assessment**
- **Report on health impacts and policy options**

- **Monitoring**
  - Impact and outcome evaluation
4.3 Project results conc. “Health policy assurance”

Specific approaches of science-based support:

- **Information system** providing evidence-based assessments and evaluations (ENHIS II project)
- **Software tools** (PIA PHR & ENHIS II projects)
- **Internet-based project information pool**: inventory of cross-border co-operations and of promoting/hindering factors; recommendations for project actors (EUREGIO project)
Sample approach for “Health policy assurance”: Recommendations concerning quality development and strengthening of cross-border cooperation

Recommendations for project actors:
1.3 Ensure the cross-border added value for the region...
1.5 Create a sense of commitment and define responsibilities...
1.7 Ensure good political and senior management support...
1.10 Use the experiences of other projects...

(Joint Declaration of the Participants of the “EUREGIO“ Conference in Düsseldorf,2007)

Fig.: Health-relevant working groups in Euregios etc. along the internal and external borders of the EU-15 (red = yes, blue = no, brown = no inf.)
4.4 Project results conc. “Health policy evaluation”

Specific approaches of science-based support:

- **Evaluation** = (retrospective) impact analysis of policies, plans, programs, projects
- **Benchmarking** of regional health policies; identifying “good practice“ models (BEN II project)

Fig.: Benchmarking methodology (BEN II project)
Health Assessment: Where do we stand & where are we drifting? *Causal web* (EPHIA), *indicator-based assessments* (ENHIS II), *geo-demographic software* (PIA PHR)

Health Policy Evaluation: How effective & efficient? *Benchmarking* with identification of further "Good practice" models (BEN II)


Health Policy Assurance: How to implement / make it happen? *Information system* (ENHIS II) "Good practice” pool (EUREGIO)
Health Assessment:
Where do we stand & where are we drifting?
*Causal web* (EPHIA), *indicator-based assessments* (ENHIS II), *geo-demographic software* (PIA PHR)

Policy example: **Child abuse / neglect** - Surveillance of screening exams participation

Health Policy Evaluation:
How effective & efficient?
**Benchmarking** with identification of further "Good practice" models (BEN II)

Health Policy Development:
What options for action, what implications?
**Organigraphs** (BEN II), **Information needs of policies** (ENHIS II), "What-if" HIA (EPHIA)

Health Policy Assurance:
How to implement / make it happen?
*Information system* (ENHIS II) "Good practice" pool (EUREGIO)
Health Assessment: Where do we stand & where are we drifting?
- Causal web (EPHIA), indicator-based assessments (ENHIS II), geo-demographic software (PIA PHR)

Health Policy Evaluation: How effective & efficient?
- Benchmarking with identification of further “Good practice” models (BEN II)

Policy example: Health inequity (Federal project on “Health promotion for socially disadvantaged persons”)

Health Policy Development: What options for action, what implications?
- Organigraphs (BEN II), Information needs of policies (ENHIS II), “What-if” HIA (EPHIA)

Health Policy Assurance: How to implement / make it happen?
- Information system (ENHIS II) “Good practice” pool (EUREGIO)
Health Assessment: Where do we stand & where are we drifting?

Causal web (EPHIA), indicator-based assessments (ENHIS II), geo-demographic software (PIA PHR)

Health Policy Evaluation: How effective & efficient?

Benchmarking with identification of further “Good practice” models (BEN II)

Policy example: Physical exercise of elderly people

Health Policy Development: What options for action, what implications?

Organigraphs (BEN II), Information needs of policies (ENHIS II), “What-if” HIA (EPHIA)

Health Policy Assurance: How to implement / make it happen?

Information system (ENHIS II) “Good practice” pool (EUREGIO)
5. Tentative conclusions, perspectives

1. Health policy-making: complex and under-researched

- Systemic & dynamic nature of health / health det’s / health (care) system: is fact of life; gives reason for problems to be perceived as “messy” or “wicked”, with multiple interdependencies

- In spite of this: assumption that “rational model” of (health) science – (health) policy interface (incl. policy cycle) offers benefits for health policy-making

2. This micro study

- Approach = “re-reading” the projects to harness added value

- Taken together, the five EC-funded health policy projects reflect important approaches to support (regional) health policy-making

- Limitations: (i) different ways to re-read the projects, (ii) different sources (funding contract, websites, project reports) not necessarily in agreement, (iii) “best answers” may vary according to topic; administrative level; personalities interacting; specific circumstances...
3. Potential extending analyses

- Evaluation of projects (not the focus here): might be worth-while
- Using additional projects, espec. dedicated “indicators” projects
- Per project, using more materials; interviewing project partners; involving policy-makers more substantially
- Surveying projects’ achievements, (non-)diffusion, successes, short-comings, e.g.: (i) improving project impact on real-life policy-making, (ii) establishing closer connections with the “evidence-processing industry”

4. Further perspectives

- “Health policy arena” still insufficiently understood, and (compared to etiologic and to health services research) under-researched
- However, (regional) health policy-making assumed to carry potential for effectiveness and efficiency gains
- Research on science-policy interface: definitely worth continuing