19TH
European Health Forum
Gastein

Demographics & Diversity in Europe
New Solutions for Health
Evaluation Survey Report
Table of contents

GENERAL INTRODUCTION .................................................. 4

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .................................................... 7

GENERAL SURVEY STATISTICS ............................................ 9

EVALUATION OF THE SESSIONS ......................................... 12
  PLENARY SESSIONS
  PARALLEL FORUM SESSIONS
  WORKSHOP SESSIONS

SOCIAL MEDIA .................................................................... 13

REGISTRATION, ORGANISATION AND OVERALL IMPRESSION .... 14

OPEN QUESTIONS .............................................................. 15

GENERAL SURVEY STATISTICS ........................................... 17

EVALUATION OF THE SESSIONS ......................................... 17
  – DETAILED ANALYSIS .................................................... 22
  OPENING PLENARY SESSION ........................................... 22
  THURSDAY PLENARY SESSION ......................................... 23
  CLOSING PLENARY SESSION ........................................... 24
  COMPARISON OF THE PLENARY SESSIONS ....................... 25
  COMPARISON OF THE PARALLEL FORUM SESSIONS .......... 26
  COMPARISON BETWEEN ALL PARALLEL FORUM SESSIONS .... 33
  EVALUATION OF WORKSHOP SESSIONS ........................... 35

SOCIAL MEDIA ................................................................. 38

REGISTRATION, ORGANISATION & OVERALL IMPRESSION .... 40

OPEN QUESTIONS .............................................................. 44
GENERAL INTRODUCTION
The European Health Forum Gastein (EHFG) was founded in 1998 as a European health policy conference and has become the leading annual health policy event in the EU. With its wide-ranging three-day programme, the Forum offers an unparalleled platform for decision-makers in various fields of public health & health care representing government, business, civil society, academia and the media.

Integrating various national, regional and European perspectives, the Forum facilitates the exchange of views and experience amongst key actors and experts from the 28 EU members, the EU candidate and EEA countries, but also from the rest of the 53 countries of the WHO European region.

The EHFG guarantees that all stakeholders in the European health arena: (1) politicians and public servants; (2) representatives of business and industry; (3) advocates of citizens’ and patients’ concerns; (4) scientists and members of the academic community can discuss key health issues on a level playing field. It aims to establish a broad basis for health policies and to lay out a framework for European health policy in the 21st century.

Amongst others, the EHFG is co-organised and supported by the European Commission, the Austrian Ministry of Women and Health, Land Salzburg, Forum of Research-based Pharmaceutical Industry in Austria (FOPI), European Federation of Pharmaceutical Industries and Associations (EFPIA) and the Austrian Medical Chamber (ÖAK).

For the last nineteen years, the EHFG has focused on a broad range of topics. Within this framework, the EHFG is on the front foot of health policy developments and is involved in finding common solutions across Europe.
Main themes of the European Health Forum Gastein conference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EHFG 2016</td>
<td>Demographics and Diversity - New Solutions for Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHFG 2015</td>
<td>Securing health in Europe. Balancing priorities, sharing responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHFG 2014</td>
<td>Electing Health - The Europe we want!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHFG 2013</td>
<td>Resilient and Innovative Health Systems for Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHFG 2012</td>
<td>Crisis and Opportunity - Health in an Age of Austerity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHFG 2011</td>
<td>Innovation and Wellbeing – European health in 2020 and beyond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHFG 2010</td>
<td>Health in Europe - Ready for the Future?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHFG 2009</td>
<td>Financial Crisis and Health Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHFG 2008</td>
<td>Values in Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHFG 2007</td>
<td>Shaping the Future of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHFG 2006</td>
<td>Health sans frontiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHFG 2005</td>
<td>Partnerships for Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHFG 2004</td>
<td>Global Health Challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHFG 2003</td>
<td>Health &amp; Wealth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHFG 2002</td>
<td>Common Challenges for Health &amp; Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHFG 2001</td>
<td>Integrating Health across Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHFG 2000</td>
<td>Information &amp; Communication in Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHFG 1999</td>
<td>Health &amp; Social Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHFG 1998</td>
<td>Creating a Better Future for Health Systems in Europe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The annual European Health Forum Gastein (EHFG) was attended by 515 delegates from 44 countries this year.

THE EHFG 2016 FOUR PILLARS STATISTIC
BASED ON OVERALL CONFERENCE PARTICIPATION

- government & administration: 38%
- civil society: 16%
- business & industry: 19%
- science & academia: 18%
- media: 8%
- other: 1%
The EHFG 2016 survey was sent out to all delegates via email and was posted on our social media outlets and was open for six weeks. The survey was completed by 107 respondents (21% of all delegates).

The survey was divided into six parts, in which respondents were asked general questions (1), questions concerning the different sessions (2) and workshops they attended (3). They were also asked to express their opinion about the registration and organisational elements (4). Respondents were asked questions about their social media activities during the congress and in general (5). In the last part of the survey, there were thematical questions and questions to the overall impression (6).

