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Background

In the last decade, EUnetHTA (the European network for Health Technology Assessment), has developed several tools and methods to facilitate joint production of HTAs. However, to implement and make sure the tools and methods are put into practice, Partners need to receive training in order to know how to utilise them. Additionally, EUnetHTA stakeholders are interested in learning more about the EUnetHTA tools. Building a training environment, including delivery of face-to-face training courses was thus required to ensure the optimal use of the EUnetHTA tools and methods.

Objectives

The overall objective of WP2 was to “Increase awareness and understanding of the usefulness of the EUnetHTA tools, methods and results among EUnetHTA partners and stakeholders”.

To fulfil this objective WP2 has provided training activities to facilitate uptake and ensure the optimal use of the EUnetHTA tools and methods in order to support efficient production and use of HTA in countries in Europe.

The overall aim of the courses for partners and associates was: Familiarize with the EUnetHTA Tools and methodology.

The overall aim of the courses for EUnetHTA stakeholders was: Increase understanding of HTA, promote awareness of EUnetHTA and HTA processes and the stakeholders’ roles in these

Method

Partners and stakeholders were surveyed to identify their training needs, the required training format and which priority to give the various tools and methods. Based on the survey results, a training program including both face-to-face and online activities was set up. Tool and method developers created the material and provided the activities. Training opportunities were advertised using pamphlets, newsletters, news items on the intranet and on the public site and direct e-mail. Feedback was requested from participants after each training session and specific questions were included in the annual EUnetHTA general survey for Partners. The feedback was used to modify the second and third training courses.

Results

At the end of May 2015, EUnetHTA has provided three face-to-face training courses for ~90 partners and associates from 27 agencies in 25 countries. Three training courses have also been provided for ~70 EUnetHTA Stakeholder representatives (mostly patient organisations, manufacturers and health care providers), table 1.
Slideshows from the training courses are provided through Slideshare and the EUnetHTA website. E-learning material (webcasts of recorded training sessions) were also created and are provided on the EUnetHTA Intranet.

All participants at both the training courses for partners and stakeholders were either satisfied or very satisfied. 70% indicated having changed their practice following the training event.

The agendas for the training courses and the summaries of the evaluation of the training courses are provided in appendix.

Table 1. Summary of training courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Live events</th>
<th>Face-to-face training for partners</th>
<th>Face-to-face training for stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face training for partners</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face training for stakeholders</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25 countries)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care providers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 % found the course very useful, and 57 % quite useful</td>
<td></td>
<td>63 % found the course very useful, and 37 % quite useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 70% indicated they changed their practice after the training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion and conclusions

EUnetHTA has succeeded in organizing face-to-face training courses about its tools and methods.

Because EUnetHTA is a transnational network, several channels like use of webinars and e-learning should be extended so to allow, at a reduced cost, more Partners as well as Stakeholders to increase their knowledge on EUnetHTA tools and methods in order for them to efficiently produce joint HTA information.

Stakeholders also benefited from the training program to get a better comprehension of both HTA and EUnetHTA tools and methods. However, cost of pursuing this activity will need to be further assessed.
Appendix
Training Course for EUnetHTA partners and associates

Brussels, Belgium

January 14, 2014, 09:30 – 17:30

Organized by: Norwegian Knowledge Centre for the Health Services (NOKC) and Belgian Health Care Knowledge Centre (KCE); EUnetHTA WP2 Lead Partner and Co-Lead Partner

Address of venue:

Centre Pacheco (next to the office of KCE)
Entrée, Tour des Finances
Boulevard Pachéco, 13
1000 Bruxelles

Contact persons: Ingvil Sæterdal, mobile +47 464 23 116 or Patrice Chalon, tel +32 2 287 33 66, mobile +32 479 522 663

Overall aim of the course: Familiarize with the EUnetHTA Tools and methodology

Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Light snack before start of meeting</th>
<th>09:00 – 09:30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welcome and introductions of participants</td>
<td>09:30 – 09:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brief introduction of EUnetHTA, Marianne Klemp, NOKC</strong></td>
<td>09:45 – 10:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Outcomes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Be familiar with EUnetHTA and understand the task of EUnetHTA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 – 11:00</td>
<td><strong>POP database</strong>, Judith Erdös, LBI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 11:00 – 13:00 | **HTA Core Model**, Kristian Lampe, THL; Simone Warren, CVZ; Anna Nachtnebel, LBI |  | | ✓ Increase awareness of the usefulness of the model and knowledge about the ontology and methodological guidance.
✓ Receive hands-on knowledge on how to use the HTA Core Model® Online. |
| 11:25 – 11:40 | **Coffee break**                                                          |  | |  |
| 13:00 – 14:00 | **Lunch**                                                                 |  | |  |
| 14:00 – 14:30 | **HTA Core Model**, Kristian Lampe, THL; Simone Warren, CVZ; Anna Nachtnebel, LBI |  | | ✓ Remaining issues |
| 14:30 – 15:30 | **Methodological guidelines**, Marianne Klemp, NOKC |  | | ✓ Familiarizing with the guidelines; understanding their use in HTA.
✓ Getting more practice in using the guidelines. |
| 15:30 – 15:50 | **Coffee break**                                                          |  | |  |
| 15:50 – 16:50 | **EVIDENT Database**, Irena Guzina, HAS                                   |  | | Increase use and familiarity with the use of the database.                                                                                                                                                    |
| 16:50 – 17:20 | **EUnetHTA Intranet**, Patrice Chalon, KCE                                |  | |  |
| 17:20 – 17:30 | **Summary and feedback**, Ingvil                                            |  | |  |
| 17:30        | **End of course**                                                         |  | |  |

NOKC: Norwegian Knowledge Centre for the Health Services  
KCE: Belgian Health Care Knowledge Centre  
LBI: Ludwig Boltzmann Institut  
CVZ: College voor Zorgverzekeringen
HAS: The Haute Autorité de santé
Training course I for EUnetHTA partners and associates:
Summary of the Evaluation

Joint Action 2
2012-2015

EUnetHTA Joint Action 2 is supported by a grant from the European Commission. The sole responsibility for the content of this article (publication, presentation etc.) lies with the authors and the European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.
Introduction
The first training course for EUnetHTA partners and associates took place in Brussels on January 14, 2014. It was organized by the Norwegian Knowledge Centre for the Health Services (NOKC) and the Belgian Health Care Knowledge Centre (KCE); EUnetHTA WP2 Lead Partner and Co-Lead Partner. The WP2 members participated in the preparations of the training course by attending the WP2 face-to-face meeting, e-meetings and the Discussion forum at the Intranet.

The overall aim of the course was to familiarize with the EUnetHTA Tools and methodology

We wanted to receive feedback from the participants of the training course in order to adjust and make improvements for the next courses. We therefore carried out a survey. This report is a brief summary of the results from this survey.

Methods
The training course was evaluated using a survey. We sent out invitations to participate in the survey by e-mail the day after the course. The survey was published on EUnetHTA website until February 5th, 2014. The survey consisted of 12 questions assessing the content of the course, the format of the course and practical arrangements. The questions are shown in appendix 1.

We summarized the replies to questions 1, 2, 8, 9 and 10 by counting and presented the results as graphical figures. We made a narrative summary of the replies to the other free text questions. We have presented the results to the EunetHTA Executive meeting and to the WP2 members, appendix 2.

Results
We sent the e-mail invitation to all of the 36 participants. 22 of the participants replied to the survey.

These are the results:

1. **How would you assess the usefulness of the course overall?**
2. **Did the course meet your expectations? If no, please explain**

Two participants found that the course was rather basic and another participant would like a more basic introduction to the tools and the terminology used by the tools.

3. **Which topic did you like particularly well and why?**

The results are sorted by topic popularity (the most popular topic at the top).
The HTA Core Model® and Online Tool; hands on use of online tool, introduction to the model (including history on how, why and when the model was developed), to see the usefulness of the model and possibilities for collaboration on projects, good insight in what the model (including REA) is used for.

