DG HOME ECI Directive evaluation - Survey for POC

Section 1 - Personal information

1. Name and surname*

2. Organisation/authority*
   Ministry of Justice and Security

3. Sector*
   - ○ Energy
   - ○ Transport
   - ◉ No specific sector
   - ○ Other, please specify

4. Phone number

5. Email address*

6. Country (of work) *
   Netherlands

Back Next Cancel

DG HOME ECI Directive evaluation - Survey for POC

Page 3 of 7

Section 2 - Framework of protection of national CI

7. Was there a **definition of CIs** in your national legislative framework before 2008?*
   - (●) Yes
   - ( ) No
   - ( ) Do not know

8. If yes, how were CIs defined?

Critical processes are processes that could result in severe social disruption in the event of their failure or disruption. These processes together form the critical infrastructure of The Netherlands. The term 'critical sectors' was used in the past. Since not all processes in a sector are critical, the current focus is on critical processes instead of critical sectors.

9. Did specific **laws/measures** to identify and protect national CIs exist in your country before 2008?*
   - (●) Yes
   - ( ) No
   - ( ) Do not know

10. Does your **current national legislation** for the protection of national CIs include the following elements?*

	Yes	No	Do not know
a. A unique definition of CIs and criteria for their identification	●	○	○
b. A requirement to identify key assets of national CIs and security solutions for their protection	●	○	○
c. A liaison function between the competent national authorities and CI owners/operators	●	○	○
d. Regular threat assessments concerning national CIs	●	○	○
e. Regular reporting by CI owners/operators to the competent national authorities on the type of risks, threats and vulnerabilities	●	○	○
f. A national-level function responsible for maintaining contact between responsible authorities and CI owners/operators at the MS level	●	○	○
g. The creation of forums facilitating the exchange of information and discussion with other MS on CI of mutual interest	●	○	○
h. Procedures for communicating information to other MS concerning national CI in your country	●	○	○

Back Next Cancel

DG HOME ECI Directive evaluation - Survey for POC

Section 3 - Evaluation of Directive 2008/114

Relevance of Directive 2008/114 to security threats

11. To what extent can the following elements represent a **threat** to CIs?

	Not at all	To a low extent	To a moderate extent	To a high extent	To a very high extent	Do not know
a. Earthquakes	○	◉	○	○	○	○
b. Volcanic eruption	◉	○	○	○	○	○
c. Flooding	○	○	○	◉	○	○
d. Cyberattack	○	○	○	○	◉	○
e. Supply chain disruption	○	○	○	○	◉	○
f. Energy supply disruption	○	○	○	◉	○	○
g. Bombing	○	○	○	◉	○	○
h. Transportation accident	○	◉	○	○	○	○
i. Accidents involving hazardous materials	○	◉	○	○	○	○
j. Insider infiltration	○	○	○	◉	○	○
k. Unlawful intrusion (including using unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs))	○	○	○	◉	○	○
l. Attacks orchestrated by state-sponsored actors	○	○	○	◉	○	○
m. Other	○	○	○	○	○	◉

12. If other, please specify

-

13. To what extent do you consider the provisions contained in the Directive **appropriate to** protect CIs against the following **threats**?

	Not at all	To a low extent	To a moderate extent	To a high extent	To a very high extent	Do not know
a. Earthquakes	○	○	○	○	○	◉
b. Volcanic eruption	○	○	○	○	○	◉
c. Flooding	○	○	○	○	○	◉
d. Cyberattack	○	○	○	○	○	◉
e. Supply chain disruption	○	○	○	○	○	◉
f. Energy supply disruption	○	○	○	○	○	◉
g. Bombing	○	○	○	○	○	◉
h. Transportation accident	○	○	○	○	○	◉
i. Accidents involving hazardous materials	○	○	○	○	○	◉
j. Insider infiltration	○	○	○	○	○	◉
k. Unlawful intrusion (including using unmanned aerial vehicles	○	○	○	○	○	◉

(UAVs))

l. Attacks orchestrated by state-sponsored actors	○	○	○	○	○	◉

14. Are there **other threats** not mentioned in the previous question that the Directive serves to address? *
    - ○ Yes
    - ◉ No
    - ○ Do not know

15. If yes, please specify what these threats are?

With regard to question 13: we have no designated ECI. We have national policy and sectoral legislation in place to protect CIs. We don't use the provisions contained in the Directive to protect against the threats mentioned above.

