

Open Public Consultation: Revision of the European Interoperability Framework (Public Administrations)

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Disclaimer

The European Commission is not responsible for the content of questionnaires created using the EUSurvey service - it remains the sole responsibility of the form creator and manager. The use of EUSurvey service does not imply a recommendation or endorsement, by the European Commission, of the views expressed within them.

Introduction

***Name:**

Oskar

***Email address:**

oskar.thunman@callistaenterprise.se

***What is your nationality?**

- Austrian Belgian British Bulgarian Croatian Cypriot
- Czech Danish Dutch Estonian Finnish French
- German Greek Hungarian Icelandic Irish Italian
- Latvian Liechtensteiner Lithuanian Luxembourgish Maltese Norwegian
- Polish Portuguese Romanian Slovak Slovenian Spanish
- Swedish Other

***Where do you live?**

- Austria Belgium Bulgaria Croatia Cyprus Czech Republic
- Denmark Estonia Finland France Germany Greece
- Hungary Iceland Ireland Italy Latvia Liechtenstein
- Lithuania Luxembourg Malta Netherlands Poland Portugal
- Romania Slovakia Slovenia Spain Sweden United Kingdom
- Norway Other

***What is the name of your administration?**

the Swedish eHealth Agency

***What is your function in your administration?**

Semantic Interoperability Expert

*At which level of government does your organisation/administration work?

- Municipal / local
- Regional / sub-national
- National
- European
- Don't know / No opinion

*Have you already replied to any targeted consultation related to the revisions of the EIS/EIF in the course of 2015 (e.g. workshops, interviews, online surveys)?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / No opinion

*Before you reply to this public consultation, please tell us to what extent you are aware of the European Interoperability Strategy and its content.

- Fully aware
- Partially aware
- I only found out about it through this public consultation
- Don't know / No opinion

*Before you reply to this public consultation, please tell us to what extent you are aware of the European Interoperability Framework and its content.

- Fully aware
- Partially aware
- I only found out about it through this public consultation
- Don't know / No opinion

2. Publication consent

*

Please indicate your preference for the publication of your response on the Commission's website:

- Under the name given:** I consent to publication of all information in my contribution and I declare that none of it is subject to copyright restrictions that prevent publication.
- Anonymously:** I consent to publication of all information in my contribution and I declare that none of it is subject to copyright restrictions that prevent publication.
- Please keep my contribution confidential.** (it will not be published, but will be used internally within the Commission)

3. Accompanying document

The document accessible [here](#) is a draft version of the revised European Interoperability Framework (EIF). While still being under continuous improvement by the Commission Services, it already reflects the results of a targeted consultation with the Member States representatives to ISA programme (the predecessor of ISA²), as well as other inputs.

The EIF is a technical document, mainly addressing recommendations on interoperability, based on an [existing framework](#) and as such is herewith consulted with stakeholders. It mainly addresses recommendations on interoperability, the wording and impact of which are assessed through this consultation's questions. You are thus invited to familiarise yourselves with this draft EIF, so as to better understand the context of the questions. You will have the possibility to provide your feedback by answering this consultation's questions as well as through a free comment box available at the end of section 5 of this consultation.

4. Assess the need of revising the EIS and EIF

The questions related to this section have been addressed during the targeted consultations which took place in the course of 2015, with regards to the revision of the EIS/EIF (e.g. workshops, interviews, online surveys).

In December 2010, the Commission adopted the Communication "[Towards interoperability for European public services](#)" that included the [European Interoperability Strategy \(EIS\)](#) and [European Interoperability Framework \(EIF\)](#).

Following recent political, legal and technological evolutions, a revision is now necessary so that interoperability is ensured for the public services of the Digital Single Market and that e-barriers do not emerge between the public administrations of the Member States to the detriment of other public administrations, businesses and citizens that need to interact with them.

Questions included in the following sections will focus, on the one hand, on interoperability at Member States' (national) level and, on the other hand, on interoperability at cross-border level.

4.1 Assessment of needs and problems at Member States level

The following set of questions will address [interoperability at Member State level](#), i.e. across national public administration's entities of different levels and sectors.

***Q1. To what extent is interoperability among your country's public administration's entities considered as a political priority?**

- High priority
- Medium priority
- Low, or not at all a priority
- Don't know/ No opinion

***Q2. What are the main priorities in relation to interoperability among your country's public administration's entities?**

Main priorities: Coordination of efforts, common terminologies, common standards, national medication summary
Other important issues: empowering citizens, cross-border services, decision and knowledge support, drug/prescription statistics, security.