Methodological guidelines; because of their usefulness and importance in the HTA compilation

POP database; discovered new applications

EVIDENT database; because it was clearly presented.

Intranet; because the essential features was presented

All topics: because they are different and are all important serving different needs

4. What was particularly helpful about the course?

- Networking and meeting people working on the tools, discuss challenges
- Explanations of POP, EVIDENT and the HTA core model
- POP interactive session/hand on use
- Practical tasks, work in pairs, comments and questions
- The full support provided by NOKC and KCE

5. Which topics did you like less well, and why?

Guidelines; some participants thought that the session on the guidelines went too quickly. They would suggest taking one or two and presenting using actual examples from some of the EUnetHTA pilots.

HTA core model; The HTA Core Model was also difficult to understand for beginners in such a short time. Although interesting, some participant were lost in this session. Using concrete HTA examples would have helped greatly in understanding the concept.

Lecture on the Intranet; would be better to browse around the different features.

6. What would you recommend changing about the course?

- Less content to present. The course could be organized as one info day with an overview of the EUnetHTA tools and one day workshop on specific tools (for example using some of the guidelines or the core model)
- Include more practical examples on the use of the HTA core model and guidelines
- Practical examples or other information could be sent out before the course.
• More small group work and interactive sessions including hand-on training
• More advanced courses in such a manner to support the implementation of the tools at a national level. Include experiences at national level to encourage new users.

7. Is it according to your evaluation any obvious shortcomings with the program (please specify)?

“No, there are no shortcomings. All the people involved were immensely helpful and ready to assist at all times” – statement from one participant.

Suggestions for improvements:
• Include real life examples and practicing in small groups in the next course
• Design the training so that the participants will be able to train their people back home
• Rework the presentations in such a way as to develop a communication tool that may be disseminated to all agencies and used as written support for the trainees that are expected to train HTA assessors locally.
• Expand the timeframe of the course. One day was too short.

8. Will you use some of the tools/methods presented in your daily work?

![Pie chart showing 20 Yes and 2 No responses.]

Will you use some of the tools/methods presented in your daily work?
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9. Did you find the content and format of the course enabling you to provide similar training at your workplace? If not, please explain:

- "The format needs to be harmonized to send a coherent/clean EUnetHTA message”.
- “Helpful to have access to slides presented in the course”
- “Would need more time to work with the tools in the sessions and more cases as examples”.

10. How did you find the following organizational issues?
Practical support and information given in advance?

- Very good: 9
- Quite good: 13
- Quite bad: 0
- Very bad: 0

Meeting room facilities

- Very good: 0
- Quite good: 6
- Quite bad: 0
- Very bad: 16
11. Do you have any suggestions to improvements of the organizational issues?

- Handouts of presentations (for taking notes and see details)
- Provide computers
- Make sure the plenary presentations are visible to everyone
- Ensure that everybody can access the EUnetHTA tools before starting.
- Practical information on how to get to the venue
- Provide courses locally to large organizations
- Split over 2 half days.
- Continuously update the content of the courses
- The participant list should indicate the individual's person role in EUnetHTA in order to measure impact of course (if the majority of the participants are not in a position to further disseminate the tools learned at the session within their respective organization). The courses may equally have an aim to respond to difficulties/challenges with regard to disseminating the information locally.

12. Do you have any other comments?

“Make sure that the trainers actively invite the participants to voice their opinion/understanding/experience by a show of hands, by taking the microphone to speak. It was
interactive in the sense that the participants were able to follow the presenter in real time on their own laptops but there was very little exchange”.

“Thank you for organizing and supporting. The workshop was very useful to me”

“I have now the basis information to understand the concept behind the tools and to try to introduce them in our internal process.”

“The databases and the core model offer good and potentially powerful tools to facilitate the production of HTA reports and the coordination of HTA work across Europe”

“The participant on the course should be the ones that communicate the information within their local agencies.”

Conclusions

Overall, our conclusion is that we received very positive feedback for the training course. We list here a few bullet point on what was particularly good and could be kept or developed further and a few bullet point on what should be improved for the next training course.

What was particularly good and could be kept or developed further:

• **Networking;** to see others, meet people working on the tools, discuss challenges
• **Overall picture of the Tools;** see how the tools are linked together, see how they can be useful in our daily work
• **HTA Core Model®;** the explanations, insight in how it works, relevance for our daily work, online tool,
• **EUnetHTA methodological guidelines;** their usefulness when preparing HTA
• **EVIDENT;** clearly presented, understood purpose
• **POP;** interactive session, discovered new applications

Suggestions for improvement:

• **Format;** more interactivity and small group working sessions
• **Less content on one day;** split over two ½ days,
• **Workshop on specific tools;** one day general info, one day workshop (selection of tools)
• **Hands-on sessions**
• **Material provided in advance**
• **HTA Core Model®;** more in-depth work using EUnetHTA pilots as examples
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• **Methodological guidelines**; examples of use (together with the Core Model)
• **Intranet**; hands-on session, browse the different features

WP2 will consider carefully the feedback from the evaluation when planning the next face-to-face training course for partners and associates.
Appendix 1 Survey

EVALUATION FORM – EUnetHTA training course for partners and associates
January 14, 2014

We would like you to give us some feedback on the training course in order for us to improve our next course and learn what was good and what was not so good.

1. How would you assess the usefulness of the course overall?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Quite good</th>
<th>Quite bad</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Did the course meet your expectations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No, please explain why: .............</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Which topic did you like particularly well, and why?

4. What was particularly helpful about the course?

5. Which topic did you like less well, and why?
6. What would you recommend changing about the course?

7. Is it according to your evaluation any obvious shortcomings with the program? (please specify)

8. Will you use some of the tools/methods presented in your daily work?

   Yes  No, please explain why:............

   0      0

9. Did you find the content and format of the course enabling you to provide similar training at your workplace?

   Yes  No, please explain why:............

   0      0

10. How did you find the following organizational issues:

Practical support and information given in advance

   Very good  Quite good  Quite bad  Very bad

   0          0          0          0

Meeting room facilities (location, sound, internet access)

   Very good  Quite good  Quite bad  Very bad

   0          0          0          0
Lunch and refreshments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Quite good</th>
<th>Quite bad</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Do you have any suggestions to improvements of the organizational issues:

12. Do you have any other comments?

Thank you!
Appendix 2 Presentation of the results (slide show)

EUnetHTA partner and associates training – update/feedback

March 19 2014

EUnetHTA Executive Committee e-meeting
Training Course for EUnetHTA partners and associates
Paris, France

November 20, 2014, 12:00 – 17:30
November 21, 2014, 09:00 – 15:00

Organized by: Norwegian Knowledge Centre for the Health Services (NOKC) and Belgian Health Care Knowledge Centre (KCE); EUnetHTA WP2 Lead Partner and Co-Lead Partner

Address of venue:
Haute Autorité de santé (HAS)
2, avenue du Stade de France
93218 Saint-Denis La Plaine Cedex
Paris, France

Contact person: Ingvil Sæterdal, mobile + 47 97087730

Overall aim of the course: Familiarize with the EUnetHTA Tools and methodology

Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 1</th>
<th>Light lunch before start of meeting</th>
<th>12:00 – 13:00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welcome and introductions of participants, Ingvil Sæterdal, NOKC</td>
<td>13:00 – 13:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EUnetHTA Intranet, Carl Devos, KCE</td>
<td>13:15 – 13:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Outcomes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>√ Lear major functions of the Intranet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### HTA Core Model®, Kristian Lampe, THL; Lisa Krüger, ZIN; Julia Meyer, LBI