16. Are there any current/emerging **threats and/or challenges** that render the existing Directive **outdated/inadequate?** *
    - ○ Yes, completely
    - ○ Yes, partially
    - ◉ No
    - ○ Do not know

17. If yes, please specify what these threats/challenges are and why the existing Directive is inadequate in addressing them

-

Relevance of definitions, scope and provisions of Directive 2008/114

18. To what extent do you agree with the following statements on the **definitions** included in the Directive, given the requirements you have to meet in your Member State/sector to protect CIs and the current and emerging threats? *

	Not at all	To a low extent	To a moderate extent	To a high extent	To a very high extent	Do not know
a. The definitions included in the Directive are helpful to the process of identifying CIs	○	◉	○	○	○	○
b. The definitions included in the Directive are helpful to the process of identifying European Critical Infrastructures (ECIs)	○	○	◉	○	○	○
c. The definitions included in the Directive cover all key elements needed in order to identify and protect CIs	○	◉	○	○	○	○
d. The scope of the Directive captures the range of risks facing CIs	○	◉	○	○	○	○

19. To what extent do you think that the **scope** of the current Directive should be widened to incorporate additional sectors? *
    - ○ Coverage is adequate
    - ○ Directive should cover more sectors
    - ○ Directive should cover energy sector only

- (●) Directive should cover transportation sector only
- ( ) Do not know

20. If you think it should be widened, what other sectors should be covered?

The energy sector is fully covered by national legislation and regulation. Also with regards to transport, a lot is covered already by both national and international regulation. However, the Directive has a marginal added value for aviation (which falls under the transport sector).

21. To what extent do you consider the following **provisions** of the Directive relevant to CI protection?*

	Not at all	To a low extent	To a moderate extent	To a high extent	To a very high extent	Do not know
a. The procedure for identifying ECIs	○	◉	○	○	○	○
b. The procedure for designating ECIs in cooperation with other affected MS	○	◉	○	○	○	○
c. The Operator Security Plan (OSP) requirement	○	◉	○	○	○	○
d. The Security Liaison Officer (SLO) requirement	○	◉	○	○	○	○
e. The reporting requirements	○	◉	○	○	○	○
f. The role of the European Commission	○	◉	○	○	○	○
g. The creation of an ECIP point of contact in each MS	○	○	○	◉	○	○

Relevance of Directive 2008/114 to recent developments

22. To what extent do you think that **developments** in the following areas have affected the relevance of the Directive and its provisions? *

	Increased the relevance	Not affected the relevance	Decreased the relevance	Do not know
a. Technological and scientific(e.g investment in cyber innovation, artificial intelligence, machine learning)	○	◉	○	○
b. Economic (e.g. increasing use of cryptocurrencies)	○	◉	○	○
c. Social (e.g. growing urbanization and associated strain on infrastructure of cities, including water systems, emergency services, public health)	○	◉	○	○
d. Policy/political(e.g. (elections, EU policy, MS national strategies/action plans)	○	◉	○	○
e. Environmental (e.g. climate change and extreme weather events, including droughts, flooding and heatwaves)	○	◉	○	○

23. Can you please provide an explanation of the most important developments and how did they affect the relevance of the Directive?

-

24. Are there **other elements** (e.g. specific requirements, procedures, roles, responsibilities) **and/or stakeholders** that the Directive does not include and that should be considered when defining a framework for CI protection at the EU level? If yes, please specify which elements/stakeholders should be included.

