B.I.R.O.
Best Information through Regional Outcomes

A Shared Evidence-Based Diabetes Information System to Support European Health Policy

Governance
Risk Profile for Diabetes
Diagnosis and Classification
Risk Profile for Complications and Intermediate Outcomes
Management and Care of Diabetes and its comorbidities
Lifestyle Management
Complications
Health care and research
Health Status, Demographic and Socio-economic factors
Health System and health care delivery
Cost of Diabetes
Patients and Citizens
Lifestyle Management
Complications

General Information

What is Diabetes

Types of Diabetes

      Type 1, Type 2, Gestational, Others

Pre-diabetes

      IGT, IFG

Treatment

Cost of Diabetes

Search this site:

B.I.R.O.
Best Information through Regional Outcomes

A Shared Evidence-Based Diabetes Information System to Support European Health Policy

Language Options

Governance
EU, Commission, Parlament..
National and regional governments
Local health care authorities
Payers, social and private insur.
NGOs
WHO, IDF, Diabetes Orgs.
Health care and research
Primary care, practices, societies
Diabetes Care units, professional associations, academic research
Industry, EU-DG research, Universities
Patients and Citizens
Patient and consumers orgs
Patients and their families, citizens

→ Tailored diabetes report - Governance"

→ Tailored diabetes report - "Health care and research"

→ Tailored diabetes report – "Patients and Citizens"

General Information on diabetes

- Diagnosis and classification

- Treatment

- Human, social and economic impact

Search this site:

Backbone of report structures
Based on Clinical Review (WP2) and Common Dataset (WP3)

1. Demographic characteristics
2. Clinical characteristics
3. Health system
4. Population
5. Outcome indicators

Assigned priority and feasibility for each indicator

- Priority: "How important is it to include the selected data item"
  - Priority scale: subjective, consensus based
  - 1=High, 2=Intermediate, 3=Low
- Feasibility: "How feasible is it to collect the selected data item"
  - Feasibility Scale: subjective, consensus based
  - A=High, B=Intermediate, C=Low

- Useful and necessary approach?

Stratification factors for each indicator

- Indicates whether or not the data should be stratified for output.

- Does this way of organising the report look reasonable?

- Stratifcation (strata) selected correctly?

Data quality

- Defined criteria for data quality

  - The reports should also indicate the level of data quality.

- Levels of quality could be indicated as follows; Q1=High, Q2=Intermediate, Q3=Low

  - Q1: Report includes data from >70% of reporting centers.

  - Q2: Report includes data from 30-70% of reporting centers.

  - Q3: Report includes data from <30% of reporting centers.

- Can data quality be handled better and in a different way at this point?

- Quality *and* validity issues

- Relation to priority and feasibility?

Discussion points

- Relation to WP2-4 ok?
- Overall approach reasonable?
- Level of details sufficient?
- Feasibility and data quality issues?
- Possble to use for WPs 8-12?

- Remmber: Report is to be revised – goal for this report by July 2007

WP7 evaluation and devlopment

WP4

WP7

Evaluations

WP10-11

WP7

WP8-9