**Learning Outcomes:**
- Increase awareness of the usefulness of the model and knowledge about the ontology and Methodological guidance.
- Hands-on training on how to use the HTA Core Model® Online.
- Start producing own Core HTA information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13:45 – 17:30</td>
<td><strong>Coffee break</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30</td>
<td><strong>End of Day 1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Day 2

**POP database, Judith Erdös, LBI**

**Learning Outcomes:**
- Learn how the database can increase collaboration and joint work
- Hands on use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00 – 10:30</td>
<td><strong>Coffee break</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 – 10:50</td>
<td><strong>End of Day 1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EVIDENT Database, Irena Guzina, HAS**

**Learning Outcomes:**
- Increase familiarity with the database and understand its purpose
- Hands on use
- Overview of troubleshooting items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:50 – 12:15</td>
<td><strong>Lunch</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Methodological guidelines, Mira Pavlovic, HAS, Hedi Schelleman, ZIN**

**Learning Outcomes:**
- Familiarizing with the guidelines
- Understanding how to use them in EUnetHTA pilots.
- Getting practice in using the guidelines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13:15 – 14:45</td>
<td><strong>Summary and feedback</strong>, Ingvil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00</td>
<td><strong>End of course</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

NOKC: Norwegian Knowledge Centre for the Health Services  
KCE: Belgian Health Care Knowledge Centre  
LBI: Ludwig Boltzmann Institut  
ZIN: Zorginstituut Nederland  
HAS: The Haute Autorité de santé
Training course II for EUnetHTA partners and associates: Summary of the Evaluation

Joint Action 2

2012-2015
Introduction
The second training course for EUnetHTA partners and associates took place in Paris on November 20-21, 2014. It was organized by the Norwegian Knowledge Centre for the Health Services (NOKC) and the Belgian Health Care Knowledge Centre (KCE); EUnetHTA WP2 Lead Partner and Co-Lead Partner. Haute Autorité de santé (HAS) hosted the training course and took part in the organization. The WP2 members participated in the preparations of the training course by attending the WP2 face-to-face meeting in April 2013, e-meetings and the Discussion forum on the Intranet.

The overall aim of the course was to familiarize with the EUnetHTA Tools and methodology

We wanted to receive feedback from the participants of the training course in order to adjust and make improvements for possibly future face-to-face courses. We therefore carried out a survey. This report is a brief summary of the results from this survey.

Methods
The training course was evaluated using a survey. We sent out invitations to participate in the survey by e-mail the day after the course. The survey was published on EUnetHTA website until January, 2015. The survey consisted of 12 questions assessing the content of the course, the format of the course and practical arrangements. The questions are shown in appendix 1.

We summarized the replies to questions 1, 2, 8, 9 and 10 by counting and presented the results as graphical figures. We made a narrative summary of the replies to the other free text questions. We have presented the results to the EUnetHTA Executive meeting and to the WP2 members, appendix 2.

Results
We sent the e-mail invitation to all of the 24 participants. 9 of the participants replied to the survey.

These are the results:

4. How would you assess the usefulness of the course overall?

![How would you assess the usefulness of the course overall?](chart.png)
5. Did the course meet your expectations? If no, please explain

All participants that replied to the survey experienced that the course met their expectations.

6. Which topic did you like particularly well and why?

The results are sorted by topic popularity (the most popular topic at the top).

- The HTA Core Model®
- EVIDENT database
- POP database
- The HTA Core Model® for REA
- Intranet

Participants enjoyed to learn how to use the databases. They also liked the practical exercises and the discussions.

4. What was particularly helpful about the course?

- Practical exercises
- To get to know the tools better
5. Which topics did you like less well, and why?
Methodological guidelines; due to little experience, too theoretical presentation

6. What would you recommend changing about the course?

- More time for discussions
- More practical exercises
- Include a general overview of all EUnetHTA tools
- Presentations of participants with more info about their work (not just name and country)

7. Is it according to your evaluation any obvious shortcomings with the program (please specify)?

“No”
However, could start the course with a presentation on how all the tools are linked together.

8. Will you use some of the tools/methods presented in your daily work?
9. Did you find the content and format of the course enabling you to provide similar training at your workplace? If not, please explain:

Did you find the content and format of the course enabling you to provide similar training at your workplace?
- Will not have as much details about the tools and methods as the trainers

10. How did you find the following organizational issues?

Practical support and information given in advance?

- Very good: 5
- Quite good: 4
- Quite bad: 3
- Very bad: 6

Meeting room facilities

- Very good: 6
- Quite good: 3
- Quite bad: 4
- Very bad: 5
11. Do you have any suggestions to improvements of the organizational issues?

- Make sure that wifi is available and stable
- Remember to ask the participants to bring their own computer

12. Do you have any other comments?

“Thank you for organizing a useful and interesting training course”

Conclusions

Overall, our conclusion is that we received very positive feedback for the training course. We list here a few bullet point on what was particularly good and could be kept or developed further and a few bullet point on what we can improved for future face-to-face training courses.

What was particularly positive and could be kept or developed further:

- **Interactive sessions;** Group work and interactivity during presentations
• **Topic selection;** Participants seem to be happy with the presentations on the databases (POP and EVIDENT)

**Suggestions for improvement:**

• **Format;** make sure that all sessions are interactive and that we have enough time for discussions.

• **Material provided in advance** should be kept to a manageable level (not too much to read)

WP2 will consider carefully the feedback from the evaluation when planning the next face-to-face training course for partners and associates.
Appendix 1 Survey

EVALUATION FORM – EUnetHTA training course for partners and associates
November 20-21, 2014

We would like you to give us some feedback on the training course in order for us to improve our next course and learn what was good and what was not so good.

13. How would you assess the usefulness of the course overall?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Quite good</th>
<th>Quite bad</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Did the course meet your expectations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No, please explain why:..........</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Which topic did you like particularly well, and why?

16. What was particularly helpful about the course?

17. Which topic did you like less well, and why?
18. What would you recommend changing about the course?

19. Is it according to your evaluation any obvious shortcomings with the program? (please specify)

20. Will you use some of the tools/methods presented in your daily work?

   Yes  No, please explain why:.............
   O    O

21. Did you find the content and format of the course enabling you to provide similar training at your workplace?

   Yes  No, please explain why:.............
   O    O

22. How did you find the following organizational issues:

**Practical support and information given in advance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Quite good</th>
<th>Quite bad</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Meeting room facilities (location, sound, internet access)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Quite good</th>
<th>Quite bad</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Lunch and refreshments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Quite good</th>
<th>Quite bad</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Do you have any suggestions to improvements of the organizational issues:

24. Do you have any other comments?

Thank you!
Appendix 2 Presentation of the results (slide show)

EUnetHTA training course for partners and associates – feedback

January 28 and February 3 2015

EUnetHTA WP2 e-meeting and Executive committee e-meeting
Training Course for EUnetHTA partners and associates

Diemen, Amsterdam

May 6, 2015, 12:00 – 17:00
May 7, 2015, 09:00 – 15:00

Organized by: Norwegian Knowledge Centre for the Health Services (NOKC) and Belgian Health Care Knowledge Centre (KCE); EUnetHTA WP2 Lead Partner and Co-Lead Partner

Address of venue:

ZorgInstituut Nederland (ZIN)