-

Back Next Cancel

DG HOME ECI Directive evaluation - Survey for POC

The extent to which Directive 2008/114 has achieved its stated objectives

25. Do you think that the **level of protection** of ECI in the transport and energy sectors has **increased** in your country since the introduction of the Directive?*

- ○ Yes
- ◉ No
- ○ Do not know

26. If you answered yes to the previous question, to what extent do you consider this increase in the level of CI protection to be **a result of the following elements of the Directive**?

	Not at all	To a low extent	To a moderate extent	To a high extent	To a very high extent	Do not know
a. Common definitions	○	○	○	○	○	○
b. Defined responsibilities (CI owners and operators, Security Liaison Officers (SLOs), ECIP points of contact, etc.)	○	○	○	○	○	○
c. Common procedures for the identification and designation of ECIs	○	○	○	○	○	○
d. The obligation for ECI owners/operators to prepare an Operator Security Plan (OSP) or equivalent)	○	○	○	○	○	○
e. Common reporting requirements	○	○	○	○	○	○
f. Shared guidelines for the implementation of the Directive	○	○	○	○	○	○
g. Other	○	○	○	○	○	○

27. If other, please specify

-

28. To what extent do you think the Directive resulted in:*

	Not at all	To a low extent	To a moderate extent	To a high extent	To a very high extent	Do not know
a. The establishment of a common and agreed-upon procedure for the identification and designation of ECIs	○	○	◉	○	○	○
b. The establishment of a common approach to the task of assessing the need to improve the protection of ECIs	○	○	◉	○	○	○

Cooperation

29. Prior to the introduction of the Directive, did **cooperation** concerning the protection of CI exist between you and

	Yes	No	Do not know
a. Other competent authorities in your country?	◉	○	○
b. Relevant authorities in potentially affected MS?	○	○	◉
c. CI operators and other stakeholders within your country?	◉	○	○

30. Did you notice an **increase in cooperation** with competent authorities in other MS after the introduction of the Directive?*

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Do not know

31. If you noticed an **increase in cooperation** with competent authorities in other MS after the introduction of the Directive, to what extent has this been due to the following?

	Not at all	To a low extent	To a moderate extent	To a high extent	To a very high extent	Do not know
a. The existence of common definitions	◉	○	○	○	○	○
b. The existence of common procedures	◉	○	○	○	○	○
c. The existence of clearer definitions of responsibilities	◉	○	○	○	○	○
d. The existence of common guidelines	◉	○	○	○	○	○
e. Other	○	○	○	○	◉	○

32. If other, please specify

The establishing of CIP POCs and the network and information sharing that comes along with it.

33. Did you notice an **improvement in cooperation** with CI operators and other stakeholders at the MS level after the introduction of the Directive?*

- ○ Yes
- ◉ No
- ○ Do not know

34. If **cooperation** with CI operators and other stakeholders at the MS level **has improved** after the introduction of the Directive, to what extent has this been due to the following?

	Not at all	To a low extent	To a moderate extent	To a high extent	To a very high extent	Do not know
a. The existence of common definitions	○	○	○	○	○	○
b. The existence of common procedures	○	○	○	○	○	○
c. The existence of clearer definitions of responsibilities	○	○	○	○	○	○
d. The existence of common guidelines	○	○	○	○	○	○
e. Other	○	○	○	○	○	○

35. If other, please specify

36. Do you **exchange experiences/best practice** on topics related to CI protection with other stakeholders at the national level since the entry into force of the Directive?*
- (●) Yes, often
- ( ) Yes, sometimes
- ( ) Yes,rarely
- ( ) Never
- ( ) NA

37. Did the **frequency** of such exchanges **increase** when compared to the situation before the entry into force of the Directive?*
- ( ) Yes
- (●) No
- ( ) Do not know

Identification of ECI

38. To your knowledge, has the MS that you represent ever **initiated** the process for the identification of potential ECI?*
- (●) Yes
- ( ) No
- ( ) Do not know

39. If yes, what is the share of CI that were eventually identified as ECI?
- ( ) All of them
- ( ) Most of them
- ( ) Half of them
- ( ) Less than half
- (●) None

40. If not, what are the reasons for not initiating the identification procedure?

At the moment, progress is being made with regard to the identification of an ECI.

