Landeszentrum Gesundheit
Nordrhein-Westfalen

Health foresight – A survey on quantifying tools

Rainer Fehr – University Bielefeld

Odile Mekel – LZG.NRW, Bielefeld

Fintan Hurley – IOM, Edinburgh

Johan Mackenbach – Erasmus MC, Rotterdam

Universität Bielefeld

Landeszentrum Gesundheit
Nordrhein-Westfalen

IOM

Erasmus MC
University Medical Center Rotterdam

HIA Conference, Geneva, 2-4 Oct 2013

GESUNDHEITSCAMPUS
NORDRHEIN-WESTFALEN

Context

To improve foresight and “prospective prudence” in PH: evidence-based quantification

Existing approaches needing improvement, evaluation (Fehr et al. 2012 JECH 66(12):1088 – 91)

Helpful:

- Status quo of tool development and of practical experiences gained
- Opinions on perspectives for quantitative health foresight and impact assessment

Methods

Survey aiming at collecting relevant information from the “provider” side (toolmakers)

Survey topics:

- Status quo of model development and availability
- Experiences made with model usage
- Options for further development
- Options for (comparative) evaluation
- Options for maintenance and continued availability of the tools including their data contents

Methods (2)

Interrelated views:

- For each tool: current development status, including significant applications, experiences gained
- For each item of interest, comparison across tools

Results are used to identify opportunities and threats to the overall approach

Considered tools in the survey

ARMADA	MSLT
DYNAMO-HIA	POHEM
HECOS	Prevent
Foresight Obesity	QBM
Health Forecasting	RIVM-CDM
IMPACT	SimSmoke
ICT	MicMac
INTARESE / HEIMTSA	

Prelim results: Responses

Questionnaires sent out to: authors of 15 tools

Responses so far:

- Declined to respond = 1
- No response = 4
- Full response concerning 12 of these tools; and 2 new versions -> 14 tools in total

Tool development / availability

Tool development

Ready for use: 14 (of 14)

Maintenance / Updating: Updated = 7, new versions = 2, no update = 5 (of 14)

Information on tool development = 8 (of 14)

Tool availability

Can be used by others than developers = 7 (of 14)

User support = 13 (of 14)

Tool use / evaluation

Tool use

Wide variation of usage

Results made available = 10 (of 14)

Tool evaluation

Evaluation conducted = 4 (of 14)

Results made available = 3 (of 4)

Specific qualities

Handling uncertainty = 14 (of 14) (various shades)

Maintenance & availability assured = 6 (of 14)

Tool use: Satisfied = 6, Could be more = 6 (of 14)

Evaluation as a priority? No = 9; Yes; = 4; If done by others = 1 (of 14)

Financial support: Yes = 7 (of 14) (N/A since superseded = 2)

Discussion

- A considerable number of tools is currently “ready for use”
- In some cases completely new versions have been developed
- Often, results of tool usage are published
- Half of the tools is accessible for outside users; practitioners can choose among them
- For those that are accessible, most developers are not satisfied with the extent of their usage

Discussion (2)

- Handling of uncertainty is a standard feature but handled in different ways / various degrees of sophistication
- Most tools cannot handle SES inequalities within the tools inside; data are probably lacking for modeling this
- Evaluation of tools is rare; mostly not seen as priority, but most are interested in a collaborative evaluation

Discussion (3)

Results of this current survey are going to be merged with existing knowledge, including from our earlier workshops on impact quantification

Further groups to be surveyed:

- advanced HIA practitioners as key users
- policy-makers as primary target group for the information produced with these tools

Acknowledgements

Thanks to all survey participants !

This survey is a collaborative initiative of:

Landeszentrum Gesundheit
Nordrhein-Westfalen

IOM

Erasmus MC
University Medical Center Rotterdam

Universität Bielefeld


57
89762
10
70
2010
398
19
379
4
88
9305
67303
1
24