**Supplementary Table 2: Full list of the key messages as discussed by participants at the 29th – 31st January 2017 HTAi Global Policy Forum meeting, Barcelona, Spain.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Key Messages** |
| **Value Frameworks** |
| **Content** | * Need for clear definition of what a value framework is
* Does growth in alternative value frameworks highlight that established generic value frameworks are losing sight of details?
* More analysis (conceptual, normative, economic etc.) of the value frameworks and their different aspects is needed
* Continue to evolve value frameworks to meet emerging challenges such as affordability – we might learn from those emerging value frameworks
* Value frameworks and their implementation via HTA systems must be adaptable enough to address technologies that are revolutionary vs. available current processes
* It may be necessary to adapt methodologies for assessing evidence to address different disease states and types of technologies
* We are not capturing all aspects of value
* Some aspects of value important to patients may not be captured in all value frameworks
* Aspects of value that are economic externalities (insurance, hope, real option etc. are tricky) need to be incorporated and are often not addressed in practice
* EUnetHTA model is considered a reasonable starting point as core value framework
* There is a need for HTAi – unmet need – to define the core components of value frameworks
* HTA framework is not only about value for money but about including other society values. The latter is an unavoidable element for HTA adaptability to respond proactively to the societal needs
* Societal values should influence value frameworks
* Progress on realizing that there is more to value than clinical and economic factors
* We need to identify “additional” components of value, and how they can be presented and incorporated. Move from the implicit to the explicit
 |
| **Processes** | * There is a need for clarity between what is value in a value framework and values of the decision-making process
* We have enough value frameworks - key principles of value frameworks can apply to all healthcare interventions:
	+ Make them predictable and transparent
	+ More from assessment and management of health
	+ Forward looking
* New value frameworks have limited value for those jurisdictions with robust, well-defined HTA processes
* Not everything needs to be quantifiable; what is not quantifiable is still important and needs to be captured (explicitly) qualitatively
* Variability on how additional factors are incorporated (if at all) and there is often no transparency on additional factors and how they are used for decision making
* Progress has been made in recognising there is more to value than [sic] what we currently capture (in existing frameworks); however, we struggle in identifying the best ways to integrate these additional aspects into the frameworks in order to capture various dimensions of value. Increasing transparency on the basis of value framework (being explicit on rationale) would help
* All HTA decision makers need to describe their value frameworks which need to be adaptable to respond to new circumstances
* Legitimacy of value frameworks is needed – requires broad stakeholder involvement and expert involvement
* Existing value frameworks need to be adapted to ensure they are meeting the demand for civic participation
* Current processes to conclude on an added benefit do not currently take into consideration a robust patient point of view
* Need to be explicit regarding assessment and attrition processes and how they are linked
 |
| **Decision-making** | * Accept duality of value frameworks and decision-making. Let us try not to put everything into one system
* We need to assess how value frameworks work in different types of payer systems
* Legitimacy of value frameworks is needed – requires final decision at a high level (Parliament) with broad political consensus
* Decision makers have a responsibility to clearly state rationale and detail behind application of value frameworks to make a decision
* A comprehensive value framework is important, but it does not negate or replace the need for a conversation/negotiation on how technologies can be made available whilst addressing issues such as affordability
* It is important to recognise that the value frameworks used in HTA can have significant implications for global incentives for innovation and access to technologies
 |