



Shaping the future public sector interoperability policy

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction



* I want to give input on the following topics

at least 1 choice(s)

- impact assessment for a future interoperability policy (*13 questions, approx. 15 min.*)
- European Interoperability Framework (EIF) evaluation (*13 questions, approx. 10 min.*)
- final evaluation of the ISA² programme (*9 questions, approx. 10 min.*)

* How familiar are you with digital public services and interoperability?

- not at all
- to a limited extent
- to some extent
- to a great extent
- completely

- don't know/no opinion

About you

* Language of my contribution

- Bulgarian
- Croatian
- Czech
- Danish
- Dutch
- English
- Estonian
- Finnish
- French
- German
- Greek
- Hungarian
- Irish
- Italian
- Latvian
- Lithuanian
- Maltese
- Polish
- Portuguese
- Romanian
- Slovak
- Slovenian
- Spanish
- Swedish

* I am giving my contribution as

- Academic/research institution
- Business association
- Company/business organisation
- Consumer organisation

- EU citizen
- Environmental organisation
- Non-EU citizen
- Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- Public authority
- Trade union
- Other

* First name

Sara

* Surname

Roda

* Email (this won't be published)

sara.roda@cpme.eu

* Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

CPME - Standing Committee of European Doctors

* Organisation size

- Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- Small (10 to 49 employees)
- Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- Large (250 or more)

Transparency register number

255 character(s) maximum

Check if your organisation is on the [transparency register](#). It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

9276943405-41

If your organisation responds without being registered, the Commission will consider its input as that of an individual and will publish it as such.

* Country of origin

Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Afghanistan | <input type="radio"/> Djibouti | <input type="radio"/> Libya | <input type="radio"/> Saint Martin |
| <input type="radio"/> Åland Islands | <input type="radio"/> Dominica | <input type="radio"/> Liechtenstein | <input type="radio"/> Saint Pierre and Miquelon |
| <input type="radio"/> Albania | <input type="radio"/> Dominican Republic | <input type="radio"/> Lithuania | <input type="radio"/> Saint Vincent and the Grenadines |
| <input type="radio"/> Algeria | <input type="radio"/> Ecuador | <input type="radio"/> Luxembourg | <input type="radio"/> Samoa |
| <input type="radio"/> American Samoa | <input type="radio"/> Egypt | <input type="radio"/> Macau | <input type="radio"/> San Marino |
| <input type="radio"/> Andorra | <input type="radio"/> El Salvador | <input type="radio"/> Madagascar | <input type="radio"/> São Tomé and Príncipe |
| <input type="radio"/> Angola | <input type="radio"/> Equatorial Guinea | <input type="radio"/> Malawi | <input type="radio"/> Saudi Arabia |
| <input type="radio"/> Anguilla | <input type="radio"/> Eritrea | <input type="radio"/> Malaysia | <input type="radio"/> Senegal |
| <input type="radio"/> Antarctica | <input type="radio"/> Estonia | <input type="radio"/> Maldives | <input type="radio"/> Serbia |
| <input type="radio"/> Antigua and Barbuda | <input type="radio"/> Eswatini | <input type="radio"/> Mali | <input type="radio"/> Seychelles |
| <input type="radio"/> Argentina | <input type="radio"/> Ethiopia | <input type="radio"/> Malta | <input type="radio"/> Sierra Leone |
| <input type="radio"/> Armenia | <input type="radio"/> Falkland Islands | <input type="radio"/> Marshall Islands | <input type="radio"/> Singapore |
| <input type="radio"/> Aruba | <input type="radio"/> Faroe Islands | <input type="radio"/> Martinique | <input type="radio"/> Sint Maarten |
| <input type="radio"/> Australia | <input type="radio"/> Fiji | <input type="radio"/> Mauritania | <input type="radio"/> Slovakia |
| <input type="radio"/> Austria | <input type="radio"/> Finland | <input type="radio"/> Mauritius | <input type="radio"/> Slovenia |
| <input type="radio"/> Azerbaijan | <input type="radio"/> France | <input type="radio"/> Mayotte | <input type="radio"/> Solomon Islands |
| <input type="radio"/> Bahamas | <input type="radio"/> French Guiana | <input type="radio"/> Mexico | <input type="radio"/> Somalia |
| <input type="radio"/> Bahrain | <input type="radio"/> French Polynesia | <input type="radio"/> Micronesia | <input type="radio"/> South Africa |
| <input type="radio"/> Bangladesh | <input type="radio"/> French Southern and Antarctic Lands | <input type="radio"/> Moldova | <input type="radio"/> South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands |
| <input type="radio"/> Barbados | <input type="radio"/> Gabon | <input type="radio"/> Monaco | <input type="radio"/> South Korea |
| <input type="radio"/> Belarus | <input type="radio"/> Georgia | <input type="radio"/> Mongolia | <input type="radio"/> South Sudan |