In most of the survey questions the respondents were asked to choose one answer they find most applicable. However, to some questions they were allowed to give multiple answers and express their personal suggestions or points of criticism.

General rating scheme used in this survey:

1 = no influence  
3 = medium influence  
5 = high influence  
1 = total disagreement  
3 = neutral  
5 = total agreement  
1 = poor (knowledge)  
3 = medium (knowledge)  
5 = excellent (knowledge)
General survey statistics

60% of the participants who completed the survey were female, 40% male, over 70% of them identified themselves as regular participants, 15% as speakers and a tenth as journalists.

Over two thirds of the respondents identified health policy as one qualification of their field. Half of them chose health care and nearly half of them research. Nearly 30% chose health promotion, 18% management and 12% journalism. Phama sector, medical technology, management, networking and social security were other selected categories.

Half of the respondents were representing public institutions during the 19th EHFG, followed by representatives of teaching and research (29%), NGOs (21%) and politics (16%). Industry as well as press was represented by 8% survey respondents each, interest groups by 5% of respondents.

30% of the participants were invited to the conference, 35% were made aware of the EHFG 2016 through word of mouth, 10% by social media platforms. In general, 40% of respondents had participated in a previous conference.

The main factors of influence on the decision to attend the EHFG 2016 were networking opportunities and potential for learning. For 85% attending the conference was influenced by networking opportunities, 70% attended because of potential for learning and over 60% because of topic choice, more than half attended because of the calibre of speakers. Nearly half considered the influence on European health policy as a decisive factor to attend the conference.

**MAIN REASONS TO ATTEND THE EHFG CONFERENCE**

**NETWORKING**

Networking opportunities were selected as the most rewarding activity. 85%

**INFLUENCE**

Influence on the European health policy is a reason to attend the EHFG conference. 48%

**TOPIC CHOICES**

Two thirds attended because of the programme - timeliness & choice of topics. 61%

**LEARNING**

Over two thirds attended because of the learning potential during the event. 70%
**PROGRAMME OVERVIEW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>M Lunch Reception</td>
<td>M Lunch Reception</td>
<td>T F1 “Reality meets Reality” 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>A Opening Plenary</td>
<td>A Closing Plenary</td>
<td>2 F4 Capturing change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>A Forum 1: Life-course and intersectoral approaches to public health</td>
<td>A Forum 7: Project Session</td>
<td>1 W6 Refugees for Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>W1 Urban environments and NCDs</td>
<td>N Li Life-course vaccination</td>
<td>T W9 Pancreas Cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00</td>
<td>W2 Cancer care</td>
<td>1 F3 Paninised prevention</td>
<td>2 F5 Maternal healthcare in Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>W3 Health Technology Assessment</td>
<td>T L3 IDP 4 co-morbid patients</td>
<td>1 F6 Healthy ageing: West meets East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>F2 Guiding patients to the “Best Point of Service”</td>
<td>2 F7 Project Session</td>
<td>2 F10 Beyond “SREXIT”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>F3 “Healthy” innovation: putting patients before profits</td>
<td>2 F6 “Reality meets Reality” II</td>
<td>2 F11 “CyberAGE”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>F4 Desperate migration and health – impact and remedies</td>
<td>F A Networking Dinner</td>
<td>6 Conclusion dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00</td>
<td>W4 Work &amp; health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:00</td>
<td>W5 Health today, here tomorrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:00</td>
<td>A Welcome Reception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Forum 1** Life-course and intersectoral approaches to public health, Organised by World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe

**Forum 2** Guiding patients to the “Best Point of Service”, Organised by Austrian Federal Ministry of Health and Women’s Affairs and Main Association of Austrian Social Security Institutions in cooperation with European Observatory on Health Systems and Policies

**Forum 3** “Healthy” innovation: putting patients before profits, Organised by Open Society Foundations in collaboration with EPHA and EUPHA

**Forum 4** Desperate migration and health, Organised by International Peace Institute

**Forum 5** Maternal healthcare in Europe, Organised by Alliance for Maternal Health Equality and MSD for Mothers

**Forum 6** Healthy ageing: West meets East, Organised by Health Promotion Administration, Ministry of Health and Welfare, Taiwan R.O.C. in cooperation with London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, UK

**Forum 7** Project Session

Project 1 | Active and healthy ageing starts in childhood, Organised by European Federation of Allergy and Airways Diseases Patients’ Associations (EFA)

Project 2 | Can wearable devices help in the clinic? And provide Big Data on patients?, Organised by World Obesity Federation

Project 3 | General Practitioners’ cluster, Organised by Swiss Contribution Office in Hungary and the Government of Hungary

Project 4 | Innovating care for people with multiple chronic conditions, Organised by ICARE4EU, financed from the Health Programme 2008–2013 of the European Union
**Forum 8** Innovative medicines, Organised by Main Association of Austrian Social Security Institutions, Belgian National Institute for Health and Disability Insurance (NIHDI) and Estonian Health Insurance Fund in cooperation with European Social Insurance Platform

**Forum 9** “Reality meets Reality” I, Organised by DG Communications Networks, Content and Technology (DG CONNECT), European Commission

