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Basque Country’s Health System

- Population: 2,17M
- Financed by taxes: 3.422M€ in 2016
- Universal Healthcare coverage
- Healthcare providers
  - Basque Public Health Service-Osakidetza
    - 13 Integrated Care Organisations
      - 14 Acute Hospitals, 313 Primary Care Centers
      - +30.000 Healthcare professionals
    - 2 Sub-acute Hospitals
    - 3 Mental Health Networks
  - Non for profit and Private health centres
Integrated Care the Basque Country

- **Integrated Care Organisation (ICO)**
  - Synergies between different levels of care
  - More coordinated, more efficient and higher quality care

- **Integrated care is based on three pillars:**
  - **Integrated Governance**
    - Unified approach to the organization and provision of services
    - One locus of responsibility managing the care process
  - **Population approach**
    - Population Risk stratification
    - Responsibility for the health of the entire population of a given geographic area.
    - Coordination with social and public health actors.
  - **Culture and values**
    - Change from diverse Silos’ cultures to a common organizational culture
    - Shift to health related outcomes: bundled evaluation
Integration Care

- Mental Health
- Social Health collaboration
- Other community workers: Education, industry, entrepreneurship, environment
- Research and innovation
- Health Care
- Primary Care
- H. Subacute
- Social Resources
- Public Health
- Third Sector
- Integration Tools: OSIs, care pathways, priority circuits
- Prevention and Health Promotion
- Risk Stratification
- Funding and Procurement
- InterRai
- Osakidetza
- Osabide Global
- SciRocco
System maturity self-assessment

1. Identification of regional/local stakeholders
   10 experts

2. Individual self-assessment
   Meeting to introduce the project and the “Scirocco Tool”

3. Data collection/data analysis
   10 spider diagrams

4. Stakeholder workshops
   Consensus → Final spider diagram of the Basque Country

5. Summary of results and feedback on the process
Local Stakeholders

Multidisciplinary and multi-level group of 10 stakeholders:

- Insurance & Procurement unit’s Technical
- Health & social care Coordinator
- Economic director of an ICO
- Director of integration of an ICO
- Deputy Director of Quality and Information Services of the General Directorate
- Integration and chronicity service’s technical of the General Directorate
- Internal medicine service Manager
- Primary care unit Manager
- Primary care Nurse
- Hospital Nurse
Outcomes of Individual self assessment

Insurance & Procurement unit’s technical Director of Integration of an ICO Health & social care Coordinator
Outcomes of Individual self assessment

- Highest mean values
- Lowest mean values
- Greatest variability
- Lowest variability
Outcomes of Individual self assessment
Understanding variability

• The great variability in some dimensions can be explained by:

1. The **understanding** of what the dimension describes differs among the stakeholders
2. The **complexity** of the dimensions with differences in the weight given by the stakeholders to their various components
3. There is real **disagreement** between the stakeholder’s perspectives
Negotiation and Consensus Building

Process

1. Presentation of the individual self-assessments to the whole group

2. Split stakeholders into two working groups
   - Select a representative for each of the groups

3. Facilitated discussion on the outcomes of the self-assessment process in groups, and reach an agreement resulting in a group-diagram

4. Final diagram for the Basque country
   - Presentation of the agreed group-diagrams to the whole group by the representatives.
   - Consensus on the final diagram of the Basque Country
Negotiation & Consensus Building

Group 1

Group 2
Negotiation & Consensus Building

Final Consensus
Negotiation & Consensus Building

Experience

• The spider diagram for the Basque Country is quite **homogeneous**

• **Not very difficult to agree on discrepancies in stakeholders’ individual scoring**

• The outcomes provide very **harmonised approach to integrated care in the region**. The outcomes show that there is a progress towards integrated care in all of the dimension.

• **There are areas for improvement** e.g. participation and empowerment of the citizens and innovation management that needs to be further promoted.

• It is also necessary to create right environments between the different agents involved to **improve** their **collaboration**.
Thank you!