- Belgium
- Belize
- Benin
- Bermuda
- Bhutan

- Bolivia
- Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba
- Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Botswana
- Bouvet Island
- Brazil
- British Indian Ocean Territory
- British Virgin Islands
- Brunei
- Bulgaria

- Burkina Faso
- Burundi

- Cambodia

- Cameroon

- Canada
- Cape Verde
- Cayman Islands

- Germany
- Ghana
- Gibraltar
- Greece
- Greenland

- Grenada
- Guadeloupe

- Guam

- Guatemala
- Guernsey
- Guinea
- Guinea-Bissau

- Guyana

- Haiti
- Heard Island and McDonald Islands

- Honduras
- Hong Kong

- Hungary

- Iceland

- India
- Indonesia
- Iran

- Montenegro
- Montserrat
- Morocco
- Mozambique
- Myanmar /Burma
- Namibia
- Nauru

- Nepal

- Netherlands
- New Caledonia
- New Zealand
- Nicaragua

- Niger

- Nigeria
- Niue

- Norfolk Island
- Northern Mariana Islands
- North Korea

- North Macedonia
- Norway
- Oman
- Pakistan

- Spain
- Sri Lanka
- Sudan
- Suriname
- Svalbard and Jan Mayen
- Sweden
- Switzerland

- Syria

- Taiwan
- Tajikistan
- Tanzania
- Thailand

- The Gambia

- Timor-Leste
- Togo

- Tokelau
- Tonga

- Trinidad and Tobago
- Tunisia

- Turkey
- Turkmenistan
- Turks and Caicos Islands

- Central African Republic
- Chad
- Chile
- China

- Christmas Island
- Clipperton
- Cocos (Keeling) Islands

- Colombia
- Comoros

- Congo
- Cook Islands
- Costa Rica
- Côte d'Ivoire
- Croatia
- Cuba

- Curaçao

- Cyprus

- Czechia

- Democratic Republic of the Congo
- Denmark

- Iraq
- Ireland
- Isle of Man
- Israel

- Italy

- Jamaica
- Japan

- Jersey
- Jordan

- Kazakhstan
- Kenya
- Kiribati
- Kosovo
- Kuwait
- Kyrgyzstan

- Laos

- Latvia

- Lebanon

- Lesotho
- Liberia

- Palau
- Palestine
- Panama
- Papua New Guinea
- Paraguay

- Peru
- Philippines

- Pitcairn Islands
- Poland

- Portugal
- Puerto Rico
- Qatar
- Réunion
- Romania
- Russia

- Rwanda

- Saint Barthélemy
- Saint Helena Ascension and Tristan da Cunha
- Saint Kitts and Nevis
- Saint Lucia

- Tuvalu
- Uganda
- Ukraine
- United Arab Emirates
- United Kingdom
- United States
- United States Minor Outlying Islands
- Uruguay
- US Virgin Islands
- Uzbekistan
- Vanuatu
- Vatican City
- Venezuela
- Vietnam
- Wallis and Futuna
- Western Sahara
- Yemen
- Zambia
- Zimbabwe

The Commission will publish all contributions to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would prefer to have your details published or to remain anonymous when your contribution is published. **For the purpose of transparency, the type of respondent (for example, 'business association', 'consumer association', 'EU citizen') country of origin, organisation name and size, and its transparency register number, are always published. Your e-mail address will never be published.** Opt in to select the privacy option that best suits you. Privacy options default based on the type of respondent selected

* **Contribution publication privacy settings**

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

Anonymous

Only organisation details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published as received. Your name will not be published. Please do not include any personal data in the contribution itself if you want to remain anonymous.

Public

Organisation details and respondent details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published. Your name will also be published.

