Decipher PCP experiences

Suzan Ikävalko, Senior Associate

1.3.2017

DECIPHER mHealth PCP: Lessons learned analysis

- Decipher PCP process and work has been **analysed** in order to disseminate learnings and **to serve future initiatives in this field.**

- EU Commission sees **PCP as complementary to the SME instrument** -> how to get the best out of both?

- The analysis includes **views from; the demand side / procurers, suppliers and experts.**

- **All companies** participating in the DECIPHER PCP are **SMEs**.

- Analysis covers the 0-2 phases -> i.e. upto the prototype phase.

Procuring organizations strategies and drivers behind participation in PCP

- Main drivers and expected benefits were related to a learning experience around PCP and around technological developments in the mHealth area.

- Healthcare savings, cost optimization and better services are mentioned as drivers but do not fully translate as such into the concrete PCP action.

- Contracting authorities did not justify or base their involvement in DECIPHER PCP on existing eHealth or Innovative procurements strategies.

    -> However, doing so could strengthen the case (see supply side comment on this).

Supply side views

- PCP is seen as a valid instrument to connect the correct stakeholders and to create new types of development and innovation opportunities for SMEs / tech companies.

- Market dialogue with the supply side actors is a must activity in PCP 0 phase.

- PCP provides information on real needs from real users across Europe, which is an ideal situation for the supply side.

- End-user involvement is a must in the service design and testing activities

    -> The supply side expressed a need for more direct feedaback/interaction with the users.

- Demonstration and testing phase should be given more importance & time.

    -> Less requirement on reporting and more useful interaction between relevant stakeholders.

Launching phase of Decipher PCP

- Training and support needs of the procuring authorities should be assessed in advance - all relevant parties should be fully and adequately ready to participate to a joint PCP.

- The PCP preparation should be led by a combination of clinicians, hospital managers and commissioners of service, working very closely with the procuring authority..

- The need for a new solution, real interest of procuring organizations and the adequacy of the solution to the existing service system should be assessed before embarking into the process.

- It should be explored whether the EU PCP model could be improved based on learnings from the UK and Dutch SBIR, which have been operating for a longer time.

Technological aspects in mHealth

- Procurers should be selected so that they have similar technical capabilities in order to achieve a consensus on the potential utility of the solution.

- It is important to reach a common understanding of the IT infrastructure at early phases of the project planning (available PHR interfaces in the case of DECIPHER) in each country.

- Base connectivity requirements on international standards.

- It seems important to provide clearer and more compact specifications.

-         -> Procurers expected to receive real prototypes in phase 2

- It may also be appropriate to put more effort on state of the art analysis (adequate market scanning) to provide more background information for both procurers and bidders.

  -> This has been taken into consideration in some of the newer PCPs where preparatory work has been more extensive and also executed in advance of the PCP –project itself (even as separately funded activity).

Legal and procedural challenges

- Main challenges in a cross-border PCP can be found in the legal sphere and service adoptability & interoperability issues.

    -> Time delays, were the biggest impediment in DECIPHER PCP.

- Compliance with legal aspects was too burdensome;

    -> National/Regional and EU legal framework need to be simplified and made easier to work with.

    -> Get rid off unnecessary (perceived) legal constraints.

- Make it easier & faster & result oriented:

    -> Preparing the tender documents and the contracts only in English presents a significant saving in time and money.

    -> Work only with lawyers that help to make the best out of this instrument.

- PCP is not subject to procurement law

    -> it should be seen & used as an instrument that allows flexible, simplified and smooth adoption practices. This is in the interest of both the demand and the supply side.

Technological challenges & IPR

Supplier views

- Technical challenges are not too big to overcome. Legal and "semantic coordination" needs pose important challenges and even obstacles.

- Technical requirements should be defined in the way that the companies are able to develop solutions based on them (…epSOS in requirements)

- The suppliers express a clear wish to be able to test their prototypes in real life test environments

> -> However, the approach of providing a test environment was considered good since the operational PHR interfaces are not available.

- The procuring authorities have exploitation right if the winning supplier does not provide commercially at the end of the process

- The main concern of providing full-access to source code to procurers is that after the PCP phase, the procurer may want to ask one of the competitors to further develop the prototype.

> -> This need to avoid lock-in is evident but the topic should be further investigated so that it does not exclude best providers

Business / service model generics

- Business case – service model is a necessary tool in a PCP. Involve all relevant actors in the definition of it from the start.

- Business and financial competences are needed in the business model development and when evaluating proposals.

- Investor engagement is also recommended as expert resource in the PCP.

- Take into account the differing ways in which this type of service might be provided/paid for in different Member States.

