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# Part A questions for generic feedback

These questions will be asked in each public consultation to provide an understanding of the recipients’ demographics, the quality of the document and to gather generic feedback. Questions marked with an asterisk are mandatory.

## Demography

**Country**\* [-List of countries-, EEA (Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway, Europe non-EEA,European Organisation (European Commission, EMA, etc.), International Organisation (UN, WHO, etc.), Other]

**Type of the responder**\* [Public organisation, Private organisation, Non-governmental organisation (NGO), Academic or research institution, Interest group, Individual expert or professional, Patient representative, Individual citizen, Other]

**Sector**\* [Health care provider, Health care administration, Government/public administration, Research and development, Manufacturer of medical devices, Pharmaceutical industry, Education and academia, Information technology, Data management/processing, Patient advocacy, Legal and compliance, Information & media, Other]

**Organisation size**\* [Micro (1–9 employees), Small to medium enterprise (10–249 employees), Large enterprise (250+ employees), Not applicable/Individual citizen

**Professional role/function** [open text field]

## Quality

**From your perspective, how ready is the document to meet the expected needs?**\* [Early draft, Major additions/changes needed, Minor additions/changes needed, Only final editorial changes needed]

**What is the level of quality of the document?**\* [Rate 1 (Low) – 4 (Very High)]

**Is the document easy to understand?**\* [Rate 1 (not clear nor easy to understand) – 4 (very clear and easy to understand)]

**How well does the document address the key issues and challenges related to its subject matter?**\* [Rate 1 (not well) – 4 (very well)]

**How feasible and implementable do you find the guidelines or technical specifications presented in the document?**\* [Rate 1 (not feasible and implementable at all) – 4 (very feasible and implementable)]

## Generic feedback

**Do you have any suggestions for improving the document? Are there any additional topics or areas that should be covered?** [Please provide feedback and ideas for enhancing the document] [max. 750 characters]

# Part B questions for specific feedback

**Do you have previous experience applying for electronic health data? Please choose one**. [No / Yes, at a national level / Yes, at international level / Yes, at both national and international level]

**What perspective describes best your affiliation? Please choose one.** [The perspective of a data user / The perspective of a data holder / The perspective of an HDAB / None of the above]

**Before reading the deliverable, how would have you rated your ability to fill out the data access / data request application correctly?** [Rate 1 (not able at all) – 4 (very well able)].

**Now, after reading the deliverable, how would you rate your ability to fill out the data access / data request application correctly?** [Rate 1 (not able at all) – 4 (very well able)].

**Is chapter 6 clear and easy to understand?** [Rate 1 (not clear nor easy to understand) – 4 (very clear and easy to understand)].

**If there are specific topics missing in chapter 6, please elaborate on these below.** [Please provide feedback, max. 750 characters].

**If there are parts of chapter 6 that are superfluous, please elaborate on these below.** [Please provide feedback, max. 750 characters].

**Is chapter 7 clear and easy to understand?** [Rate 1 (not clear nor easy to understand) – 4 (very clear and easy to understand)].

**If there are specific topics missing in chapter 7, please elaborate on these below** [Please provide feedback, max. 750 characters].

**If there are parts of chapter 7 that are superfluous, please elaborate on these below.** [Please provide feedback, max. 750 characters].

**Is chapter 8 clear and easy to understand?** [Rate 1 (not clear nor easy to understand) – 4 (very clear and easy to understand)].

**If there are specific topics missing in chapter 8, please elaborate on these below** [Please provide feedback, max. 750 characters].

**If there are parts of chapter 8 that are superfluous, please elaborate on these below** [Please provide feedback, max. 750 characters].

**Is chapter 9 clear and easy to understand?** [Rate 1 (not clear nor easy to understand) – 4 (very clear and easy to understand)].

**If there are specific topics missing in chapter 9, please elaborate on these below.** [Please provide feedback, max. 750 characters].

**If there are parts of chapter 9 that are superfluous, please elaborate on these below.** [Please provide feedback, max. 750 characters].