**Forum 10** “Reality meets Reality” II, Organised by DG Communications Networks, Content and Technology (DG CONNECT), European Commission

**Forum 11** Facing the challenge of Alzheimer’s (and other dementia), Organised by International Forum Gastein supported by an unrestricted educational grant from MSD

**Forum 11** Beyond "BREXIT", Organised by International Forum Gastein

**Workshop 1** Urban environments and NCDs. Engaging multiples stakeholders and sustainable environments to nurture a life free from NCDs, Organised by World Health Organization

**Workshop 2** Cancer care. Sustainable and equitable cancer care: tomorrow’s reality or science fiction?, Organised by Bristol-Myers Squibb

**Workshop 3** New frontiers in Health Technology Assessment, Organised by DG Research and Innovation (DG RTD), European Commission

**Workshop 4** Work and health, Organised by European Agency for Safety and Health at Work (EU OSHA)

**Workshop 5** Hear today, here tomorrow, Organised by MED-EL Medical Electronics

**Workshop 6** Capturing change. Health information, Organised by World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe

**Workshop 7** Refugee health. A journey, from arrival to integration, Organised by DG Health and Food Safety (DG SANTE), European Commission

**Workshop 8** EU Action on Pancreas Cancer, Organised by EU COST Action EUPancreas (BM1204) - An integrated European platform for pancreas cancer research: from basic science to clinical and public health interventions for a rare disease

**Lunch Workshop 1** Life-course vaccination. Finding the balance in life-course vaccination, Organised by European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC)

**Lunch Workshop 2** Personalised prevention, Organised by European Federation of Pharmaceutical Industries and Associations (EFPIA)

**Lunch Workshop 3** ICP 4 co-morbid patients. Integrated care pathways (ICP) supporting multi-morbid patient journeys, Organised by Roche Diabetes Care and European Health Future Forum (EHFF) in cooperation with International Foundation for Integrated Care (IFIC) and others

**Lunch Workshop 4** Health literacy, Organised by Swiss Federal Office of Public Health in collaboration with the European Observatory on Health Systems and Policies
Evaluation of the Sessions
The conference programme offered 3 Plenary Sessions, 12 Parallel Forum Sessions, 8 different Workshop Sessions and 4 Lunch Workshops.

PLENARY SESSIONS
Overall, the Opening Plenary Session was rated 3.95 out of 5. With 4.33 average rating, the input speech by Nick Fahy received the highest ranking, followed by the quality of moderation by Josep Figueras (4.15). The online message-to-the-moderator system received an average rating of 4.01. The Thursday Plenary received an overall rating of 3.48. The highest rating of 3.78 was received by the moderation (Anya Sitaram) followed by the online message-to-the-moderator system (3.72). Paul Krugman’s keynote speech received 3.45. The Closing Plenary Session was rated with an overall rating of 3.82. The quality of the conference film received the highest voting with 4.12. The quality of the moderation by Tania Dussey-Cavassini received 3.97, while the online message-to-the-moderator system was rated with 3.68.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opening Plenary</th>
<th>Demographics and diversity in Europe. New solutions for health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday Plenary</td>
<td>Greying baby boomers – a twofold challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing Plenary</td>
<td>Demographics and diversity in Europe. New solutions for health</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERALL QUALITY ASSESSMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening Plenary 3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday Plenary 3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing Plenary 3.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODERATION ASSESSMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening Plenary 4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday Plenary 3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing Plenary 3.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOTING TOOL ASSESSMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening Plenary 4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday Plenary 3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing Plenary 3.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PARALLEL FORUM SESSIONS
Forum 10 received the best average rating of all forum sessions (4.65), followed by Forum 5 (4.23) and Forum 7 (4), sharing its third place with Forum 6 which also received an average rating of 4. At the other end of the scale, F9 Session II with 3.41 and Forum 2 with 3.4 received the lowest ratings.

Comparing all Parallel Forum Sessions, the assessment of the length of presentations of the fora was overall positive. The presentations in Forum 9 Session II (25%), Forum 1 (24%) and Forum 6 as well as Forum 4 (18%) were criticised for having been too long.

Overall, the number of presentations of the fora was considered as very good. Only in Forum 4, 19% of the respondents who participated criticised that there were too many presentations. Furthermore, 17% of respondents considered the number of presentations as too many in Forum 9 Session II and Forum 5.

For one fourth of the respondents, Forum 4 did not offer enough time for interactive discussions, the same was criticised by 23% of respondents who participated in Forum 8 and Forum 10. One fifth of respondents who participated in Forum 11 criticised that there was too little time allocated for interactive discussion.

WORKSHOP SESSIONS
The average ratings for the 8 Workshops and the 4 Lunch Workshops were all above 3.86. The best rating was given to Lunch Workshop 1 (4.38), followed by Workshop 2 (4.36), Workshop 7 (4.35) and Lunch Workshop 3 (4.23). The respondents gave their lowest overall rating to Workshop 6 (3.86).

