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PART I

• THE DIRECTIVE’S MAIN CONTENTS AND GOALS
LEGAL BASIS

• SECTION 114 TFUE: THE EU IS ENTITLED TO ADOPT LEGAL MEASURES TO CO-ORDINATE THE FUNCTIONING OF INTERNAL MARKET

• THEREFORE, THE DIRECTIVE IS MAINLY AIMED AT DEVELOPING THE SERVICE MARKET WITHIN THE EU

• HOWEVER, THE PROTECTION OF PATIENTS’ OWN HEALTH IS ALSO ADDRESSED
DIRECTIVE’S GOALS:

• TO MAKE THE MOVEMENT OF PATIENTS WITHIN THE EU MORE EFFECTIVE

• TO ENSURE A HIGH LEVEL OF HEALTH PROTECTION
THE KEY PRINCIPLES

• EXPENSES ARE REIMBURSED TO THE SAME EXTENT TO WHICH PATIENTS WOULD BE ENTITLED AT HOME

• TO SET UP NETWORKS OF EXPERTISE AND SPECIALISED CENTRES AMONG THE MEMBER STATES

• REIMBURSEMENTS MAY BE LIMITED GIVEN CERTAIN REASONS OF GENERAL INTEREST

• MEMBER STATES ARE LEFT FREE TO INTRODUCE A SYSTEM OF PRIOR AUTHORISATION

• ESTABLISHING OF NATIONAL CONTACT POINTS
HOWEVER

THE REIMBURSEMENT OF HEALTH CARE EXPENSES IS LIMITED TO THOSE TREATMENTS WHICH THE CITIZEN IS ENTITLED IN HIS/HER OWN NATIONAL HEALTH SYSTEM
WHAT KIND OF EXPENSES?

• ONLY THE MEDICAL AND HEALTH ONES CONNECTED TO THE TREATMENTS SUPPLIED

• THE MEMBER STATES ARE FREE TO SET UP HIGHER REIMBURSEMENTS
PRIOR AUTHORISATION

• TO BE DEEMED AS A BARRIER AGAINST THE FREEDOM OF PEOPLE TO MOVE CROSS BORDER

• IT IS NOT JUSTIFIED WHEN THE TREATMENT ABROAD IS LISTED IN THE NATIONAL HEALTH SYSTEM
SOME ISSUES AT STAKE

• TO EVALUATE THE CAPS FOR THE REIMBURSEMENT CONCERNING HEALTH INSURANCE POLICIES

• TO SET UP REASONABLE CAPS TO ENSURE THE ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL BALANCE OF THE AFFILIATION SYSTEM (WHICH IS THE ONE THAT HAS TO REIMBURSE THE EXPENSES)
THE DIRECTIVE THEN….

• ADDRESSES PATIENTS’ RIGHTS
• PROVIDES FOR CLEAR RULES TO ACCESS HIGH QUALITY AND SAFE HEALTH CARE SERVICES
• ENSURES SINGLE CITIZENS’ RIGHT TO MOVE CROSS BORDER TO ACCESS HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS AND SERVICES
POTENTIALS

• OPPORTUNITY FOR THOSE COUNTRIES WITH THE BEST QUALITY STANDARDS AND CAPACITY OF EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION

• POSITIVE IMPACT ON TOURIST PROMOTION LINKED TO HEALTHY LIFE STYLES
PART II

• THE IMPLEMENTATION: THE SITUATION AT PRESENT

• WHAT KIND OF IMPLEMENTATION?
1. EXPERT PANEL ON EFFECTIVE WAYS OF INVESTING IN HEALTH (EXPH): CROSS BORDER COOPERATION – 29th JULY 2015

• NO ADEQUATE INFORMATION FOR CITIZENS
• NCPs ARE NOT YET IN PLACE. IF SO, INFORMATION ARE UNCLEAR AND NOT USEFUL TO DECIDE
• PRIOR AUTHORISATION
• REIMBURSEMENT
FOCUS ON

• PRIOR AUTHORISATION
• REIMBURSEMENT
PRIOR AUTHORISATION

• RECITAL 43 OF THE DIRECTIVE: THE CRITERIA FOR PRIOR AUTHORIZATION HAVE TO BE DULY JUSTIFIED.

• “EXTENSIVE SYSTEMS OF PRIOR AUTHORIZATION” SHOULD NOT BE ACCEPTED OR JUSTIFIED.

• BURDENSOME PROCEDURES (SEE ITALY)
REIMBURSEMENT

• Article 7(9) permits Member States to limit the application of the rules on reimbursement of cross-border healthcare for overriding reasons of general interest.

• However, Article 7(11) requires that such limitations be necessary and proportionate, and do not constitute a means of arbitrary discrimination or an unjustified obstacle to free movement. Furthermore, Member States are required to notify the Commission of any decision to introduce limitations under 7(9).

• Although the Commission has received no specific notifications, some of the ways in which Member States have transposed the Directive could be considered as limiting reimbursement.

• According to Article 7(4) of the Directive, the reference point for reimbursement for crossborder healthcare should be the amount borne by the system when that particular healthcare is provided by a public or contracted healthcare provider (depending on the way a given health system is organised) in the Member State of affiliation.
PART III

• CONCLUDING REMARKS (AND SOME POSSIBLE REMEDIES)
SOME POSSIBLE REMEDIES

• MSs: FAILURE TO FULFIL THEIR OBLIGATIONS UNDER EITHER ART. 7(4) OR 7(7) OF THE DIRECTIVE: THE COMMISSION MAY THEN START A PROCEDURE UNDER ART. 258 TFEU CALLING ON MSS TO COMPY WITH EU LAW BY REMOVING ARBITRARY AND DISCRIMINATORY RESTRICTIONS ON CROSS-BORDER CARE.

• IN ADDITION, INDIVIDUALS MAY EVEN CONSIDER A MORE INNOVATIVE APPROACH BY CHALLENGING THE INCORRECT IMPLEMENTATION UNDER THE EU CHARTER OF FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS (ART. 35, THE RIGHT TO HEALTH CARE) JOINED WITH THE NON DISCRIMINATION PROVISION, BASED ON NATIONALITY (ART. 21(2) BEFORE THE NATIONAL COURTS
SOME CONCLUDING REMARKS

• Overall, the implementation of Directive 2011/24 should allow the overcoming of a purely economic approach to health services so as to reach out for a new relationship between citizens and welfare state. This relationship is to depict enforceable rights also within the legal framework of patient’s mobility: cross-border health care is expected then to strike a balance between the fulfilling of citizens’ needs and the obligation of Member States to ensure financial sustainability of the budgets of their national health systems.

• Such a goal cannot be accomplished when Member States build up barriers against the freedom of movement, thus preventing European citizens from migrating out of their health systems. Hence, it is not a question of market freedom versus European social market. It is rather a question of implementing procedures aimed at supporting cross-border health care services, which could actually bring in important changes in the organisation and management of national health systems.