I agree with the [personal data protection provisions](#)

Impact assessment for a future interoperability policy

In the Communication [Shaping Europe's digital future](#), the Commission has announced that by 2021 'a reinforced **EU governments interoperability strategy** to ensure coordination and common standards for secure and borderless public-sector data flows and services' will be put forward.

This part of the consultation focuses on the future interoperability policy for the EU's public sector. The aim is to gather stakeholders' feedback on the possible **objectives and policy options** for enhancing interoperability in the public sector in the EU, as well as the potential impacts that could arise from the policy options (including economic, social, environmental and fundamental rights impacts). The information collected will feed into the impact assessment on a future interoperability policy.

Policy objectives

IA.1. Should a future interoperability policy of the EU's public sector aim to achieve the following specific objectives?

	not at all	to a limited extent	to some extent	to a great extent	completely	don't know /no opinion
Reduce administrative burdens on businesses and citizens when interacting with public administrations	<input type="radio"/>					
Act as an enabler for innovative public-private (govtech) cooperation to foster the digitalisation of the public sector	<input type="radio"/>					
Support and promote the development and use of common standards and specifications for secure and borderless public-sector data flows and services	<input type="radio"/>					
Introduce a longer-term strategy to enhance commitment to the interoperability of digital public services throughout the EU	<input type="radio"/>					
Support and promote the development, sharing and re-use of interoperability solutions and specifications by public administrations across the EU	<input type="radio"/>					
Support and promote the provision of quality, user-centric digital public services on a cross-border and cross-domain basis fostering the interoperability-by-design of policies, data, solutions and services	<input type="radio"/>					
Foster the availability and exchange of diverse, high-performance digital solutions to guarantee freedom of choice and the ability to change IT modules when necessary, thus contributing to digital sovereignty	<input type="radio"/>					

IA.2. What other specific objective(s) could a future public sector interoperability policy pursue?

500 character(s) maximum

IA.3. What needs do you have with respect to interoperability in the EU’s public sector that should be considered when designing the future public sector interoperability policy?

500 character(s) maximum

The public consultation is very broad and the questions do not allow contextualising interoperability in the healthcare sector. CPME issued a statement which intends to address the major challenges and particularities of interoperability in the healthcare sector, offering few recommendations - please see annex to this response.

Policy options

The future public sector interoperability policy could take different forms. The impact assessment focuses on a set of **four core options** that can be complemented by **three “add-on” options** (see below).

Core options

Option A (baseline) reflects the status quo with **no change to the current EIF**. It will look at the evolution of the policy problems and expected impacts in the absence of a future public sector interoperability policy, but will also take into account ongoing changes such as the transition of some of the implementing actions and governance of the EIF from ISA² to the Digital Europe Programme.

Option B (soft law) looks at possible **revisions of the EIF** and/or new guidelines/recommendations in the form of a Commission Communication, while keeping **compliance voluntary**. The possible revision of the EIF and its implementation strategy may involve:

- ensuring coherence with other EU initiatives;
- restructuring the EIF into a more practical framework, *inter alia* using open-source software;
- enhancing cooperation between public administrations and with the private sector; and
- adopting a new interoperability action plan.

Option C1 (hard law (Regulation) on cooperation) would involve a legislative proposal in the form of a Regulation introducing **shared interoperability governance** building on a cooperation mechanism (e.g. a committee, a joint undertaking or a centre of excellence). It may involve one or more of the following:

- fostering the development of the EU govtech sector;
- facilitating joint investment in interoperability solutions and skills;
- providing technical assistance;
- devising ways to establish public data and interoperability solutions based on common models or repositories of public services; and
- streamlining existing EU interoperability governance for greater coherence.

Option C2 (hard law (Directive) on interoperability requirements) – a Directive could introduce a legal framework with **minimum interoperability requirements** for public administrations and/or require all

Member States to adopt a national interoperability strategy/framework in line with EU norms. The requirements may involve:

- common specifications for public administrations;
- devising ways to establish public data and interoperability solutions based on common models or repositories of public services;
- mandating the development of national interoperability frameworks and strategies aligned with EIF principles and recommendations;
- and ensuring data exchanges and portability.

