



the Netherlands as case

- Interesting case
 - Well-known for advanced digital infrastructure
 - High access and use percentages for internet and mobile technologies
 - Notoriously public failure of national EPD, owing to political concerns
 - Slow uptake of mHealth;
 - Categorized by Wendy Currie (October 2014) as 'follower' rather than 'front runner' (together with France, Germany and Belgium)
- <http://vitaltransformation.com/enabling-technologies-for-better-patient-outcomes-live-streaming-from-the-europea-health-forum-gastein/>
- Large policy push for more "e" and "m" in healthcare
 - 2013-2014: 2-3 major policy reports + high-profile letter from Minister
 - 2014: EU mHealth Green Paper + addendum
- Funding programs advocate *socially responsible research and innovation (RRI)*
 - Less attention for "already known" sectors, i.e. eHealth
 - Picked up in the private sector, mostly by larger companies

Reasons for slow uptake of “e” and “m” in Dutch healthcare

- Dutch physicians (and health-sector managers) indicate: ethical and legal uncertainty is a primary reason for *not* adopting these innovations
 - Ideals of patient self-management, empowerment, etc have consequences for professional functioning
 - Concerns about legal liability
 - Much of the regulatory framework surrounding and supporting health care needs to be updated
 - At least 6 relevant national laws
 - » 4 health-sector-related laws are non-ICT specific
 - » 2 laws related to ICT, only 1 is health specific
- Developers often have insufficient knowledge of (legal) requirements and risks
- Intended users (patients *and* professionals) not included, included too late or become ‘token’ participants in design and development

Tensions (non-exhaustive list)

- Market rhetoric and ideology “anybody’s game”
- Development and “scaling up” takes longer than standard funding cycles
- Government actors claim interest is in improving citizen health
- More interest in ‘social robustness’ as part of responsible research and innovation
- ‘Personalized’ and ‘unobtrusive’ technologies better align to user needs
- Distinction between medical device and lifestyle assistance becoming “fuzzy”
- Search for one-size-fits all solutions
- Mutual dependencies; successes are exception, rather than rule
- Developers and/or institutions juggle a two-pronged strategy due to ‘uncertainty’
- Also have economic interests, some preclude social scientific research
- Often reduced in practice to informed consent and data protection
- Raise a number of ethical, legal and social issues
- “Lifestyle” apps close to “care” have (legal) consequences for technology
- Variations in technology and types of care

How to secure trust?

- Look to a more structured framework for 'socially responsible research and innovation' (e.g. Stilgoe et al 2013)
 - Involves including actors much earlier in conceptualization, research and development of innovations
 - Abandons distinction between development and implementation as separate phases
 - Examines the role of social power relations and both existing and potential governance structures
 - Includes shifting focus from what law cannot do or what it prohibits to what it *can* do and how to work within the *possibilities* it offers
 - TILT: examine how ethics and legislation can play a more instrumental role as framework that creates conditions of interactions and delineates boundaries between actors



However...

- Is a tricky process
- Involves some experimentation in practice
- Also runs risk of tokenism
- Law as "framework that creates conditions of interaction" is fragile notion
 - Current laws must strike a delicate balance between protecting patients and not overburdening professionals
 - Collective action dilemma's
 - Non-acceptance, especially in highly-regulated, protected fields
- ...