Social Media
The EHFG is actively present on various social media channels, not only during the conference but also throughout the entire year. The respondents were asked about their opinion on social media usage. Over half of the participants, who completed the survey have used our Twitter platform, over one-third used Facebook and 18% of them were following us on LinkedIn. Two thirds followed the Twitter hash tag #ehfg2016. Over two thirds of the respondents intend to use at least one of our social media channels between the conferences.
Registration, organisation and overall impression

We asked questions concerning registration and organisational elements. The vast majority considered the online registration as fast and simple (79%), for nearly three quarters of the respondents the payment options were clear and fair and for 94% of the respondents, staff were responsive to enquiries. Organisational elements such as the on-site registration, shuttle service, accommodation, lunch catering and the networking events were also rated very positively throughout the survey.

When asked about the conference organisation, responses were as follows: Communication in the run-up to the EHFG was rated by 88% as excellent or good. The most positive feedback was received regarding the assistance given by the conference staff with 79% choosing excellent and 16% choosing good. For 88% the quality and clarity of the conference materials was excellent or good. Over 90% considered the event signage as excellent or good. The choice of topics was rated by over 78% as excellent or good. The overall conference atmosphere was rated by 91% as excellent or good.

Also considering the rating of conference networking, the feedback was very positive throughout (overall average rating of 4.36). The network facilities such as the lounge and breakout areas were given an average rating of 4.28. The opportunities to progress international health work received an average rating of 3.97. The opportunities to engage with key decision makers was given an average rating of 3.93. The opportunities to make new contacts was given the highest rating with 4.41.

Consequently, networking opportunities were considered the most rewarding activity at the conference (44%). For over one fourth of the respondents Workshops were considered most rewarding, Fora for over 12% and Plenary Sessions for 12%. Evening Events have been considered by 7% as most rewarding activity at the EHFG 2016. Compared to other EHFG conferences, 33% rated the EHFG 2016 as better than previous conferences. For 53% of respondents there was no change to previous conferences and 14% considered the EHFG 2016 worse than the conferences in the years before. When asked about future attendance, over 97% plan to participate again.
Open Questions

Finally, analysing open questions, one can summarise that respondents would appreciate more result-oriented discussions and suggested clear actions/proposals of results for the future. Another recommendation was to ensure that all stakeholders are invited when a certain topic is being discussed. One respondent recommended to have shorter sessions, especially the Plenary Sessions.

Nick Fahy’s input speech during the Opening Plenary and the conference cartoonist Floris Oudshoorn were mentioned very positively as well as the excellent participation by the Young Gasteiners. Furthermore, it was commented that the conference has become more interactive and participatory.

Regarding organisational aspects, a point of criticism referred to too few opportunities for having coffee. In general, there was a very positive feedback given to the congress staff and the overall organisation of the conference.

For a more detailed analysis of the evaluation, please see the following pages. Should you require more information on this report, i.e. comments or raw data, or if you have any questions, please feel free to contact Josef Wenninger (Josef.Wenninger[at]ehfg.org)
GENERAL SURVEY STATISTICS
GENERAL SURVEY STATISTICS

Gender

- Female: 60%
- Male: 40%

Participant's category

- Participant: 71%
- Speaker: 15%
- Journalist: 10%
- Invited Guest: 4%

n=107
Qualifications which describe your field

- Health policy: 67%
- Healthcare: 50%
- Health research: 48%
- Health promotion: 29%
- Management: 18%
- Journalism: 12%
- Pharma sector: 11%
- Social security: 10%
- Medical technology: 9%
- Industry: 6%
- Self employed: 5%
- Insurance: 5%
- Support group: 5%
- IT: 3%

n=107

Qualifications which describe your organisation

- Public institution: 50%
- Teaching and research: 29%
- NGO: 23%
- Politics: 16%
- Press: 8%
- Industry: 8%
- Interest group: 5%
- Other: 8%

n=107
Participation in a previous conference

- Yes: 48%
- No: 52%

n=107
In what way(s) were you made aware of the EHFG 2016?

Factors of influence on decision to attend the EHFG 2016

1=no influence, 5=high influence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Influence Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential for learning</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking opportunities</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic choices</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calibre of speakers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence on European health policy</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EVALUATION OF THE SESSIONS – DETAILED ANALYSIS

Opening Plenary Session

Selected Comments on the Opening Plenary:

- The interactive system is a great way to involve the audience. However, there were too many options this year in the questions to the audience. It was a bit distracting to scroll through 8 different choices when presenting the results and diluted the key points a bit.
- Superb introduction - very participative
- More time should be allocated to react to questions / comments from audience.
- Discussion and the session was too long. -30 min would do it.
- Jakab very good. Nick also good, but it would have been helpful to take that one step further & ‘translate’ it to current EU policy processes re social inclusion (which are under threat).
- The plenaries of 2 hours are too long. The discussion is dynamic for 15 hours and then it becomes unbearably boring.
- There was hardly time to answer the questions online, especially when there were many possibilities of choice
- I missed the input from citizens
Thursday Plenary Session

Selected Comments on the Thursday Plenary:

- Krugman had a very good presentation and speech, but it was not very tailored to policy makers, rather than economists.
- Keynote should have focused more on economic issues related to health care
- I only participated in Mr. Krugman speech
- Sorry, but very disappointed by Krugman's contribution....
- The Plenary, especially the keynote speech was a bit of disappointment. Not particularly interesting and relevant (very US-focused) and again way too long.
- I am not a health economist so I found Paul Krugman's presentation a little difficult to follow but aspects of it were interesting. I wish I had understood it better!!
- Even if the speakers is a Nobel Prize winner, indeed expert in his field, I found the level of his lecture too high to reach an audience of no economists,
- The online-moderator did not pick the top-rated question and therefore left out a very good chance to raise awareness and to get clear answers from the panel.
- High expectations, but the panel discussion was not focused enough. I loved the introduction by Paul Krugman - high level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall evaluation</th>
<th>3.48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The online message-to-the-moderator system was interactive and innovative</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The plenary speakers and debate were of a high standard</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of the keynote speech was high (Paul Krugman)</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of moderation was high (Anya Sitaram)</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=101
Closing Plenary Session

Selected Comments on the Closing Plenary:
- Video was very nice, please put it to YouTube so everyone can share it.
- This was a terrible Plenary. I left early as did others, and more would have done so if they hadn't been sitting so near the front.
- Too long.
- The moderation was excellent!
Comparison of the Plenary Sessions – average ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plenary Session</th>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Quality of the input speech</th>
<th>Quality of speakers &amp; debate</th>
<th>Quality of moderation</th>
<th>Quality of the interactive tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening Plenary</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday Plenary</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing Plenary</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opening Plenary
- Demographics and diversity in Europe.
- New solutions for health

Thursday Plenary
- Greying baby boomers – a twofold challenge

Closing Plenary
- Demographics and diversity in Europe.
- New solutions for health
Comparison of the Parallel Forum Sessions - average quality rating

Ranking all fora  
1=poor 5=excellent  
top down

F10 Facing the challenge of Alzheimer’s (and other dementia) 4,65
F5 Maternal healthcare in Europe 4,23
F7 Project Session 4
F6 Healthy ageing: West meets East 4
F8 Innovative medicines 3,94
F3 “Healthy” innovation 3,94
F9 "Reality meets Reality” I (Thurs) 3,91
F11 Beyond “BREXIT” 3,76
F4 Desperate migration and health 3,71
F1 Life-course approaches 3,64
F9 "Reality meets Reality” II (Fri) 3,41
F2 Guiding patients to the “Best Point of Service” 3,4
The quality of the presentations and speakers was high.
The discussion was of a high standard.
The discussion was oriented towards concrete results and followed clear objectives.
There was enough time for discussion (and I had the opportunity to participate).
All the main aspects of the subject were dealt with.
Overall this forum was of a high quality.

Forum 1: Life-course and intersectoral approaches
1=total disagreement, 5=total agreement
n=22

Forum 2: Guiding patients to the "Best Point of Service"
1=total disagreement, 5=total agreement
n=20
The quality of the presentations and speakers was high

The discussion was oriented towards concrete results and followed clear objectives

There was enough time for discussion (and I had the opportunity to participate)

All the main aspects of the subject were dealt with

Overall this forum was of a high quality

---

The quality of the presentations and speakers was high

The discussion was oriented towards concrete results and followed clear objectives

There was enough time for discussion (and I had the opportunity to participate)

All the main aspects of the subject were dealt with

Overall this forum was of a high quality

---
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The quality of the presentations and speakers was high
The discussion was of a high standard
There was enough time for discussion (and I had the opportunity to participate)
The discussion was oriented towards concrete results and followed clear objectives
All the main aspects of the subject were dealt with
Overall this forum was of a high quality

Forum 5: Maternal healthcare in Europe
1=total disagreement, 5=total agreement

n=13

Forum 6: Healthy ageing: West meets East
1=total disagreement, 5=total agreement

n=21
The quality of the presentations and speakers was high
The discussion was of a high standard
There was enough time for discussion (and I had the opportunity to participate)
The discussion was oriented towards concrete results and followed clear objectives
All the main aspects of the subject were dealt with
Overall this forum was of a high quality
The quality of the presentations and speakers was high

Overall this forum was of a high quality
All the main aspects of the subject were dealt with
There was enough time for discussion (and I had the opportunity to participate)
The discussion was oriented towards concrete results and followed clear objectives
The discussion was of a high standard
The quality of the presentations and speakers was high

Forum 9: "Reality meets Reality" I (Thurs)
1=total disagreement, 5=total agreement

n=11

Forum 9: "Reality meets Reality" II (Fri)
1=total disagreement, 5=total agreement

n=17
The discussion was of a high standard

Overall this forum was of a high quality

All the main aspects of the subject were dealt with

There was enough time for discussion (and I had the opportunity to participate)

The discussion was oriented towards concrete results and followed clear objectives