Add-on options

Add-on option 1 (synergies) entails **supporting the synergies** between the EIF/future public sector interoperability policy and existing/upcoming policies, programmes and initiatives with a focus on funding for public-sector modernisation and digitalisation, e.g. the Digital Europe Programme, Resilience and Recovery Fund, Technical Support Instrument (successor of structural reform support programme) and Horizon Europe.

Add-on option 2 (conditionalities) – **policy conditionalities** could give the interoperability framework a more binding element. In this case, public administrations requesting EU funding and assistance for their efforts to modernise and digitalise their work would have to show that they are taking an interoperability-by-design approach to developing policies, solutions and services.

Add-on option 3 (European Semester) – the European Semester could be used as a tool to **monitor countries' efforts to implement interoperability and ensure policy coordination**. A special category could be added in the European Semester, with a focus on monitoring public administrations' digitalisation and interoperability efforts, and country-specific recommendations could be issued on the basis of their progress.

IA.4. Would the above policy options **help foster interoperability in the public sector** at EU, national, regional and local levels, and support an integrated and coherent approach to interoperability across the EU?

	not at all	to a limited extent	to some extent	to a great extent	completely	don't know /no opinion
Option A: baseline (no change to status quo)	<input type="radio"/>					
Option B: soft law	<input type="radio"/>					
Option C1: hard law (Regulation) on cooperation	<input type="radio"/>					
Option C2: hard law (Directive) on interoperability requirements	<input type="radio"/>					
Add-on option 1: synergies	<input type="radio"/>					

Add-on option 2: conditionalities	<input type="radio"/>					
Add-on option 3: European Semester	<input type="radio"/>					

IA.5. Will the policy options **receive enough support from policymakers and public administrations** to be properly implemented?

	not at all	to a limited extent	to some extent	to a great extent	completely	don't know /no opinion
Option A: baseline (no change to status quo)	<input type="radio"/>					
Option B: soft law	<input type="radio"/>					
Option C1: hard law (Regulation) on cooperation	<input type="radio"/>					
Option C2: hard law (Directive) on interoperability requirements	<input type="radio"/>					
Add-on option 1: synergies	<input type="radio"/>					
Add-on option 2: conditionalities	<input type="radio"/>					
Add-on option 3: European Semester	<input type="radio"/>					

Impacts

IA.6. What impact would **option A (baseline)** have on...? *Use the following scale: (--) very negative; (-) negative; (0) neutral; (+) positive; or (++) very positive. Select DK/NO if you don't know or have no opinion.*

	--	-	0	+	++	DK /NO
The costs of interacting with public administrations? (<i>Costs could include time and/or effort spent in interacting with public administrations, fees incurred, etc. Negative consequences would mean higher costs and positive consequences would mean lower costs</i>)	<input type="radio"/>					
The costs of doing business in the EU?	<input type="radio"/>					
The costs borne by public administrations in providing public services?	<input type="radio"/>					
The quality of the services provided by public administrations?	<input type="radio"/>					
Research, development and innovation in the EU?	<input type="radio"/>					

The free movement of goods, services, capital and workers across Member States? (<i>For instance, free movement can include selling products or providing services across borders in the EU, or the ability of EU citizens to work in any EU country. Negative consequences would mean limiting free movement and positive consequences would mean facilitating free movement.</i>)	<input type="radio"/>					
Individuals' rights to move freely within the EU?	<input type="radio"/>					
Access to and quality of basic goods and services , particularly for those subject to social exclusion and from disadvantaged backgrounds? (<i>Negative consequences would mean fewer products and services, and positive consequences would mean more.</i>)	<input type="radio"/>					
The green transition in the EU?	<input type="radio"/>					

IA.7. What impact would **option B (soft law)** have on ...? *Use the following scale: (--) very negative; (-) negative; (0) neutral; (+) positive; or (++) very positive. Select DK/NO if you don't know or have no opinion.*

