

## Towards an EU sustainable health information infrastructure. Integrating technical and political views and interest

Alicia Padrón-Monedero

A Padrón-Monedero<sup>1</sup>, S Sarmiento-Suárez<sup>2</sup>, T Gómez-García<sup>2</sup>, M Ortiz-Pinto<sup>2</sup>, B Pérez-Gómez<sup>1</sup>, P Fernández-Navarro<sup>1</sup>, I Galán<sup>1</sup>, I Noguera<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>National Center for Epidemiology, Carlos III Institute of Health, Madrid, Spain

<sup>2</sup>National School of Public Health, Carlos III Institute of Health, Madrid, Spain

Contact: a.padronm@isciii.es

### Background:

Health information systems (HIS) play a key role in providing information for decision-making. Europe lacks of an integrated HIS on non-communicable diseases (NCD) and Health

Systems Performance (HSP) able to compare health problems across countries. NCDs are the main contributor to the EU-burden of disease, including the highest mortality rates. There is a general agreement among public health policy makers and researchers on the need of an integrated EU health information (HI) infrastructure to monitor risk factors, NCD and HSP. Such infrastructure would provide common inputs for public health and research to prioritize health policies. However, there is no EU-EEA consensus on how to go forward with this initiative.

### Methods:

The Information for Action (InfAct) project is aimed at establishing a sustainable HI infrastructure on HIS and HSP by cataloging resources, experience, research capacities and expertise into a 'one-stop shop'. Significant political will is needed to support and systematically feed a functional and permanent governance structure. InfAct provides a ground for Member States to discuss and generate consensus through two main boards: 1) Technical Dialogues (TD), composed by national experts, to discuss scientific aspects, feasibility and added value; and 2) Assembly of Members (AoM) where political representatives from Ministries of Health and Research provide the framework of political acceptance and guarantee of implementation and future development.

### Results:

Both boards reveal different interests and concerns. The AoM rather focused on resources and necessary political decisions based on expected returns. The TD focused on feasibility aspects and new adaptations required from current systems. The feedback provided by both boards is key to develop a sustainable EU-HIS infrastructure.

### Conclusions:

The TD and the AoM are key forums to provide feedback, guidance and advocacy to build a sustainable EU-HIS infrastructure