***Q3. Are the priorities mentioned in the previous question (Q2) formalised in a specific strategy?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / No opinion

***Please specify which official document you are referring to.**

<http://www.regeringen.se/informationmaterial/2016/04/vision-e-halsa-2025/>

***Q4. Please select up to 10 major problems identified in your administration as obstructing the implementation of interoperability among your country's public administration's entities.**

at most 10 choice(s)

- There is no single legal framework in my country within the area of interoperability across sectors (legislation in the area of interoperability tends to be sectorial).
- There is a lack of resources available for implementing interoperability in my country.
- Interoperability is not a priority in the political agenda of my country.
- There is a lack of a consolidated view on all the existing interoperability initiatives in my country.
- The IT budget of my country is largely affected by the maintenance of legacy systems.
- Interoperability is not perceived as a worthwhile investment in my country.
- EU funds, i.e. European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF) that could be used to implement interoperability are not well leveraged by my country.
- The implementation of interoperability initiatives in my country is not sufficiently monitored.
- There is a shortage of skills to implement interoperability-related policies and initiatives in my country.
- There is a shortage of qualified IT personnel having project management skills to run multinational and multi-stakeholder initiatives.
- Technological evolution in my country is largely affected by the maintenance of legacy systems.
- There is a lack of standards to sufficiently ensure interoperability or standards, even if available, are not enough integrated by suppliers in their solutions.
- There is a lack of a national public procurement strategy or guidelines, especially with regards to reference to standards and specifications
- Public administrations tend to use proprietary IT solutions, which often create a situation of vendor lock-in in my country.
- The costs and benefits of interoperability are not assessed when developing national legislation.
- Some of the Member States' policies may contain requirements that are not supported by / adapted to the market (e.g. reference to specific technologies as being the only permissible solutions).
- Other
- Don't know / No opinion

Please describe the other problems identified in your administration as obstructing the implementation of interoperability among your country's public administration's entities.

Data quality in legacy systems, heavily regulated across many agencies, responsibilities divided over many agencies.

***Q5. In relation to interoperability among public administration's entities, which of the following areas have been addressed by your administration?**

- Semantic interoperability (i.e. how the meaning and syntax of information should be addressed)
- Information availability and usage (i.e. where and which information is available and what can be done with this information)
- Trust and Privacy (i.e. how information can be accessed and exchanged in a secure and trustworthy way)
- Catalogue of service (i.e. consolidated list of available services)
- Catalogue of ICT standards and interoperability specifications to guide public procurers,
- Interoperability architecture (i.e. architecture that puts together and structures all aspects of a public service from legal to organisational, information-related and technical)
- Expertise support and methodologies (i.e. how to create and maintain the aforementioned architecture)
- National legislation referring to/linked with ICT (i.e. performing a systematic and well defined ICT implications' assessment with the involvement of legal and ICT experts)
- Interoperability awareness (i.e. awareness and recognition of interoperability as a cornerstone for building public services)
- Sharing best practices and supporting communities by using collaborative platform(s).
- Other
- Don't know / No opinion

***Please further detail the initiative(s) that address "semantic interoperability" in your administration.**

Much work has been done in project form and further efforts are needed to establish practices that lead to continuous development of semantic interoperability. This is just being addressed in our "vision for e-health 2025" that was launched this year.

***Please further detail the initiative(s) that address "information availability and usage" in your administration.**

An eGovernment Delegation was instructed to promote and coordinate the agencies' efforts to improve the conditions for the re-use of documents. This work was carried out between 2010 and 2015.

***Please further detail the initiative(s) that address "trust and privacy" in your administration.**

Sambi, a national federation of actors within healthcare to put in place role based federated security services.

***Please further detail the initiative(s) that address "catalogue of services" in your administration.**

The eGovernment Delegation put in place a catalogue of information services to promote the reuse of services and information between government agencies. Also portfolio management was done within the eDelegation project during 2010 and 2015.

***Please further detail the initiative(s) that address "interoperability architecture" in your administration.**

The Architectural principles of the EIF were adopted into a national interoperability framework consisting of "principles for collaboration" that is being implemented across agencies.

***Please further detail the initiative(s) that address "interoperability awareness" in your administration.**

The ehealth agency has been given the role to coordinate interoperability efforts across agencies in collaboration with regional healthcare organizations. This work is a result of the vision for e-health 2025.

***Please further detail the initiative(s) that address "sharing of best practices and supporting communities by using collaborative platform(s)" in your administration.**

Besides the efforts on interoperability awareness, collaboration between communities is also done through the national eHealth service platform and a Integration Competence Center, both operated by Inera under the Swedish Association of Local Agencies and Regions.

4.2 Assessment of needs and problems at cross-border level

The following set of questions will address the **cross-border dimension of interoperability**, i.e. when it has to be established between public administrations of different countries or between businesses and public administrations that are not located in the same country.