41. To your knowledge, has the MS that you represent ever **entered into discussions** with other MS concerning the **cross-cutting criteria** for ECI identification as described in the Directive?*
- (●) Yes
- ( ) No
- ( ) Do not know

42. If you answered yes to the previous question, how many times has this occurred since 2008?

It happened once, in the transport sector.

43. Do you have **reason to believe** that the MS that you represent may be significantly affected by CI that is located in a second MS, but that has not been identified as ECI by the MS where it is located?*

- ○ Yes
- ◉ No
- ○ Do not know

44. To your knowledge, has the European Commission ever been informed about this situation, either by you or counterparts?

- ○ Yes
- ◉ No
- ○ Do not know

45. If you answered yes to the previous question, how many times has this occurred?

Designation of ECI

46. To your knowledge, has the MS that you represent ever **entered into bilateral or multilateral discussions** with another MS concerning the possible **designation** of specific CI as potential ECIs? *

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Do not know

47. If yes, what is the share of CI that were eventually identified as ECI?

- ○ All of them
- ○ Most of them
- ○ Half of them
- ○ Less than half
- ◉ None

Reporting

48. To your knowledge, were **threat assessments** concerning the transport and energy sectors (as described in the Directive) carried out prior to the introduction of the Directive?*

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Do not know

49. If the MS you represent has designated ECIs, has the frequency by which **threat assessments** in relation to concerned sectors changed since the introduction of the Directive?*

- ○ Yes, it increased
- ○ Yes, it decreased
- ○ No, it remained more or less the same
- ○ I do not know
- ◉ Not applicable

50. To your knowledge, how frequently does the Member State that you represent **submit data** to the European

Commission on the types of risks, threats and vulnerabilities facing sectors in which ECI have been designated?*

- (●) Never
- ( ) Less than once every two years
- ( ) Once every two years
- ( ) Once a year
- ( ) More than once a year
- ( ) Do not know

Other factors contributing to or limiting the protection of ECI in the energy and transport sector

51. To what extent do you think **external factors** (not directly linked to the implementation of the Directive) have contributed to an increase in the level of protection of ECIs in your country*

	Not at all	To a low extent	To a moderate extent	To a high extent	To a very high extent	Do not know	Not applicable
a. National-level legal initiatives and/or measures taken by national authorities (please specify)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(●)
b. Measures taken by CI owners/operators (please specify)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(●)
c. Other European-level/EU initiatives and measures not related to Directive 2008/114 (e.g. EPCIP) (please specify)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(●)
d. Other	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(●)

52. If other, please specify

-

53. In your experience, have you identified any **external factors** that have negatively affected the implementation of the Directive? *

- ( ) Yes
- (●) No
- ( ) Do not know

54. If yes, can you please specify?

-

Side effects of Directive 2008/114

55. To what extent do you think the implementation of the Directive has had the following effects on the **protection of national CIs (including those not designated as ECIs)**?*

	Not at all	To a low extent	To a moderate extent	To a high extent	To a very high extent	Do not know
a. An increased level of protection of CIs in the transport and energy sectors	(●)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

b. An increased level of protection of CIs in sectors other than transport and energy	◉	○	○	○	○	○
c. The creation of procedures and definitions common to all MS that could also be applied to the work of protecting national CI	◉	○	○	○	○	○
d. Improved information exchange and collaboration between MS in the field of CIP	○	○	○	◉	○	○
e. Increased awareness concerning the importance of CIs and their protection more specifically	◉	○	○	○	○	○
f. Increased harmonisation of governance structures and procedures for the protection of CIs	◉	○	○	○	○	○
g. Increased harmonisation of control and reporting requirements/procedures	◉	○	○	○	○	○
h. Increased cooperation between public and private CIP stakeholders (including operators)	◉	○	○	○	○	○
i. Increased cooperation between CI operators/owners across MS	◉	○	○	○	○	○
j. Increased cooperation across sectors at the MS level	◉	○	○	○	○	○
k. Other	◉	○	○	○	○	○

