

Co-funded by the Health Programme of the European Union





Summary Second Assembly of Members

(Brussels, November 13th, 2019)

Representatives:

A total of 17 EU/EEA countries gave inputs through 22 member representatives from Ministries of Health (MoH) and Ministries of Research (MoR): Austria (MoH), Belgium (MoH, MoR), Bosnia and Herzegovina (MoH), Croatia (MoH), Czech Republic (MoH), Estonia (MoH), Finland (MoH), France (MoH, MoR), Romania (MoH), Iceland (MoH), Italy (MoH), Lithuania (MoH), Malta (MoH, MoR), Netherlands (MoH), Portugal (MoH, MoR), Spain (MoR), UK (MoH, MoR).

Summary:

Beneficiaries/stakeholders from InfAct presented: The distributed Infrastructure for Population Health (DIPoH) (rationale, structure, services and business case), the Fact Sheets (FS) with InfAct current main outcomes, the conclusions of the first Technical Dialogue in Madrid (Spain) (October 16th 2019), the National Nodes, the Research Nodes and the ESFRI application by InfAct.

Main conclusions and comments from the representatives:

- Alternatives for funding and design of the research infrastructure (RI), apart from the business plan for ESFRI roadmap and the ERIC/DIPOH, were required.
- Funding of such infrastructure will depend on political commitment across EU-EEA-Member States (MS). At the highest political level decision depends on clear future return of investment and a benefit/added value at the national level.
- > A more precise definition of expenses that should be covered by MS is needed.
- Clarify the role of the European Commission in supporting the RI, as supporter of HIS and partner involved in InfAct.
- Current Research Nodes could not see the added value of such RI as one stop shop. To address that gap a strategy to build confidence/added value among existing Research Networks is needed.
- The importance of the National Nodes and the Research Nodes was stressed, but further clarification was needed about their definition. It was highlighted the huge economic effort that requires the establishment of a national hub (for example in France). It was also stressed the huge diversity of formats within countries to perform hubs and its consequences in terms of efficiency.
- > Information was required about the central office location.
- > It was required a formal proposal in order Ministry representatives could submit to their Ministers.