***Q6. To what extent is cross-border interoperability considered as a political priority in your country?**

- High priority
- Medium priority
- Low, or not at all a priority
- Don't know / No opinion

***Q7. What are the main priorities in relation to cross-border interoperability in your country?**

parttook in both Stork II and epsos, currently in e-sens and have applied for CEF-funding of our cross border exchange of e-prescriptions.

***Q8. Are priorities mentioned in the previous question formalised in a specific strategy?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / No opinion

***Please specify which official document you are referring to.**

Vision:
<http://www.regeringen.se/contentassets/79df147f5b194554bf401dd88e89b791/vision-e-halsa-2025.pdf>
Agreement:
<http://www.regeringen.se/contentassets/5a2c8365d1b04d33a9bc7512d5d1c5aa/overenskommelse-om-vision-ehalsa-2025.pdf>

***Q9. What are the main problems, if any, faced by your administration while implementing these aforementioned priorities?**

Regulation spread out across agencies, legacy systems and the data quality within them, the compatibility of Swedish set of security services with international standards.

***Q10. Please select up to 10 major problems identified in your administration as obstructing the implementation of interoperability with other countries.**

at most 10 choice(s)

- Our national interoperability frameworks and/or strategies are not fully aligned with the EIS and EIF (adopted in 2010) since they were adopted before the ones at EU level.
- Our national interoperability frameworks and/or strategies are not fully aligned with the EIS and EIF, since the latter do not always capture the needs of our public administrations.
- There is a lack of resources available for implementing cross-border interoperability in my country.
- Cross-border interoperability is not a priority in the political agenda of my country.
- There is a lack of a consolidated view on all the existing cross-border interoperability initiatives in my country.
- The IT budget of my country is largely affected by the maintenance of legacy systems.
- Cross-border interoperability is not perceived as a worthwhile investment in my country.
- European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF) that could be used to implement cross-border interoperability are not well leveraged by my country.
- There is a shortage of skills to implement cross-border interoperability policies and initiatives in my country.
- There is a shortage of qualified IT personnel having project management skills to run multinational and multi-stakeholder initiatives.
- Cross-border digital public services available in my country are not (although it is needed) sufficiently multilingual.
- There is a limited demand from our national citizens, businesses and/or administrations for digital cross-border public services (e.g. cross-border mobility is low).
- Existing cross-border digital public services available in my country are not sufficiently known by citizens, businesses and/or public administrations (lack of awareness).
- Our national portals tend to be fragmented.
- Our national portals are not sufficiently integrated with EU portals.
- Technological evolution in my country is largely affected by the maintenance of legacy systems.
- Public administrations tend to use proprietary IT solutions, which often create a situation of vendor lock-in in my country.
- There is a lack of interoperability standards or different countries are using different standards.
- Interoperability standards, even when available, are not widely used.
- Other
- Don't know / No opinion

Q11. In your view, do you see any additional problems that may obstruct the implementation of interoperability between your administration and other countries?

For patient data coming from healthcare, the current patient data act makes it illegal to share information across borders.

***Q12. In relation to cross-border interoperability, which of the following areas have been addressed by your administration?**

- Semantic interoperability (i.e. how the meaning and syntax of information should be addressed)
- Information availability and usage (i.e. where and which information is available and what can be done with this information)
- Trust and Privacy (i.e. how information can be accessed and exchanged in a secure and trustworthy way)
- Catalogue of service (i.e. consolidated list of available services)
- Catalogue of ICT standards and interoperability specifications to guide public procurers
- Interoperability architecture (i.e. architecture that puts together and structures all aspects of a cross-border public service from legal to organisational, information-related and technical)
- Expertise support and methodologies (i.e. how to create and maintain the aforementioned architecture)
- Cross-border legislation referring to/linked with ICT (i.e. performing a systematic and well defined ICT implications' assessment with the involvement of legal and ICT experts)
- Interoperability awareness (i.e. awareness and recognition of interoperability as a cornerstone for building cross-border public services)
- Sharing best practices and supporting communities by using collaborative platform(s).
- Other
- Don't know / No opinion

***Please further detail the initiative(s) that address "semantic interoperability" in your administration.**

This is just being addressed in our "vision for e-health 2025" that was launched this year.

***Please further detail the initiative(s) that address "trust and privacy" in your administration.**

This is just being addressed in our "vision for e-health 2025" that was launched this year.

***Please further detail the initiative(s) that address "interoperability architecture" in your administration.**

This is just being addressed in our "vision for e-health 2025" that was launched this year.

***Please further detail the initiative(s) that address "interoperability awareness" in your administration.**

This is just being addressed in our "vision for e-health 2025" that was launched this year.

***Please further detail the initiative(s) that address "sharing of best practices and supporting communities by using collaborative platform(s)" in your administration.**

This is just being addressed in our "vision for e-health 2025" that was launched this year.