Eekholt 4, 1112 XH
Diemen

Contact person: Ingvil Sæterdal, mobile + 47 97087730

Overall aim of the course: Familiarize with the EUnetHTA Tools and methodology

Agenda

Day 1

Light lunch before start of meeting 12:00 – 13:00

Welcome and introductions of participants, Ingvil Sæterdal, NOKC 13:00 – 13:15
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EUnetHTA Intranet</strong>, Carl Devos, KCE</td>
<td>13:15 – 14:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Outcomes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Learn major functions of the Intranet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POP database</strong>, Judith Erdös, LBI</td>
<td>14:00 – 15:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coffee break</strong></td>
<td>14:45 - 15:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HTA Core Model®, Kristian Lampe, THL</strong></td>
<td>15:15 – 16:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ In general, you will increase your awareness of the usefulness of the model and knowledge about the ontology and methodological guidance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction to the EUnetHTA Methodological guidelines</strong>, Jörg Lauterberg, IQWiG</td>
<td>16:00 – 16:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ You will get an overview of the development process of EUnetHTA’s methodological guidelines, their topics, target groups, intended use, and where to find them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End of Day 1</strong></td>
<td>16:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Event: Tour in Amsterdam and Dinner</strong></td>
<td>17:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodological guideline on information retrieval</strong>, Elke Hausner, IQWiG</td>
<td>09:00 – 09:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ You will receive a general introduction to the guidelines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ You will get practical experience in using the guidelines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Methodological guideline on economic evaluation, Emelie Heintz, SBU

- You will acquire an understanding of how the requirements on economic evaluation may differ between countries
- You will acquire an understanding of how the guideline can be used for economic evaluations conducted within EUnetHTA

**09:45 – 10:30**

### Coffee break

**10:30 – 10:50**

### HTA Core Model REA, Evelien van Bijnen, ZIN; Julia Mayer, LBI-HTA

- You will increase your awareness of the processes and timeframes used in WP5
- You will get to understand the HTA Core Model® in the specific context of rapid REA and receive hands-on training on how to use the HTA Core Model® for rapid REA

**10:50 – 12:15**

### Lunch

**12:15 – 13:15**

### HTA Core Model REA continues, Evelien and Julia

**13:15 – 14:45**

### Summary and feedback, Ingvil

**14:45 – 15:00**

### End of course (Light snacks and refreshments before departure)

---

NOKC: Norwegian Knowledge Centre for the Health Services  
KCE: Belgian Health Care Knowledge Centre  
LBI-HTA: Ludwig Boltzmann Institute for Health Technology Assessment  
ZIN: Zorginstituut Nederland  
IQWiG: Institute for Quality and Efficiency in Health Care  
SBU: Swedish Council on Health Technology assessment  
THL: National institute for health and welfare
Training course III for EUnetHTA partners and associates:
Summary of the Evaluation

Joint Action 2

2012-2015

EUnetHTA Joint Action 2 is supported by a grant from the European Commission. The sole responsibility for the content of this article (publication, presentation etc.) lies with the authors and the European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.
Introduction

The third training course for EUnetHTA partners and associates took place in Diemen on May 6-7, 2015. The course was organized by the Norwegian Knowledge Centre for the Health Services (NOKC) and the Belgian Health Care Knowledge Centre (KCE); EUnetHTA WP2 Lead Partner and Co-Lead Partner. Zoorginstituut Nederland hosted the training course and took part in the organization. The WP2 members participated in the preparations of the training course by attending the WP2 face-to-face meeting in March 2015, e-meetings and the Discussion forum on the Intranet.

The overall aim of the course was to familiarize with the EUnetHTA Tools and methodology.

We wanted to receive feedback from the participants of the training course in order to adjust and make improvements for possibly future face-to-face courses. We therefore carried out a survey. This report is a brief summary of the results from this survey.

Methods

The training course was evaluated using a survey. We sent out invitations to participate in the survey by e-mail the day after the course. The survey was published on EUnetHTA website until June 20, 2015. The survey consisted of 12 questions assessing the content of the course, the format of the course and practical arrangements. The questions are shown in appendix 1.

We summarized the replies to questions 1, 2, 8, 9 and 10 by counting and presented the results as graphical figures. We made a narrative summary of the replies to the other free text questions.

Results

We sent the e-mail invitation to all of the 40 participants. 16 of the participants replied to the survey.

These are the results:

7. How would you assess the usefulness of the course overall?

![Pie chart showing the assessment of the course usefulness.]

- Very good
- Quite good
- Quite bad
- Very bad
8. Did the course meet your expectations? If no, please explain

All participants that replied to the survey experienced that the course met their expectations.

9. Which topic did you like particularly well and why?

The results are sorted by topic popularity (the most popular topic at the top).

Methodological guidelines (both general introduction and the guidelines for information retrieval and economic evaluation); good presentations, interesting to see how they were developed, new to some of the participants.

The HTA Core Model® for REA; discussions and group work, provided insight into EUnetHTA working process.

POP database; group work with hands on exercise.

The HTA Core Model® general introduction; learned new functions, very good presentation

Group work, interactivity and practical work
“The practical parts were very nice, it’s a good way to keep people interested and help to understand the process”
4. What was particularly helpful about the course?

- Learn more about EUnetHTA (the structure, and the work we do)
- Get in contact with other EUnetHTA partners
- Have insight in how other HTA agencies work
- Work with the POP database in practice, learn new “tricks”
- The group work
- Combination of talks concerning the theory of the HTA core model, the work on guideline production and the application (REA pilots)

5. Which topics did you like less well, and why?

**Intranet**: it was hard to follow; the trainer and the talk could have been more interactive.

**POP database**: too focused on search strategies. Should be more focused on the practical benefit of identifying Partners working with the same or similar topics.

**HTA core model**: too much information about the different applications / versions etc. The model should be better introduced by presenting a real Project of a REA, and how the authors collect, evaluate and present information then, and what helpful tools (e.g. guidelines, handbook etc.) they can access during the working process.

**Time for discussion**: more time to discuss how different agencies work, exchange ideas and experience and also discuss the topics that was presented.

6. What would you recommend changing about the course?

- Parallel sessions with for different levels of experience
- More interactivity
- Always more time
- Include a general introduction to EUnetHTA
- All trainers should be good presenters
- Provide documents for preparations in due time
- Slides with readable text
- Provide the trainers with ideas to make their presentations more vivid and interactive

7. Is it according to your evaluation any obvious shortcomings with the program (please specify)?

“No, overall I liked the program a lot! – Statement from one participant.
All participants except from two found no shortcomings with the program.
Suggestions for improvements:
- Include a general presentation about EUnetHTA (for example a short version of the general EUnetHTA presentation)

8. Will you use some of the tools/methods presented in your daily work?

9. Did you find the content and format of the course enabling you to provide similar training at your workplace? If not, please explain:
• Not feeling confident enough due to lack of personal experience in using the tools
• Do not have enough knowledge about the tools and methods to be able to explain them to colleagues.

10. How did you find the following organizational issues?
11. Do you have any suggestions to improvements of the organizational issues?
The information provided in advance should not be too comprehensive. Provide shorter documents so participants will have time to read it all.

Make sure that the temperature in the meeting room is comfortable.

“Good mixture of topics and good time schedule. Very nice atmosphere. Thanks for the good organization”

“No, the organization was very good”

12. Do you have any other comments?

More discussion and exchange about how different agencies work in terms of methodology.

Conclusions

Overall, our conclusion is that we received very positive feedback for the training course. We list here a few bullet point on what was particularly good and could be kept or developed further and a few bullet point on what we can improved for future face-to-face training courses.

What was particularly positive and could be kept or developed further:

- **Networking:** Get in contact with other EUnetHTA partners and have insight in how other HTA agencies work.
- **Interactive sessions:** Group work and interactivity during presentations.
- **Topic selection:** Participants seem to be happy with focusing mostly on the methodological guidelines and the HTA Core Model.

Suggestions for improvement:

- **Format:** make sure that all sessions are interactive and that we have enough time for discussions.
- **Material provided in advance** should be kept to a manageable level (not too much to read).
Appendix 1 Survey

EVALUATION FORM – EUnetHTA training course for partners and associates
May 6-7, 2015

We would like you to give us some feedback on the training course in order for us to improve our next course and learn what was good and what was not so good.

25. How would you assess the usefulness of the course overall?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Quite good</th>
<th>Quite bad</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Did the course meet your expectations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No, please explain why:.............</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. Which topic did you like particularly well, and why?