    -> This can be complicated for an SME to understand but can be a learning opportunity.

The business model in Decipher: starting point

Supplier views

- The need for this type of services and the business model possibilities were clear - it is not so clear who should be the payer of these services.

- Challenge brief merely explained the opportunities (market size and potential).

- Use case scenarios explained were credible.

- For suppliers cross-border activity may appear as too complicated in relation to the financial compensation available or predicable as market opportunity.

- The service and procurement strategies & goals of the 3 procurers/healthcare providing organizations should have been clarified and better defined

The business model views towards the end of the project

- The preferred outcome would be that the model is effective regardless of the health system where it is used.

- The business model cannot rely on the public sector only to be successful.

    -> DECIPHER PCP outcome could be exploited by include insurance companies and clinical champions/ hospitals.

    -> Decipher consortium should facilitate this wider interaction aiming at sustainable service/ business models and deployment.

- Suppliers also recommend providing open data access to third parties to create new services and enlarge the scope of opportunities.

- Companies are not only interested in developing new technologies .

    -> they also see new opportunities as (broader) service providers once the new solutions are taken into use and commercialized.

DECIPHER PCP creates clear opportunities for SMEs

- All of the suppliers selected to Decipher PCP are SMEs - mostly companies that are already operating in this business area.

- A PCP process allows SMEs to emerge and compete more fairly on a European scale

  -> SMEs cannot easily qualify as a technical provider to big procurers.

  -> SMEs have the ability to react quickly to the requirements from the call and to adapt fast to customer needs.

- PCP as a stage gated process and partial funding on a prototype development is seen as a positive opportunity.

- Suppliers also find it important that they can gain insights and acquire new learnings from what is going on in the specific thematic sector in different EU countries and within the procuring organizations.

  -> This can create further opportunities also outside the currently ongoing Decipher PCP.

Procurer views on cross-border collaborative work

- Cross-border pooling of demand can drive technological standardization and create better understanding of national differences and how to solve these.

- Collaboration / dialogue between the 3 procurers on the demand side was too limited.

- Procurers should be more involved in the process of work and evaluation.

- The healthcare systems and processes between the different procuring authorities appear quite different

- An important challenge in the PCP process is trying to harmonise the requirements from different public sector organisations in different countries with different degrees of development of their Personal Health Record (PHR).

- In the assessment & evaluations procurers should have had access to relevant information regarding the exclusion or selection criteria, terms of process, global view of the different proposals along the execution process -> in order to prove the viability of the integration with the current technology in their region.

Suppliers views on cross-border collaborative work

- There should have been better and closer interaction directly with the 3 contracting authorities and also between those three. This interaction could have included face to face meetings or workshops.

- More concrete information on their service strategies and existing ICT infrastructure would have helped to develop services with speedier implementation possibilities, including integration of different systems of different countries with different healthcare backgrounds.

- More close interaction with the healthcare providing organizations would have created better understanding of the real life environments and the real needs from the early stages of the PCP process.

- Semantic and security issues may now arise in the implementation phases since a lot of back end information are missing.

Views on process management and evaluations

- PCP as practiced seems to be a bureaucratic way to achieve the objective of developing technology. Maximum process wise standardized project duration should be 18- 24 months. Would a 1-2 staged PCP be enough ?

- Rather than fail trying to achieve over-elaborate goals keep it simple. The requirement to give bidders the opportunity to appeal greatly extended the timeline for no obvious benefit

- It might have been better to have all the assessors see and score all of the applications rather than dividing them between 3 groups of assessors

- Assessors did not know each other nor competencies and strengths among the group members in before hand

- Many organisations would not sustain not being paid for two years for the project work completed. This is something that needs to be understood by the project managers and the EU.

- They evaluation process and selection criteria should be more precise and specified. Recommendations of the MOR should be more explained and coherent from phase to phase.

Key issue & questions to conclude

Nordic Healthcare Group

- Base PCP on a real measurable and (economically & quality wise) appropriate need.

  -> Does the procuring authority really need the new solution and is someone also willing to pay for it?

- Validate user acceptance, motivations and empowerment aspects.

  -> Are your end-users on board ?

- Business model thinking helps to focus on expected impact and outcomes (cost savings, better health outcomes etc)

  -> Do you know how to create value and how strategic partners are leveraged

- Collaborative direct interaction between the procurers, suppliers and end-users is a must.

  -> How do we fix this best?

- EU cross-border PCP projects drive forward interoperability and create new learnings

  -> Do they support market coherence and the growth of our SMEs?

  -> Do they create new business and possibilities for scalable Business models?