	--	-	0	+	++	DK /NO
The costs of interacting with public administrations ? (<i>Costs could include time and/or effort spent in interacting with public administrations, fees incurred, etc. Negative consequences would mean higher costs and positive consequences would mean lower costs</i>)	<input type="radio"/>					
The costs of doing business in the EU ?	<input type="radio"/>					
The costs borne by public administrations in providing public services?	<input type="radio"/>					
The quality of the services provided by public administrations?	<input type="radio"/>					
Research, development and innovation in the EU?	<input type="radio"/>					
The free movement of goods, services, capital and workers across Member States? (<i>For instance, free movement can include selling products or providing services across borders in the EU, or the ability of EU citizens to work in any EU country. Negative consequences would mean limiting free movement and positive consequences would mean facilitating free movement.</i>)	<input type="radio"/>					
Individuals' rights to move freely within the EU?	<input type="radio"/>					
Access to and quality of basic goods and services , particularly for those subject to social exclusion and from disadvantaged backgrounds? (<i>Negative consequences would</i>	<input type="radio"/>					

<i>mean fewer products and services, and positive consequences would mean more.)</i>						
The green transition in the EU?	<input type="radio"/>					

IA.8. What impact would option **C1 (hard law (Regulation) on cooperation)** have on ...? *Use the following scale: (--) very negative; (-) negative; (0) neutral; (+) positive; or (++) very positive. Select DK/NO if you don't know or have no opinion.*

	--	-	0	+	++	DK/NO
The costs of interacting with public administrations? (<i>Costs could include time and/or effort spent in interacting with public administrations, fees incurred, etc. Negative consequences would mean higher costs and positive consequences would mean lower costs</i>)	<input type="radio"/>					
The costs of doing business in the EU?	<input type="radio"/>					
The costs borne by public administrations in providing public services?	<input type="radio"/>					
The quality of the services provided by public administrations?	<input type="radio"/>					
Research, development and innovation in the EU?	<input type="radio"/>					
The free movement of goods, services, capital and workers across Member States? (<i>For instance, free movement can include selling products or providing services across borders in the EU, or the ability of EU citizens to work in any EU country. Negative consequences would mean limiting free movement and positive consequences would mean facilitating free movement.</i>)	<input type="radio"/>					
Individuals' rights to move freely within the EU?	<input type="radio"/>					
Access to and quality of basic goods and services , particularly for those subject to social exclusion and from disadvantaged backgrounds? (<i>Negative consequences would mean fewer products and services, and positive consequences would mean more.</i>)	<input type="radio"/>					
The green transition in the EU?	<input type="radio"/>					

IA.9. What impact would option **C2 (hard law (Directive) on interoperability requirements)** have on...? *Use the following scale: (--) very negative; (-) negative; (0) neutral; (+) positive; or (++) very positive. Select DK/NO if you don't know or have no opinion.*

	--	-	0	+	++	DK/NO

The costs of interacting with public administrations? (<i>Costs could include time and/or effort spent in interacting with public administrations, fees incurred, etc. Negative consequences would mean higher costs and positive consequences would mean lower costs</i>)	<input type="radio"/>					
The costs of doing business in the EU?	<input type="radio"/>					
The costs borne by public administrations in providing public services?	<input type="radio"/>					
The quality of the services provided by public administrations?	<input type="radio"/>					
Research, development and innovation in the EU?	<input type="radio"/>					
The free movement of goods, services, capital and workers across Member States? (<i>For instance, free movement can include selling products or providing services across borders in the EU, or the ability of EU citizens to work in any EU country. Negative consequences would mean limiting free movement and positive consequences would mean facilitating free movement.</i>)	<input type="radio"/>					
Individuals' rights to move freely within the EU?	<input type="radio"/>					
Access to and quality of basic goods and services , particularly for those subject to social exclusion and from disadvantaged backgrounds? (<i>Negative consequences would mean fewer products and services, and positive consequences would mean more.</i>)	<input type="radio"/>					
The green transition in the EU?	<input type="radio"/>					

IA.10. What impact would **add-on option 1 (synergies)** have on ...? *Use the following scale: (--) very negative; (-) negative; (0) neutral; (+) positive; or (++) very positive. Select DK/NO if you don't know or have no opinion.*

	--	-	0	+	++	DK /NO
The costs of interacting with public administrations? (<i>Costs could include time and/or effort spent in interacting with public administrations, fees incurred, etc. Negative consequences would mean higher costs and positive consequences would mean lower costs</i>)	<input type="radio"/>					
The costs of doing business in the EU?	<input type="radio"/>					
The costs borne by public administrations in providing public services?	<input type="radio"/>					
The quality of the services provided by public administrations?	<input type="radio"/>					
Research, development and innovation in the EU?	<input type="radio"/>					