28. What was particularly helpful about the course?

29. Which topic did you like less well, and why?
30. What would you recommend changing about the course?

31. Is it according to your evaluation any obvious shortcomings with the program? (please specify)

32. Will you use some of the tools/methods presented in your daily work?

   Yes No, please explain why:.............

   0 0

33. Did you find the content and format of the course enabling you to provide similar training at your workplace?

   Yes No, please explain why:.............

   0 0

34. How did you find the following organizational issues:

   Practical support and information given in advance

      Very good Quite good Quite bad Very bad

      0 0 0 0

   Meeting room facilities (location, sound, internet access)

      Very good Quite good Quite bad Very bad

      0 0 0 0
Lunch and refreshments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Quite good</th>
<th>Quite bad</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. Do you have any suggestions to improvements of the organizational issues:

36. Do you have any other comments?

Thank you!
Training Course for EUnetHTA Stakeholders
Brussels, Belgium

January 16, 2014, 09:30 – 17:00

Organized by: Norwegian Knowledge Centre for the Health Services (NOKC) and Belgian Health Care Knowledge Centre (KCE); EUnetHTA WP2 Lead Partner and Co-Lead Partner

Address of venue:

Centre Pacheco (next to the office of KCE)
Entrée, Tour des Finances
Boulevard Pachéco, 13
1000 Bruxelles

Contact persons: Ingvil Sæterdal, mobile + 47 464 23 116 or Patrice Chalon, tel + 32 2 287 33 66, mobile +32 479 522 663

Overall aim of the course: Increase understanding of HTA, promote awareness of EUnetHTA and HTA processes and the stakeholders’ roles in these

Agenda

| Light snack before start of meeting | 09:00 – 09:30 |
| Welcome and introductions of participants, Ingvil Sæterdal, NOKC | 09:30 – 10:00 |
| Brief introduction to EUnetHTA and its Tools, Finn Børslum Kristensen, DHMA | 10:00 – 10:30 |

Learning Outcomes:
- Be familiar with EUnetHTA, understand the task of EUnetHTA and get an overview of the EUnetHTA Tools.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HTA Core Model®, Kristian Lampe, THL</strong></td>
<td>10:30 – 11:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Learning Outcomes:</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Understand HTA, understand core HTA information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coffee break</strong></td>
<td>11:20 – 11:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How to use HTA for decision-making, Kristian Lampe, THL</strong></td>
<td>11:40 – 12:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Learning Outcomes:</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Understand how HTA reports can be used in decision-making, its</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usefulness and its limits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lunch</strong></td>
<td>12:30 – 13:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EUnetHTA methodological guideline on clinical outcomes, Mira Pavlovic, HAS</strong></td>
<td>13:30 – 14:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Learning Outcomes:</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Increase the understanding that only clinically useful new methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will be implemented in the health care systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How can patients and providers best contribute to the HTA process?</strong></td>
<td>14:30 – 15:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie Werkö, SBU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Learning Outcomes:</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Provide patients and providers with tools and knowledge to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilitate participation in HTA process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coffee break</strong></td>
<td>15:15 – 15:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How can patients and providers best contribute to the HTA process, cont</strong></td>
<td>15:35 – 16:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary and feedback, Ingvil Sæterdal</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End of course</strong></td>
<td>17:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOKC: Norwegian Knowledge Centre for the Health Services
DHMA: Danish Health and Medicines Authority, Denmark
THL: National institute for health and welfare
HAS: The Haute Autorité de santé, France
SBU: Swedish Council on Technology Assessment in Health Care
Training course I for EUnetHTA Stakeholders: Summary of the Evaluation

Joint Action 2
2012-2015

EUnetHTA Joint Action 2 is supported by a grant from the European Commission. The sole responsibility for the content of this article (publication, presentation etc.) lies with the authors and the European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.
Introduction
The first training course for EUnetHTA Stakeholders took place in Brussels on January 16, 2014. It was organized by the Norwegian Knowledge Centre for the Health Services (NOKC) and the Belgian Health Care Knowledge Centre (KCE); EUnetHTA WP2 Lead Partner and Co-Lead Partner. The WP2 members participated in the preparations of the training course by attending the WP2 face-to-face meeting, e-meetings and the Discussion forum at the Intranet.

The overall aim of the course was to increase understanding of HTA, promote awareness of EUnetHTA and HTA processes and the stakeholders’ roles in these.

We wanted to receive feedback from the participants of the training course in order to adjust and make improvements for the next courses. We therefore carried out a survey. This report is a brief summary of the results from this survey.

Methods
The training course was evaluated using a survey. We sent out invitations to participate in the survey by e-mail the day after the course. The survey was published on EUnetHTA website until February 5th, 2014. The survey consisted of 12 questions assessing the content of the course, the format of the course and practical arrangements. The questions are shown in appendix 1.

We summarized the replies to questions 1, 2, 8, 9 and 10 by counting and presented the results as graphical figures. We made a narrative summary of the replies to the other free text questions. We have presented the results to the Stakeholder forum, the WP2 members and the Executive Committee, appendix 2.

Results
We sent the e-mail invitation to all of the 30 participants. 18 of the participants represented patient organizations, 5 represented health care providers and 7 represented industry. No representatives from the stakeholder group of payers attended the training course. 16 of the participants replied to the survey.

These are the results:

10. How would you assess the usefulness of the course overall?
11. Did the course meet your expectations? If no, please explain

HTAi presentation on patient involvement did not make sense. Include how patients can be involved in EUnetHTA, + some insights in the tools POP and EVIDENT
More practical examples and get deeper into details
More practical approach, practical implications produced by applied policies
Too little details on how evaluations are carried out, more discussion/input about the providers perspective

12. Which topic did you like particularly well and why?

The results are sorted by topic popularity (the most popular topic at the top).
The HTA Core Model®. The participants liked the explanation of the report structure. They think that the explanation of the Core Model process are key to understand the EUnetHTA outcomes. Familiarizing with the HTA concept was also appreciated.

EUnetHTA methodological guidelines. Good discussion of clinical outcomes and patient relevant outcomes, good discussions overall, more time needed.

Patient involvement. The patient involvement session in order to see how patients can get involved in the HTA process.

HTA for decision-making. They found it valuable to see examples and understand that there are limits of reports and possible usage by countries.

Introduction to EUnetHTA

All topics, nice mix and order of topics

4. What was particularly helpful about the course?

To see others. Interacting with WP participants and stakeholders, hearing perspective of patient groups
Raising awareness regarding HTA, basic principles and tools, how patients and providers can participate/get involved.

The HTA Core Model®. The general overview of the elements in the model (the domains, topics and issues)

Intro to EUnetHTA, good to see what it is intended to do

Discussion of clinical outcomes

EUnetHTA approach and how it might be used by various jurisdictions

5. Which topics did you like less well, and why?

Clinical endpoints, the discussion was too technical for many of the patient representatives; assumed too much prior knowledge.

HTAi activities on patient involvement. Patient input and engagement. It did not really help raise the opportunities for patient engagement or best practice.

Some of the trainers overestimated over-estimated the level of knowledge of the participants regarding HTA and medical knowledge.

For the interactive/participative sessions it was sometimes difficult to work out what was required. Possible that some supportive documentation would have helped.
None. Every topic were useful. There wasn’t a topic I didn’t like

**HTA core model**, not useful to a newcomer who needs to learn the basic. Methodology of HTA seems to be a lot computerized and I felt that the methodology may contain limitation based on what I saw from it.

**Using HTA for decision making** - it would be more useful to include examples of evaluations performed by EUnetHTA and how the pilot core HTAs have been utilized by other countries to inform decision making: How they used the information, what work they had to do to adapt it to their setting (how useful was the core model), the impact/role it had in decision making.

