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Background

Challenges in Cancer Control in the Netherlands

• Increasing demand
  • Growing burden of cancer

• Increasing complexity of demand and supply
  • E.g. more co-morbidity, complex diseases
  • More diagnostic and treatment options

• Bottlenecks in supply and finance

→ To deliver optimal cancer control against reasonable costs
National Cancer Control Programme
2005-2010

“Improvement of cancer control by cohesion and cooperation”

Coordination in Steering Group – representatives of involved parties
Development of NCCP (2003)

- National goals, recommendations and actions formulated by working groups on:
  - Primary prevention
  - Secondary prevention
  - Cancer Care
  - Professional Education
  - Research
  - Psychosocial care

- Implementation and evaluation
  - Development of indicators
    - 12 directly available
    - 13 to be further developed/ specified
  - Checklist (+/- 150 different activities)
## Directly available indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Prevention</th>
<th>Secondary Prevention</th>
<th>Cancer care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence smokers</td>
<td>Attendance rate breast cancer screening</td>
<td>Incidence per tumor type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence obesity</td>
<td>Attendance rate cervical cancer screening</td>
<td>5 years relative survival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical activity</td>
<td>Referral rate breast cancer screening</td>
<td>Throughput time diagnosis- treatment [*]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit consumption</td>
<td>Stage at diagnosis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive predictive value breast cancer screening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*partly available*
Further actions

- 7 Priorities
  - Discouraging smoking
  - Decrease of waiting time after screening referral to regular care
  - Introduction and implementation of colorectal screening
  - Quality and access to cancer care
  - Psychosocial care
  - Translational research
  - Professional education

- Development of additional indicators

- Development and implementation of NPK Monitor
  - Indicators for quality of cancer control
  - Progress on priorities
  - Checklist for actions
NPK Monitor

Objective:
- Point out current (trends in) quality of cancer control surveillance
- Comparison to goals set in NCCP for 2010

Useful for:
- Determining or adjusting priorities in policy
- Initiate quality improvements
- (Inter)national benchmarking
Results NPK Monitor

- Numerical update of indicators on website www.npknet.nl/monitor

- But also:
  - Insight into diversity of data sources and data
    - Availability of data
    - Sometimes multiple, different data(sources)
    - Level of data, different methods used
  - Contact with data suppliers
  - Insight into process of data collection
  - Alignment with other indicator sets
    OECD, Eurochip, Quality Index, Ontario Canada
Important results until now

• Smoking free public areas including restaurants (July 2008)

• Centralized national screening policy plan
  - 5 organizations instead of 21

• Working Group of National Association of Medical Specialists, Patient groups, General Practitioners
  • Discussion about definition and measurement of quality of care (medical and psychosocial)

• Screening instrument for psychosocial needs developed and implemented from 1 Jan 2009 on
Which areas need more effort to reach the goal in 2010?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary prevention</th>
<th>Monitor 2007</th>
<th>Monitor 2009</th>
<th>Goal 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>max 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit consumption</td>
<td>&lt;2%*</td>
<td>&lt;20%*</td>
<td>min 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetable consumption</td>
<td>&lt;2%*</td>
<td>&lt;20%*</td>
<td>min 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obesity</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>max 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical activity</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>min 55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical inactivity</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>max 8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* based on young adults
* based on young children
## Results NPK Monitor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary prevention</th>
<th>Monitor 2007</th>
<th>Monitor 2008</th>
<th>Goal 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Breast cancer screening</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive predictive value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cervical cancer screening</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidence per 100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Results NPK Monitor

## Cancer care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Monitor 2007</th>
<th>Monitor 2008</th>
<th>Goal 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cancer incidence per 100,000</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage at diagnosis</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time from diagnosis to treatment</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance to guidelines</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-year relative survival</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer mortality (per 100,000)</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[www.npknnet.nl/monitor](http://www.npknnet.nl/monitor)
Results NPK Monitor

Change in five year relative survival

Source: Netherlands Cancer Registry
Results NPK Monitor

Change in five year relative survival

Goal in 2010

Five year relative survival
Lung cancer

Source: Netherlands Cancer Registry
Results NPK Monitor

Focused on lung cancer:

- No improvement in survival in time
- Limited possibilities curative treatment

TOP priority = prevention
Results NPK Monitor

Percentage of smokers

Start NCCP

Goal in 2010

Source: Stivaro
Demonstration www.npknet.nl/monitor
Conclusion

NPK Monitor instrument:

- Suitable instrument for monitoring national trends
- Important **signal function** for *initiating* improvements -for which more detail is required-
- Discussion started about
  - Progress of NCCP
  - (renewed) priorities for policy and action
  - Initiation of improvements on national, regional and local level
  - International comparison
- Input for setting or adjusting priorities/ programs
Indicators

- International
- National
- Regional
- Institute
- Team
- Professional

Macro

Micro

Surveillance
Selection
Accountability

Quality improvement
Time from diagnosis to (first) surgery

Source: Netherlands Cancer Registry
## Indicators to be further developed/ specified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Prevention</th>
<th>Secondary Prevention</th>
<th>Cancer care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smoking cessation programmes</td>
<td>Attendance rate colorectal cancer screening</td>
<td>Percentage compliance to guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge influence lifestyle on cancer</td>
<td>Referral colorectal cancer screening</td>
<td>Patient satisfaction/-.experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early detection of cancer in elderly</td>
<td>Positive predictive value cervical cancer screening</td>
<td>Access time to breast cancer unit (outpatient department)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun exposition</td>
<td>Positive predictive value colorectal cancer screening</td>
<td>Palliative care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up after PAP IIIB - cervical cancer screening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Needs further specification