56. If other, please specify

-

Obstacles to the implementation of the Directive

57. What were the main **obstacles and difficulties** that you encountered in the implementation of the provisions of the Directive?*

	Not at all	To a low extent	To a moderate extent	To a high extent	To a very high extent	Do not know
a. Difficulties in identifying CIs with potential relevance to other MS	◉	○	○	○	○	○
b. Difficulties in the identification process - application of sectoral criteria	◉	○	○	○	○	○
c. Difficulties in the identification process application of the definition of critical infrastructure	◉	○	○	○	○	○
d. Difficulties in the identification process application of the transboundary element of the definition of ECI	◉	○	○	○	○	○
e. Difficulties in the identification process application of the cross-	◉	○	○	○	○	○

culting criteria						
f. Difficulties in reaching agreement with other MS on the designation of potential ECI	◉	○	○	○	○	○
g. Difficulties generally in cooperating with the relevant competent authorities at the MS level	◉	○	○	○	○	○
h. Difficulties generally in cooperating with CI operators at the MS level	◉	○	○	○	○	○
i. Difficulties carrying out the threat assessment stipulated in the Directive	◉	○	○	○	○	○
j. Other	◉	○	○	○	○	○

58. If other, please specify

Specifically with regards to the energy sector: no obstacles or difficulties were encountered, due to the fact that no ECI is designated within this sector.

59. Can you please identify any elements of the Directive that in your view are **vague, unclear, and/or unnecessarily complex**?

-

Back Next Cancel

DG HOME ECI Directive evaluation - Survey for POC

Costs and benefits of Directive 2008/114

60. Did the procedures and requirements introduced by the Directive entail any **additional costs** to you (as compared with the situation prior to the existence of the Directive)?*

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No
- ( ) Do not know

61. If yes, please indicate the type of **costs** that the implementation of the Directive entailed? (*Please indicate all that apply*)*

- [ ] Costs related to the identification of ECIs using the sectorial, trans-boundary and cross-cutting criteria set out in the Directive
- [ ] Costs related to bilateral and multilateral discussions with other MS on relevant thresholds for cross-cutting criteria
- [ ] Costs related to bilateral and multilateral discussions concerning the potential designation of ECIs
- [ ] Costs related to informing the European Commission concerning completed ECI designations and the affected MS
- [ ] Costs related to ensuring that ECI operators have fulfilled their general obligations as set out in the Directive
- [ ] Costs related to the verification of the existence of Operator Security Plans (OSP) or equivalent and Security Liaison Officers (SLO)
- [x] Costs related to the appointment of a ECIP contact point function, and then setting up and managing the appropriate communication mechanisms to support this function
- [ ] Costs related to carrying out a threat assessment within one year after each ECI designation
- [ ] Costs related to reporting general relevant data to the European Commission every 2 years
- [x] Other, please specify

National coordination, increased workload of personnel

62. What **share** of the total cost associated with protecting CIs do the costs mentioned above represent for you?*

- ( ) 0-5%
- ( ) 6-10%
- ( ) 11-20%
- ( ) 20-50%
- ( ) More than 50%
- (●) I do not know

63. Can you please estimate – generally speaking – the annual costs associated with the protection of one national CI as it relates to specific activities?*

a. Costs associated with the identification of CIs (in terms of Full Time Equivalents-FTEs)	
b. Costs associated with carrying out bilateral and multilateral discussions with other MS (if any) (in n. of days)	
c. Costs associated with ensuring that CI operators have fulfilled their obligations (EUR/FTEs)	
d. Costs associated with carrying out a threat assessment (FTEs)	
e. Costs associated with	

reporting (FTEs)

f. Other (please specify) -

64. Please estimate how much these **costs would increase** if the CI referenced in the previous question was designated as an ECI.*