6. **What would you recommend changing about the course?**
   "Nothing"

**HTA core model:**
- More focus on the core model and practical implementation;
- More in-depth work with EunetHTA reports, how they were developed, and how they might be used.
- Discussion of each domain with guidance of what is examined

**Case studies:**
- Having some EUnetHTA partners or associate present other than the presenters, for example those who are from agencies more skeptical vis à vis the involvement of stakeholders (to ensure a kind of a dual way training).
- Specific Case studies and workshop with more details of making a decision based on a HTA report. Focus on concrete EUnetHTA activities
- Presentation from Pharma on their honest perceptions of the process and how it connects with EMA for them
- Vision of the future of EUnetHTA

**Patient involvement:**
Discussion on how a patient organisation got involved and the methods of making a case in the specific format.

**Format of training sessions:**
Hands on exercise could be useful: literature search, or have us evaluating the level of evidence (weak, moderate, high) for some information contained in a report etc.

A pre-module that explains HTA and its history in layman terms.

EUnetHTA jargon (WP, JA, JA2 etc) and technical wording should be avoided

Provide reading material in advance (and a bibliography on HTA).
Have some small group working-sessions and more interactive sessions

Group exercises that train patient organizations to “think HTA”

7. Is it according to your evaluation any obvious shortcomings with the program (please specify)?

Suggestions for improvement:

- To have a session led by a patient group that has participated in HTA, outlining their learnings.
- Outline HTA methodology
- Solve technical issues (mainly with the reimbursement form)
- Outline differences across countries in the criteria for HTA (CEA, CUA, CBA), and how harmonized clinical evaluations can be achieved.
- More education in how patients can take part in the HTA process
- Maybe one day is too short
- More focus on how the core models are going to be utilized/implemented at a country level in the decision making process - examples of how pilots have been used - and EUnetHTA influence on/integration with national HTA bodies in the future.

Positive feedback:

- “It was a very well organized first training session. I look forward the future ones”
- “No, it was an excellent training and worth every minute I spent on it and every euro to the community spent on it”.
- “Not really, I’d say that it stays very important to step into the shoes of a participant who is not familiar completely with HTA and EUnetHTA: in order to explain the process and the methodology and eventually also the historical developments of HTA in general to its actual place nowadays.”

8. Will you use some of the tools/methods presented in your daily work?
9. Did you find the content and format of the course enabling you to provide similar training at your workplace? If not, please explain:
“I would not try to replicate the day but would use some of the items covered in discussions with my Board, etc.”
“I can provide a report in my workplace, but to fully explain how the process works and how we can be involved in it will be more difficult.”
“Would need the materials and more familiarity with how they are applied.”
“Both content and format are too generic”
“Yes, but a summary on slide kit would be very helpful.”
“Not relevant”

10. How did you find the following organizational issues?

Practical support and information given in advance?

Meeting room facilities

Very good  Quite good  Quite bad  Very bad

4  12
11. Do you have any suggestions to improvements of the organizational issues?

Material in advance:
- ✔ Send material in advance, exercises, links to published reports; this will make it possible to prepare questions in advance.
- ✔ Presentations available at time of session, more content ahead of time, case studies.
- ✔ A bit more information about the topics to be covered

Reimbursement sheet (have someone with excel knowledge to define it)
Clearer directions to the appropriate entrance
Buffet lunch provided in a separate room for delegates only

12. Do you have any other comments?

"à la carte" training with different topics in different sessions (methodology guidelines, early dialogues, etc).

“This training helped in both increasing that awareness and in actively getting involved in this area”

“It was very helpful to feel in closer contact with EUnetHTA.”

“One of the very best overall introductions to general HTA but also to EUnetHTA.”
Conclusions

Overall, our conclusion is that we received very positive feedback for the training course. We list here a few bullet point on what was particularly good and could be kept or developed further and a few bullet point on what should be improved for the next training course.

What was particularly good and could be kept or developed further:

- Networking; valuable to see others, interact with WP participants and stakeholders and to hear the perspective of patient groups
- HTA Core Model®; valuable to familiarize with the HTA concept and to have an explanation of the report structure
- EUnetHTA methodological guidelines; had good discussions of clinical and patient relevant outcomes
- Patient involvement; learned more about how patients’ can contribute to the HTA process

Need for improvement:

- General; suggest to use less technical language, less jargon and to bring down the level
- HTA Core Model®; would prefer more in-depth work with EUnetHTA reports
- Format; would prefer more interactivity and small group working sessions

Supplemented learnings:

EUnetHTA could think of how to involve all stakeholders (including patients) in the pilots

WP2 will consider carefully the feedback from the evaluation when planning the next face-to-face training course for stakeholders.
Appendix 1 Survey

EVALUATION FORM – EUnetHTA training course for Stakeholders

January 16, 2014

We would like you to give us some feedback on the training course in order for us to improve our next course and learn what was good and what was not so good.

37. How would you assess the usefulness of the course overall?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Quite good</th>
<th>Quite bad</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. Did the course meet your expectations?

Yes

No, please explain why:.............

O

O

39. Which topic did you like particularly well, and why?

40. What was particularly helpful about the course?

41. Which topic did you like less well, and why?

42. What would you recommend changing about the course?
43. Is it according to your evaluation any obvious shortcomings with the program? (please specify)

44. Will you use some of the tools/methods presented in your daily work?

   Yes  No, please explain why:.............
   0  0

45. Did you find the content and format of the course enabling you to provide similar training at your workplace?

   Yes  No, please explain why:.............
   0  0

46. How did you find the following organizational issues:

   Practical support and information given in advance

   Very good  Quite good  Quite bad  Very bad
   0  0  0  0

   Meeting room facilities (location, sound, internet access)

   Very good  Quite good  Quite bad  Very bad
   0  0  0  0
Lunch and refreshments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Quite good</th>
<th>Quite bad</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47. Do you have any suggestions to improvements of the organizational issues:

48. Do you have any other comments?

Thank you!
Appendix 2 Presentation of the results (slide show)

Stakeholder training – update/feedback

March 3 2014

EUnetHTA Stakeholder Forum e-meeting
Training Course for EUnetHTA Stakeholders

Rome, Italy

October 29, 2014, 09:30 – 17:00

Organized by: Norwegian Knowledge Centre for the Health Services (NOKC) and Belgian Health Care Knowledge Centre (KCE); EUnetHTA WP2 Lead Partner and Co-Lead Partner

Address of venue:
Sheraton Roma Hotel & Conference Center  
Viale del Pattinaggio, 100  
00144 Rome  
Italia  
Meeting room: Bentivoglio room

Contact person: Ingvil Sæterdal, mobile + 47 464 23 116

Overall aim of the course: To increase understanding of HTA, and to promote awareness of EUnetHTA and HTA processes and the stakeholders’ roles in these

Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00 – 09:30</td>
<td>Light snack and coffee before start of meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:30 – 09:50</td>
<td>Welcome and introductions of participants, Ingvil Sæterdal, NOKC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:50 – 10:10</td>
<td>Brief introduction to EUnetHTA and its Tools, Marianne Klemp, NOKC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learning Outcomes:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:10 – 12:00</td>
<td>Key principles of HTA, Conor Teljeur, HIQA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 – 12:20</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:20 – 13:00</td>
<td>HTA Core Model®, Kristian Lampe, THL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00 – 14:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00 – 15:50</td>
<td>How to use HTA for decision-making, Anna Nachtnebel, LBI-HTA, Tove Ringerike, NOKC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:50 – 16:50</td>
<td>Coffee break, in between the group work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:50 – 17:00</td>
<td>How can patients and providers best contribute to the HTA process?, Anna Nachtnebel, LBI-HTA, Tove Ringerike, NOKC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>Summary and feedback, Ingvil Sæterdal, NOKC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End of course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key principles of HTA, Conor Teljeur, HIQA**

*Learning outcomes:*
- For the participants to be familiar with EUnetHTA, understand the mission and tasks of EUnetHTA and get an overview of the EUnetHTA Tools.