The free movement of goods, services, capital and workers across Member States? (<i>For instance, free movement can include selling products or providing services across borders in the EU, or the ability of EU citizens to work in any EU country. Negative consequences would mean limiting free movement and positive consequences would mean facilitating free movement.</i>)	<input type="radio"/>					
Individuals' rights to move freely within the EU?	<input type="radio"/>					
Access to and quality of basic goods and services , particularly for those subject to social exclusion and from disadvantaged backgrounds? (<i>Negative consequences would mean fewer products and services, and positive consequences would mean more.</i>)	<input type="radio"/>					
The green transition in the EU?	<input type="radio"/>					

IA.11. What impact would **add-on option 2 (conditionalities)** have on ...? *Use the following scale: (--) very negative; (-) negative; (0) neutral; (+) positive; or (++) very positive. Select DK/NO if you don't know or have no opinion.*

	--	-	0	+	++	DK /NO
The costs of interacting with public administrations ? (<i>Costs could include time and/or effort spent in interacting with public administrations, fees incurred, etc. Negative consequences would mean higher costs and positive consequences would mean lower costs</i>)	<input type="radio"/>					
The costs of doing business in the EU ?	<input type="radio"/>					
The costs borne by public administrations in providing public services?	<input type="radio"/>					
The quality of the services provided by public administrations?	<input type="radio"/>					
Research, development and innovation in the EU?	<input type="radio"/>					
The free movement of goods, services, capital and workers across Member States? (<i>For instance, free movement can include selling products or providing services across borders in the EU, or the ability of EU citizens to work in any EU country. Negative consequences would mean limiting free movement and positive consequences would mean facilitating free movement.</i>)	<input type="radio"/>					
Individuals' rights to move freely within the EU?	<input type="radio"/>					
Access to and quality of basic goods and services , particularly for those subject to social exclusion and from	<input type="radio"/>					

disadvantaged backgrounds? (<i>Negative consequences would mean fewer products and services, and positive consequences would mean more.</i>)						
The green transition in the EU?	<input type="radio"/>					

IA.12. What impact would **add-on option 3 (European Semester)** have on ...?

Use the following scale: (--) very negative; (-) negative; (0) neutral; (+) positive; or (++) very positive. Select DK/NO if you don't know or have no opinion.

	--	-	0	+	++	DK /NO
The costs of interacting with public administrations ? (<i>Costs could include time and/or effort spent in interacting with public administrations, fees incurred, etc. Negative consequences would mean higher costs and positive consequences would mean lower costs</i>)	<input type="radio"/>					
The costs of doing business in the EU ?	<input type="radio"/>					
The costs borne by public administrations in providing public services?	<input type="radio"/>					
The quality of the services provided by public administrations?	<input type="radio"/>					
Research, development and innovation in the EU?	<input type="radio"/>					
The free movement of goods, services, capital and workers across Member States? (<i>For instance, free movement can include selling products or providing services across borders in the EU, or the ability of EU citizens to work in any EU country. Negative consequences would mean limiting free movement and positive consequences would mean facilitating free movement.</i>)	<input type="radio"/>					
Individuals' rights to move freely within the EU?	<input type="radio"/>					
Access to and quality of basic goods and services , particularly for those subject to social exclusion and from disadvantaged backgrounds? (<i>Negative consequences would mean fewer products and services, and positive consequences would mean more.</i>)	<input type="radio"/>					
The green transition in the EU?	<input type="radio"/>					

IA.13. Please indicate any **other relevant economic, environmental, social or administrative impacts** (not mentioned above) of a future interoperability policy for the EU's public sector:

500 character(s) maximum

Additional information and submission of answers

* FU.1. Would you be available for a **short follow-up interview** on the topics covered by this survey? By selecting “yes” you accept to be contacted to arrange this interview.

- Yes
- No

FU.2. Please feel free to attach relevant **documents** in support of any of your replies.

Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

**e7cee103-4bbc-4844-8c45-f50889ea6af5/CPME_AD_EC_08042021_024_FINAL.CPME_.Statement.Shaping.
Healthcare.Sector.Interoperability.pdf**

Thank you for your input – it’s much appreciated.

Contact

DIGIT-ISA2-CONSULTATIONS@ec.europa.eu