The discussion was of a high standard

The quality of the presentations and speakers was high

Forum 10: Facing the challenge of Alzheimer's and other dementias

1=total disagreement, 5=total agreement

n=17

Overall this forum was of a high quality

All the main aspects of the subject were dealt with

There was enough time for discussion (and I had the opportunity to participate)

The discussion was oriented towards concrete results and followed clear objectives

The discussion was of a high standard

The quality of the presentations and speakers was high

Forum 11: Beyond "BREXIT"

1=total disagreement, 5=total agreement

n=29
Comparison between all Parallel Forum Sessions

**Assessment of the length of presentations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Too Long</th>
<th>Too Short</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1 Life-course approaches</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 Guiding patients to the “Best Point of..”</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 “Healthy” innovation</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4 Desperate migration and health</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5 Maternal healthcare in Europe</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6 Healthy ageing: West meets East</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7 Project Session</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F8 Innovative medicines</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9 “Reality meets Reality” I (Thurs)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9 “Reality meets Reality” II (Fri)</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10 Facing the challenge of Alzheimer’s (and..)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F11 Beyond “BREXIT”</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment of number of presentations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Too Many</th>
<th>Too Few</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1 Life-course approaches</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 Guiding patients to the “Best Point of..”</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 “Healthy” innovation</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4 Desperate migration and health</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5 Maternal healthcare in Europe</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6 Healthy ageing: West meets East</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7 Project Session</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F8 Innovative medicines</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9 “Reality meets Reality” I (Thurs)</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9 “Reality meets Reality” II (Fri)</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10 Facing the challenge of Alzheimer’s (and..)</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F11 Beyond “BREXIT”</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Assessment of the time allocated for interactive discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Too Long</th>
<th>Too Short</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1 Life-course approaches</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 Guiding patients to the “Best Point of..</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 “Healthy” innovation</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4 Desperate migration and health</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5 Maternal healthcare in Europe</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6 Healthy ageing; West meets East</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7 Project Session</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F8 Innovative medicines</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9 “Reality meets Reality” I (Thurs)</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9 “Reality meets Reality” II (Fri)</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10 Facing the challenge of Alzheimer’s (and..</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F11 Beyond “BREXIT”</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation of Workshop Sessions

Evaluation of Workshop Sessions
1=poor, 5=excellent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1 Life-course vaccination</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2 Cancer care</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W7 Refugee health</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3 ICP 4 co-morbid patients</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3 Health Technology Assessment</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W5 Hear today, here tomorrow</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 Urban environments and NCDs</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 Personalised prevention</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4 Health literacy</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W8 Pancreas Cancer</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4 Work &amp; health</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W6 Capturing change</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison of all sessions

Assessment of all sessions
1=poor, 5=excellent

- F10 Facing the challenge of Alzheimer’s (and... 4.65
- L1 Life-course vaccination 4.38
- W2 Cancer care 4.36
- W7 Refugee health 4.35
- L3 ICP 4 co-morbid patients 4.23
- F5 Maternal healthcare in Europe 4.23
- W3 Health Technology Assessment 4.21
- W5 Hear today, here tomorrow 4.13
- W1 Urban environments and NCDs 4.13
- L2 Personalised prevention 4.10
- L4 Health literacy 4
- W8 Pancreas Cancer 4
- F7 Project Session 4
- F6 Healthy ageing: West meets East 4
- Opening Plenary Session 3.95
- F8 Innovative medicines 3.94
- F3 “Healthy” innovation 3.94
- F9 “Reality meets Reality” I (Thurs) 3.91
- W4 Work & health 3.87
- W6 Capturing change 3.86
- Closing Plenary Session 3.82
- F11 Beyond “BREXIT” 3.76
- F4 Desperate migration and health 3.71
- F1 Life-course approaches 3.64
- Thursday Plenary Session 3.48
- F9 “Reality meets Reality” II (Fri) 3.41
- F2 Guiding patients to the “Best Point of Service” 3.40
SOCIAL MEDIA
**SOCIAL MEDIA**

**Usage of social media platforms at the EHFG 2016?**

- Twitter: 55%
- Facebook: 34%
- LinkedIn: 18%
- YouTube: 3%
- RSS/Blog: 2%
- I did not use any of the social media platforms: 25%

*Multiple answers allowed*  
*n=93*

**Did you follow our Twitter hashtag #ehfg2016?**

- Yes: 66%
- No: 34%

*n=90*

**Do you intend to use any of our social media between EHFG conferences?**

- Yes: 68%
- No: 32%

*n=90*
REGISTRATION, ORGANISATION & OVERALL IMPRESSION
REGISTRATION, ORGANISATION & OVERALL IMPRESSION

Evaluation of the registration process
1=total disagreement, 5=total agreement

- Online registration was fast and simple
  - 2% strongly disagree
  - 15% disagree
  - 20% neutral
  - 59% agree
  - 2% strongly agree

- Payment options were clear and fair
  - 3% strongly disagree
  - 4% disagree
  - 18% neutral
  - 25% agree
  - 49% strongly agree

- Staff were responsive to enquiries
  - 2% strongly disagree
  - 5% disagree
  - 13% neutral
  - 81% agree
  - 2% strongly agree