**Coffee break**

**HTA Core Model®, Kristian Lampe, THL**

*Learning Outcomes:*
- For the participants to understand the purpose and structure of the HTA Core Model® and learn where to find rapid core HTA information in a EUnetHTA pilot (joint assessment report).

**How to use HTA for decision-making, Anna Nachtnebel, LBI-HTA, Tove Ringerike, NOKC**

*Learning Outcomes:*
- For the participants to understand how HTA information (e.g., EUnetHTA joint assessments) can be used in decision making, their usefulness and limitations.

**How can patients and providers best contribute to the HTA process?, Anna Nachtnebel, LBI-HTA, Tove Ringerike, NOKC**

*Learning Outcomes:*
- To provide patients and providers with tools and knowledge to facilitate participation in the HTA processes.

**Summary and feedback, Ingvil Sæterdal, NOKC**

**End of course**

---

HIQA: Health Information and Quality Authority
LBI-HTA: Ludwig Boltzmann Institute for Health Technology Assessment
NOKC: Norwegian Knowledge Centre for the Health Services
Training course II for EUnetHTA Stakeholders: Summary of the Evaluation

Joint Action 2
2012-2015
EUnetHTA Joint Action 2 is supported by a grant from the European Commission. The sole responsibility for the content of this article (publication, presentation etc.) lies with the authors and the European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.
Introduction
The second training course for EUnetHTA Stakeholders took place in Rome on October 29, 2013. It was organized by the Norwegian Knowledge Centre for the Health Services (NOKC) and the Belgian Health Care Knowledge Centre (KCE); EUnetHTA WP2 Lead Partner and Co-Lead Partner. The WP2 members participated in the preparations of the training course by attending the WP2 face-to-face meeting, e-meetings and the Discussion forum at the Intranet.

The overall aim of the course was to increase understanding of HTA, promote awareness of EUnetHTA and HTA processes and the stakeholders’ roles in these.

We wanted to receive feedback from the participants of the training course in order to adjust and make improvements for the next courses. We therefore carried out a survey. This report is a brief summary of the results from this survey.

Methods
The training course was evaluated using a survey. We sent out invitations to participate in the survey by e-mail the day after the course. The survey was published on EUnetHTA website until end of November 2014. The survey consisted of 12 questions assessing the content of the course, the format of the course and practical arrangements. The questions are shown in appendix 1.

We summarized the replies to questions 1, 2, 8, 9 and 10 by counting and presented the results as graphical figures. We made a narrative summary of the replies to the other free text questions. We have presented the results to the Stakeholder forum, the WP2 members and the Executive Committee, appendix 2.

Results
We sent the e-mail invitation to all of the 23 participants. 12 of the participants represented patient organizations, 2 represented health care providers, 3 represented the health authorities and 6 represented industry. None representatives from the stakeholder group of payers attended the training course. 14 of the participants replied to the survey.

These are the results:

13. How would you assess the usefulness of the course overall?
14. Did the course meet your expectations? If no, please explain

The content of the course was too basic.
“Pre-reading material to be sent out in good time before the course would allow more intelligent and informed debate on the day”.

15. Which topic did you like particularly well and why?

The results are sorted by topic popularity (the most popular topic at the top).

Group work and discussions Opportunity to express opinions and ask questions. Participation to practical sessions in order to understand the real critical points of the assessment.
Key principles of HTA The presenter was excellent. The session was very well presented, made the participants understand basic principles.

HTA for decision-making. The session demonstrated the difficulty of affecting a decision – particularly with a multi-stakeholder group. Good discussions

The HTA Core Model® Clear presentation

Introduction to EUnetHTA Clear content

4. What was particularly helpful about the course?

The networking and discussions Listen to other stakeholders point of, hearing perspective of patient groups

General overview of EUnetHTA To see what EUnetHTA does and what is included in the organization

Key principles of HTA and How to use HTA for decision-making

“I find everything I have heard very useful”

5. Which topics did you like less well, and why?

“I find everything I have heard very useful”

Stakeholders’ role in the HTA process End of the day and people were getting tired, some found a medical device example not relevant

Using HTA for decision making – difficult to understand how EUnetHTA joint assessments can be used in the decision making process on a national level.

6. What would you recommend changing about the course?

More discussions, exercises and practical examples
Using both pharmaceutical and medical device examples

7. Is it according to your evaluation any obvious shortcomings with the program (please specify)?

Suggestions for improvement:

- More time for discussions
8. Will you use some of the tools/methods presented in your daily work?

9. Did you find the content and format of the course enabling you to provide similar training at your workplace? If not, please explain:
10. How did you find the following organizational issues?

Did you find the content and format of the course enabling you to provide similar training at your workplace?

- Yes: 9
- No: 5

Practical support and information given in advance?

- Very good: 10
- Quite good: 0
- Quite bad: 0
- Very bad: 0
11. Do you have any suggestions to improvements of the organizational issues?

Better meeting room facilities, bigger room
Participant list in advance
12. Do you have any other comments?

“A very positive initiative and one

Conclusions

Overall, our conclusion is that we received very positive feedback for the training course. We list here a few bullet points on what was particularly good and could be kept or developed further and a few bullet points on what should be improved for the next training course.

What was particularly good and could be kept or developed further:

- **Networking:** valuable to see others, interact with WP participants and stakeholders and to hear the perspective of patient groups
- **Group work and discussions**

Need for improvement:

- More group work and discussions covering both medical devices and pharmaceuticals
- Elaborate more on the Stakeholders role in the HTA processes

WP2 will consider carefully the feedback from the evaluation when planning the next face-to-face training course for stakeholders.
Appendix 1 Survey

EVALUATION FORM – EUnetHTA training course for Stakeholders

April 23, 2015

We would like you to give us some feedback on the training course in order for us to improve our next course and learn what was good and what was not so good.

49. How would you assess the usefulness of the course overall?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Quite good</th>
<th>Quite bad</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50. Did the course meet your expectations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No, please explain why:.............</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51. Which topic did you like particularly well, and why?

52. What was particularly helpful about the course?

53. Which topic did you like less well, and why?

54. What would you recommend changing about the course?
55. Is it according to your evaluation any obvious shortcomings with the program? (please specify)

56. Will you use some of the tools/methods presented in your daily work?

Yes  No, please explain why:.............

0  0

57. Did you find the content and format of the course enabling you to provide similar training at your workplace?

Yes  No, please explain why:.............

0  0

58. How did you find the following organizational issues:

**Practical support and information given in advance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Quite good</th>
<th>Quite bad</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Meeting room facilities (location, sound, internet access)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Quite good</th>
<th>Quite bad</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lunch and refreshments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Quite good</th>
<th>Quite bad</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

59. Do you have any suggestions to improvements of the organizational issues:

60. Do you have any other comments?

Thank you!
Appendix 2 Presentation of the results (slide show)

Stakeholder training – feedback

November 18 2014

EUnetHTA Stakeholder Forum e-meeting
Training Course for EUnetHTA Stakeholders
Brussels, Belgium

April 23, 2015, 09:00 – 17:00

Organized by: Norwegian Knowledge Centre for the Health Services (NOKC) and Belgian Health Care Knowledge Centre (KCE); EUnetHTA WP2 Lead Partner and Co-Lead Partner

Address of venue:
Centre Pacheco
Entrée, Tour des Finances
Boulevard Pachéco, 13
1000 Brussels
Belgium

Contact person: Ingvil Sæterdal, mobile + 47 97 08 77 30

Overall aim of the course: To increase understanding of HTA, and to promote awareness of EUnetHTA and HTA processes and the stakeholders’ roles in these

Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Light snack and coffee before start of meeting</td>
<td>09:00 – 09:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome and introductions of participants, Ingvil Sæterdal, NOKC</td>
<td>09:30 – 09:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief introduction to EUnetHTA and its Tools, Marianne Klemp, NOKC</td>
<td>09:50 – 10:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Outcomes: For the participants to be familiar with EUnetHTA, understand the mission and tasks of EUnetHTA and get an overview and understanding of the EUnetHTA Tools.</td>
<td>10:10 – 11:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to use HTA for decision-making based on HTA Core Information, Anna Nachtnebel, LBI-HTA, Simone Warren, ZIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning outcomes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ For the participants to understand the purpose and structure of the HTA Core Model® and learn where to find rapid core HTA information in a EUnetHTA pilot (joint assessment report).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ For the participants to understand how HTA information (e.g., EUnetHTA joint assessments) can be used in decision-making, as well as its usefulness and limitations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coffee break**

**How to use HTA for decision-making based on HTA Core Information, continues,** Anna Nachtnebel, LBI-HTA, Simone Warren, ZIN

**Lunch**

**How can patients and providers best contribute to the HTA process?**
Anna Nachtnebel, LBI-HTA, Simone Warren, ZIN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning outcomes:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ To provide patients and providers with tools and knowledge to facilitate participation in the HTA processes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coffee break**

**How to use the EUnetHTA submission template to support production of core Health Technology Assessments?** Zoe Garrett, NICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning outcomes:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ For the participants to understand the types of information included in the submission template and the evidence requirements from European agencies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Questions, Discussion, Summary and feedback,** Ingvil Sæterdal, NOKC

**End of course**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:00-11:30</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30–12:30</td>
<td>How to use HTA for decision-making based on HTA Core Information, continues, Anna Nachtnebel, LBI-HTA, Simone Warren, ZIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30–13:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30–14:30</td>
<td>How can patients and providers best contribute to the HTA process? Anna Nachtnebel, LBI-HTA, Simone Warren, ZIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30–15:00</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00–16:15</td>
<td>How to use the EUnetHTA submission template to support production of core Health Technology Assessments? Zoe Garrett, NICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:15–17:00</td>
<td>Questions, Discussion, Summary and feedback, Ingvil Sæterdal, NOKC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>End of course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LBI-HTA: Ludwig Boltzmann Institute for Health Technology Assessment
NICE: National Institute for Health and Care Excellence
NOKC: Norwegian Knowledge Centre for the Health Services
ZIN: Zorginstituut Nederland
Training course III for EUnetHTA Stakeholders: Summary of the Evaluation

Joint Action 2
2012-2015
Introduction
The second training course for EUnetHTA Stakeholders took place in Brussels on April 23, 2015. It was organized by the Norwegian Knowledge Centre for the Health Services (NOKC) and the Belgian Health Care Knowledge Centre (KCE); EUnetHTA WP2 Lead Partner and Co-Lead Partner. The WP2 members participated in the preparations of the training course by attending the WP2 face-to-face meeting, e-meetings and the Discussion forum at the Intranet.

The overall aim of the course was to increase understanding of HTA, promote awareness of EUnetHTA and HTA processes and the stakeholders’ roles in these.

We wanted to receive feedback from the participants of the training course in order to adjust and make improvements for the next courses. We therefore carried out a survey. This report is a brief summary of the results from this survey.

Methods
The training course was evaluated using a survey. We sent out invitations to participate in the survey by e-mail the day after the course. The survey was published on EUnetHTA website until end of May 2015. The survey consisted of 12 questions assessing the content of the course, the format of the course and practical arrangements. The questions are shown in appendix 1.

We summarized the replies to questions 1, 2, 8, 9 and 10 by counting and presented the results as graphical figures. We made a narrative summary of the replies to the other free text questions. We have presented the results to the Stakeholder forum, the WP2 members and the Executive Committee, appendix 2.

Results
We sent the e-mail invitation to all of the 26 registered participants. 20 of the participants represented patient organizations, 1 represented health care providers, 2 represented the health authorities and 3 represented industry. None representatives from the stakeholder group of payers attended the training course. Eight of the participants replied to the survey.

These are the results:

16. How would you assess the usefulness of the course overall?
17. Did the course meet your expectations? If no, please explain

The course lacked information about how EUnetHTA deals with domains not included in rapid REA, like economical and ethical issues that are of interest to patients.

18. Which topic did you like particularly well and why?

The rapid REA practical exercises and going through the production process

Group work and discussions Discuss in small groups and hear others’ views

HTA for decision-making. The adaption of th HTA Core Model on national level
How patients can contribute to the HTA process

Submission template See how the template can be harmonized among the member states

4. What was particularly helpful about the course?

The networking and discussions gaining insight in different opinions and questions both from stakeholders and HTA doers. Interactive form

Understand the HTA process

5. Which topics did you like less well, and why?

“All the topics were useful and gave better understanding of the topic”

The session on medical devices were not relevant to all, however still useful.
The session on the submission template was not so interesting for patient representatives, however it was useful to be reminded on which element go into reimbursement decisions.

6. What would you recommend changing about the course?

Introduction to the EUnetHTA website to introduce where information can be found
Stakeholder involvement in other areas than rapid REA
More training courses, both for beginners and advanced users

7. Is it according to your evaluation any obvious shortcomings with the program (please specify)?

No!
“The day exceeded my expectations”

8. Will you use some of the tools/methods presented in your daily work?
9. Did you find the content and format of the course enabling you to provide similar training at your workplace? If not, please explain:

“maybe it should be further simplified”
10. How did you find the following organizational issues?

Practical support and information given in advance?

- Very good
- Quite good
- Quite bad
- Very bad

Meeting room facilities

- Very good
- Quite good
- Quite bad
- Very bad
11. Do you have any suggestions to improvements of the organizational issues?

- Start the course later in order to be able to fly in the same day
- Easier access to entrance of building (it was difficult to find)

12. Do you have any other comments?

“A very enjoyable and interesting day”

“I would just like to thank the organizers for the initiative and for organizing such an interesting meeting”

**Conclusions**

Overall, our conclusion is that we received very positive feedback for the training course. We list here a few bullet point on what was particularly good and could be kept or developed further and a few bullet point on what should be improved for the next training course.

**What was particularly good and could be kept or developed further:**

- **Group work:** interesting discussions, networking, hear others’ views
• **HTA Core Model® for rapid REA;** very useful to go through the process

**Need for improvement:**

• **Stakeholder involvement;** include other areas of EUnetHTA than rapid REA where stakeholders can be involved

• **Make sure that the venue is easily found;** provide good directions
Appendix 1 Survey

EVALUATION FORM – EUnetHTA training course for Stakeholders

January 16, 2014

We would like you to give us some feedback on the training course in order for us to improve our next course and learn what was good and what was not so good.

61. How would you assess the usefulness of the course overall?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Quite good</th>
<th>Quite bad</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

62. Did the course meet your expectations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No, please explain why:..........</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

63. Which topic did you like particularly well, and why?

64. What was particularly helpful about the course?

65. Which topic did you like less well, and why?

66. What would you recommend changing about the course?
67. Is it according to your evaluation any obvious shortcomings with the program? (please specify)

68. Will you use some of the tools/methods presented in your daily work?
   Yes No, please explain why:............
   0 0

69. Did you find the content and format of the course enabling you to provide similar training at your workplace?
   Yes No, please explain why:............
   0 0

70. How did you find the following organizational issues:

**Practical support and information given in advance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Quite good</th>
<th>Quite bad</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Meeting room facilities (location, sound, internet access)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Quite good</th>
<th>Quite bad</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Lunch and refreshments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Quite good</th>
<th>Quite bad</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

71. Do you have any suggestions to improvements of the organizational issues:

72. Do you have any other comments?

---

**Thank you!**
Appendix 2 Presentation of the results (slide show)

Stakeholders training Apr 23rd

Feedback from participants

EUnetHTA Stakeholder Forum e-meeting, May 12nd, 2015