	No increase	0-1%	2-5%	6-10%	11-20%	More than 20%	Do not know
a. Costs associated with the identification of CIs	○	○	○	○	○	○	◉
b. Costs associated with carrying out bilateral and multilateral discussions with other MS	○	○	○	○	○	○	◉
c. Costs associated with ensuring that CI operators have fulfilled their obligations as per the Directive	○	○	○	○	○	○	◉
d. Costs associated with carrying out a threat assessment within one year after each ECI designation	○	○	○	○	○	○	◉
e. Costs associated with reporting	○	○	○	○	○	○	◉
f. Other (please specify)	○	○	○	○	○	○	◉

65. If other, please specify

At the moment, we have no designated ECI. Therefore we do not know how much the costs will increase. However, we do expect an increase in costs if ECI were to be designated.

66. In view of the cost estimates provided in response to the previous questions: Have the costs related to the implementation of the Directive been **reasonable and proportionate** given the results achieved in terms of the protection of designated ECIs?*

- ○ Yes, to a large extent
- ○ Yes, to some extent
- ○ Yes, to a small extent
- ○ Not at all
- ◉ Do not know

Factors limiting an efficient implementation of Directive 2008/114

67. Were/are there **other factors limiting the efficiency** of the Directive? (e.g. factors that brought to increased costs or reduced benefits) *

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Do not know

68. Can you please specify?

Critical infrastructure protection is a matter of national security. Also the certainty of energy supply is a national matter. As a consequence, there is a reluctancy to share information with other (foreign) actors with regards to CIs.

Coherence of Directive 2008/114 with other national measures

69. To what extent do the provisions in the Directive overlap (e.g. create **duplication**) with existing legislation and/or measures taken at the national level to protect CI? *

- ○ Not at all
- ○ To a low extent
- ○ To a moderate extent
- ○ To a high extent
- ◉ To a very high extent
- ○ Do not know

70. To what extent do the provisions in the Directive **contradict and/or conflict with** existing legislation and/or measures taken addressing similar threats at the national level (in terms of objectives, responsibilities, procedures, etc.)? *

- ○ Not at all
- ◉ To a low extent
- ○ To a moderate extent
- ○ To a high extent
- ○ To a very high extent
- ○ Do not know

71. To what extent are the **definitions** included in the Directive (listed below) **in line** with those in your national legislation/measures? *

	Not at all	To a low extent	To a moderate extent	To a high extent	To a very high extent	Do not know
a. Critical Infrastructure	○	○	○	◉	○	○
b. European critical infrastructure (ECI)	○	○	○	○	○	◉
c. Risk analysis	○	○	◉	○	○	○
d. Sensitive critical infrastructure protection related informatione. Protection	◉	○	○	○	○	○
f. Owners/operators of ECIs	○	○	◉	○	○	○

72. To what extent are the **procedures** included in the Directive **in line** with those in your national legislation/measures concerning the protection of CIs (but not specifically related to ECIs)? *

	Not at all	To a low extent	To a moderate extent	To a high extent	To a very high extent	Do not know
a. Criteria to determine the significance of the impact of a potential disruption	○	○	○	○	○	◉
b. Sectoral threat assessment	○	○	○	○	○	◉
c. Regular risk analysis	○	○	○	○	○	◉
d. Cooperation with CI operators	○	○	○	○	○	◉

Coherence of Directive 2008/114 with other EU measures

73. To what extent do the various obligations created by the Directive overlap (e.g. create **duplication**) with the obligations created by other relevant EU legislation? *

- ○ Not at all
- ○ To a low extent

- ○ To a moderate extent
- ◉ To a high extent
- ○ To a very high extent
- ○ Do not know

74. Based on your response to the previous question, please indicate the relevant EU legislation and describe the existing duplications.