Evaluation of organisational elements of the conference
1=poor, 5=excellent

- Shuttle service
  - 2% strongly disagree
  - 1% disagree
  - 14% neutral
  - 16% agree
  - 77% strongly agree

- On-site registration
  - 3% strongly disagree
  - 8% disagree
  - 13% neutral
  - 20% agree
  - 76% strongly agree

- Social Programme Excursions
  - 3% strongly disagree
  - 8% disagree
  - 20% neutral
  - 23% agree
  - 73% strongly agree

- Friday Evening Conclusion Dinner (Hotel de l’Europe, Bad Gastein)
  - 3% strongly disagree
  - 6% disagree
  - 23% neutral
  - 26% agree
  - 69% strongly agree

- Conference locations and accessibility
  - 2% strongly disagree
  - 15% disagree
  - 26% neutral
  - 23% agree
  - 64% strongly agree

- Thursday Evening Networking Event - FestAlm
  - 1% strongly disagree
  - 11% disagree
  - 24% neutral
  - 26% agree
  - 61% strongly agree

- Accommodation
  - 3% strongly disagree
  - 9% disagree
  - 27% neutral
  - 24% agree
  - 57% strongly agree

- Wednesday Evening Welcome Reception (Kursaal)
  - 3% strongly disagree
  - 13% disagree
  - 26% neutral
  - 27% agree
  - 56% strongly agree

- Lunch catering
  - 9% strongly disagree
  - 8% disagree
  - 39% neutral
  - 27% agree
  - 38% strongly agree

n=93
### Rating of conference organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>1=poor, 5=excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall conference atmosphere</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>25% 29% 62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event signage</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8% 30% 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance given by conference staff</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1% 16% 79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality and clarity of the conference materials</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2% 42% 45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication in the run-up to the EHFG</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9% 41% 47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice of topics for sessions: timeliness and...</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3% 15% 45% 33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rating of conference networking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>1=poor, 5=excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking facilities (i.e. lounge and breakout areas)</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to progress international health work</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to engage with key decision makers</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to make new contacts</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=9, n=92
Most rewarding activities at the conference

- Networking Opportunities: 44%
- Workshops: 25%
- Plenary Sessions: 12%
- Fora: 12%
- Evening Events: 7%

Comparison to other EHFGs

- No change: 53%
- Better: 33%
- Worse: 14%

Would you participate in the conference again?

- Yes: 97%
- No: 3%
OPEN QUESTIONS

Respondents were asked to give recommendations for how to improve the organisational aspects of next year’s conference.

This question was answered by 20 respondents.

- There are so many aspects to Health Literacy. One could organise interesting Workshops or Fora every day (one per day) to get more into details after obviously discussing the topic for 10 years ...
- More structured networking such as a world café style format.
- Too many speakers during sessions
- Please order bread at the first evening. This was the second time, where all members are missing bread on the buffet.
- Please offer a gluten free diet!
- Balanced representation of speakers would be appreciated
- If possible I would appreciate if the 5 emails in the run-up to the EHFG could be summarized to 1 or 2.
- More signage for hotels.
- Social programme conflicted with main sessions of the programme.
- There should be a clear rule that when a topic is being discussed, all stakeholders should be invited. For instance, the session about "profit over patients" was a pharma bashing session with no representative of the industry on the panel. While there should - of course - be full editorial freedom as to the questions and full freedom of speech as to the answers, such a non-representative way of working on panels is very poor, to say the least.
- I felt this years, the conference lacked a social voice. Obviously as a health conference the fundamental topics are health issues, but some sessions, where relevant could have included a speaker from the social sector. For example, the inter-sectoral approaches to health care, healthy ageing and refugee health all paid lip service to the social sector, but having a speaker from those sectors who also work on healthcare, like FEANTSA, would help broaden the expertise of the panel and show potential room for collaboration.
- This really was a good conference, thank you!
- Mobile app didn’t always work. Signage not always clear between conference venues.
- Everything was fine, but maybe it is worth to change a balance between Plenary and sessions (2-3 more top Plenary speakers with topics which are interesting for everybody).
• Name badges are useless in the current form - one cannot see the names of the delegates as the letters are too small, the name badges are twisted that you can only see one's dinner programme and finally, they are on the level of the belly. I'd suggest to use the traditional name badges that one can put on their shirt in a visible place.
• go ahead!
• Shorter sessions especially for the Plenary Sessions

In conclusion, one person recommended to have more structured networking such as a world café style format. Another recommendation was to make sure that all stakeholders are invited, when a certain topic is being discussed. One respondent recommended to have shorter sessions, especially the Plenary Sessions. Furthermore, it was criticised that the letters on the name badges were too small. Overall, several respondents congratulated the EHFG team to the overall organisation of the conference.

Respondents were asked to share any final thoughts on their experience at EHFG 2016.
• Regarding speakers (specifically in the plenaries) and participants there should be more involvement of MEPs as well as senior officials from EU Member States, e.g. Ministry of Health, Ministry of Finance and others
• Well done! If possible more Health Literacy and more Health Promotion, but less Health Care!
• Excellent conference. Would like if some of the workshops and other sessions involved splitting participants in to small working groups who could suggest some proposed actions to take away from the sessions. These could be very helpful to guide policy makers and would simply be non-binding suggestions.
• Don't just be a talking shop! Too much about public health is talking, I'd love to see more action while there is the valuable opportunity to bring experts together from across Europe.
• Three-day conference on health without hearing the voices of patients is quite disappointing.
• I would await clearer proposals of results for the future. This is always a documentary what has been till today but nothing for the future.
• EHFG could be a more balanced platform giving the floor to different stakeholders and not mainly to NGO's.
• +Nick Fahy - Paul Krugman + Cartoonist + more interactive and participatory + great weather - no time for social program (although it would have been great) + the highlight of my duty travels in 2016
• Really needs more coffee
• Excellent participation by the Young Gasteiners. This is one of the major strengths of the meeting.
• Why is it that there were so little decision-makers present (i.e. Commission, Parliament, Council, MS [other than Austria])? Talking among health advocates is interesting and fun, but not worth €2000...

• My participation next year would depend on the inclusion of the social sector in relevant workshops. The topics interest me but there needs to be a broader panel of speakers.

• The online voting-system was very good. One thing that will annoy people is the bad wifi. It does not cost very much to bring force to the wifi in the area.

• More interview opportunities with key opinion leaders would be good.

• Please don't lose focus on/link with EU policy

• More thought needs to be given to quality of presentations or panellists: too many were poor presenters, or were not the best option in the field. Panels also need to be more diverse, in every way, starting with more representatives from civil society, more patient voices and more corporate voices. There were too few entrepreneurs and businesses, and too little civil society, with too many mid-level policy makers. This made the conference not as dynamic or relevant as it could be.

• A most rewarding experience.

• It was a great experience and I learnt a lot. It was organized extremely well and we got every possible help. I wish, our every problem was as smoothly solved as ours there,

• My compliments for not serving alcohol at lunch and a very good gender balance! This is a modern event in its form, something that is still not as common as it should be!

• Great conference, beautiful location but very hard to reach by public transport. Shuttles from Munich airport should be included for journalists. Thanks!

• High level people should be available for discussions and networking and not rush off after their presentations.

• I think overall it has improved over the years slightly to more 'outcome oriented discussions'- would be great to see more of that!

• Excellent

• Commercial and funder influence on agenda is too strong.

• Great organization, lovely staff! I'd shorten the plenaries, improve lunch catering, skip cakes at the coffee breaks and change the name badges. Thanks for all your efforts!

This question was answered by 29 respondents. There were a few negative comments, one for example referring to the low quality of certain presentations. Several participants wished for more result-oriented discussions and suggested clear actions/proposals of results for the future. On the other hand there were several very positive comments concerning the friendly staff and the excellent organisation. Nick Fahy's input speech during the Opening Plenary and the conference cartoonist Floris
Oudshoorn were mentioned very positively as well as the excellent participation by the Young Gasteiners. Furthermore, it was commented that the conference has become more interactive and participatory.

For more detailed information about the evaluation results, please feel free to contact Josef Wenninger (Josef.Wenninger@ehfg.org).
Organisers & Sponsors

We would like to thank the following institutions, organisations and companies for their expertise, generous support, sponsorship and fruitful cooperation which makes the European Health Forum such a successful event and without whom we would not have been able to realise our goals. We are looking forward to continuing these partnerships on our way towards

CREATING A BETTER FUTURE FOR HEALTH IN EUROPE

Fora and Workshops organisers, co-hosts and contributors

- Alliance for Maternal Health Equality
- Bristol-Myers Squibb
- DG Communications Networks, Content and Technology (DG CONNECT), European Commission
- DG Health and Food Safety (DG SANTE), European Commission
- DG Research and Innovation (DG RTD), European Commission
- European Agency for Safety and Health at work (EU-OSHA)
- European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC)
- European Federation of Allergy and Airways Diseases Patients’ Associations (EFA)
- European Federation of Pharmaceutical Industries and Associations (EFPIA)
- European Health Futures Forum (EHFF)
- European Public Health Alliance (EPHA)
- European Public Health Association (EUPHA)
- European Social Insurance Platform (ESIP)
- Federal Ministry of Health and Women’s Affairs, Austria
- Federal Office of Public Health, Switzerland
- Health Insurance Fund, Estonia
- Health Promotion Administration, Ministry of Health and Welfare, Taiwan R.O.C.
- ICARE4EU, financed from the Health Programme 2008-2013 of the European Union
- International Foundation for Integrated Care (IFIC)
- International Peace Institute (IPI)
- London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, UK
- Main Association of Austrian Social Security Institutions
- MED-EL Medical Electronics
- MSD
- MSD for Mothers
- National Institute for Health Disability Insurance (NIHDI), Belgium
- Open Society Foundations (OSF)
- Roche Diabetes Care
- Swiss Contribution Office in Hungary together with the Government of Hungary
- World Obesity Federation