The NIS-directive: overlap and contradictions in definitions, procedures, et cetera.

75. Have you ever experienced **difficulties** in applying the rules/procedures called for in different pieces of EU legislation?*

- ○ Yes
- ◉ No
- ○ Do not know

76. If yes, can you please describe the difficulties that you encountered and the legislation that they concerned?

-

77. With regard to the EU **Directive on network and information systems** (2016/1148), do you see any overlap/duplication as it relates to the ECI Directive (2008/114)? *

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Do not know

78. If yes, please specify where the overlap/duplication lies and how this is dealt with in your MS. *

During the negotiations of the NIS Directive, there has been a lot of coordination with the CIP POC.

Coherence of Directive 2008/114 with international measures and standards

79. To what extent does the ECI Directive (2008/114) overlap(e.g. create **duplication**) with other existing international initiatives and standards at the international level (if any)?*

- ◉ Not at all
- ○ To a low extent
- ○ To a moderate extent
- ○ To a high extent
- ○ To a very high extent
- ○ Do not know

80. Based on your response to the previous question, please indicate the relevant international initiative and/or international standard and describe the areas of overlap.

Side note: within the aviation sector (and transport in general) protection is already largely covered by international law and regulations.

81. To what extent did Directive 2008/114 and its provisions **contradict and/or conflict** with existing international initiatives and/or international standards (if any) (in terms of objectives, responsibilities, procedures, etc.)?*

- (●) Not at all
- ( ) To a low extent
- ( ) To a moderate extent
- ( ) To a high extent
- ( ) To a very high extent
- ( ) Do not know

82. If you noticed any contradiction/conflicting aspect, please mention the relevant international initiative and international standards and describe the contradiction/conflicting aspect.

Side note: within the aviation sector (and transport in general) protection is already largely covered by international law and regulations.

Synergies of EU and national measures in CI protection

83. To what extent do you think that EU policy and the legislative framework concerning the protection of CIs in your MS *(not limited to the energy and transport sectors)* **work in synergy** *(i.e. the provisions included in one framework are compatible and work in combination with the provisions provided in the other)?**

	Not at all	To a low extent	To a moderate extent	To a high extent	To a very high extent	Do not know
a. In terms of procedures	●	○	○	○	○	○
b. In terms of definition of roles	○	●	○	○	○	○
c. Others	●	○	○	○	○	○

84. Can you please explain your assessment?

We have no designated ECIs.

85. In the event that you do not see that EU policy and the legislative framework at the MS level concerning the protection of CIs work in synergy, has your MS put in place **specific measures** to:*

- [x] Minimise the extent of overlap
- [ ] Streamline procedures
- [ ] Strengthen cooperation within the MS
- [ ] Other, please specify

Added value brought by Directive 2008/114 and sustainability

86. What do you think the Directive helps you to achieve concerning the protection of CIs, which you **would otherwise not have been able to do** (i.e. solely leveraging existing national and international measures)?*

- [x] Nothing that I could not have achieved without the Directive
- [ ] Helped in framing national policy, measures and initiatives, thereby fostering the creation of a harmonised framework and approach
- [ ] Supported the development of cross-border consultations and collaboration among CIP stakeholders
- [ ] Facilitated the development and exchange of good practices, guidelines and standards in the CIP field
- [ ] Supported the emergence of a European forum for CIP-related issues
- [ ] Created common terms of reference for the protection of CI in the EU
- [ ] Other, please specify

87. Were the **Directive to be repealed**, would this have a negative impact on the level of protection of ECIs in your country?*

- ○ Yes
- ○ Yes, moderately
- ◉ No
- ○ Do not know

Back Next Cancel

DG HOME ECI Directive evaluation - Survey for POC

Section 4 - Suggestions for improvement

88. Do you have any suggestions as to how to improve the protection of ECI and CI more in general?

No

Back Done Cancel