4.3 Assessment of needs and problems related to the EIF

Today, there is a common understanding among Member States on the basic requirements to achieve interoperability, based on the "European Interoperability Framework" launched by the Commission in 2010. According to the [Digital Single Market Strategy for Europe](#), it is now time to update and extend this framework.

As mentioned in the [Report on the State of Play of Interoperability 2014](#), the average alignment between EU Member States' national interoperability frameworks and the EIF stood at 74% in 2014. However, the overall average of NIF Implementation and Monitoring for 2014 was significantly lower (28%).

***Q13. In your opinion, what are the main problems, if any, faced by your administration while implementing the EIF?**

Interoperability needs to be higher prioritized in our public administrations and agencies. There has been a lack of a vision up until recently and national steering of efforts still is lacking. Legislation needs to be revised to allow sharing of data.

Based on the [Report on the State of Play of Interoperability 2014](#), certain issues have been identified as impeding the implementation of the EIF at national level.

***Q14. Please select up to 5 major problems identified by your administration as impeding the implementation of the EIF.**

at most 5 choice(s)

- Technical aspects and rules are specified in some legislation in my country, resulting in difficulties to stay in line with technological innovations.
- Lack of central interoperability governance and coordination at national level.
- There are IT budget cuts in the public administrations of my country.
- Legislation does not take interoperability into account.
- Lack of a monitoring process for interoperability projects.
- Lack of engagement from stakeholders.
- The effort needed for NIF implementation and monitoring is too significant for my country.
- Public entities in my country generally do not have sufficient IT resources.
- Skills/competencies improvement is needed in my country for the development of interoperability solutions.
- Multilingualism (whenever needed) is a key challenge in my country.
- Legacy technology is a barrier to the implementation of the EIF in my country.
- Silo mentality is a barrier to the implementation of the EIF in my country.
- Different ways of working among IT people is a barrier to the implementation of the EIF in my country.
- Benefits from the use of common interoperability solutions are not always precisely assessed.
- Lack of public procurement strategy and guidelines on the use of standards
- Don't know / No opinion

Please feel free to comment on your answer.

It's hard to pick just 5. We have skilled people and are able to perform technical initiatives but besides that all other problems apply.

***Q15. Are the principles, recommendations, conceptual models and interoperability requirements contained in the EIF considered when a new ICT project is launched in your administration?**

- Yes
- Partially
- No
- Don't know / No opinion

***Please explain the reason(s) why these principles, recommendations, conceptual models and interoperability requirements are only partially considered when a new ICT project is launched in your administration.**

New projects and solutions are done with interoperability in mind. Legacy systems and services already put in place are typically not target for these interoperability requirements.

5. Assess the impact of the EIS/EIF revision

5.1 Assessment of the revision of the EIS

The “revision and extension” of the EIF is part of the Roadmap for the implementation of the Digital Single Market. In parallel, the Commission will propose a strategy, the EIS, to ensure that the EIF recommendations are addressed through concrete actions.

This section of the survey will shape the elements to be included in the revised EIF, assess the complexity/difficulty of their implementation and identify the type and severity of their impacts. It will also identify the priorities to be tackled by the EIS.

***Q16. Do you agree that the vision for a revised EIS should be that "By 2020, citizens and businesses should benefit from interoperable user-centric digital public services, at national and EU levels, in support to the free movement of goods, persons and services throughout the Union"?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / No opinion







The EIS should be considered from both the European and national perspectives. The following set of key actions was identified through consultation with the Member States’ representatives in the ISA (Interoperability Solutions for European Public Administrations) Committee and with EC officials. Those actions should be assessed to allow for their better prioritisation in the revised EIS to realise the European Union’s overall and Member States’ individual national interoperability objectives..

Q17. Please indicate the level of importance of each of the following actions with regard to the benefits that they may generate in your country in spite of the potential complexity of implementing any individual one.

	Not at all important	Rather not important	Neither important nor unimportant	Rather important	Very important	Don't know / No opinion
*1. Define and implement a governance structure to enable interoperability of digital public services at national level	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*2. Ensure that interoperability requirements and solutions are taken into account when preparing and evaluating legislation at EU and national level	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<p>*3. Put in place optimised organisational structures for delivering integrated (end-to-end) digital public services</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>*4. Develop tools and methods to allow public services to align their business processes, thus resulting to interoperable end-to-end public services</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<p>*5. Develop and promote monitoring mechanisms to assess the interoperability maturity and to measure the costs and benefits of the digital public services delivered to citizens and businesses</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>*6. Ensure users' involvement in the design of national public services</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<p>*7. Ensure effective communication channels, informal or under formal agreements, between interoperability stakeholders to collect, share and respond to interoperability needs and raise awareness</p>						
--	---	---	---	---	---	---

<p>*8. Promote the use of interoperable solutions including those produced by EC programmes in particular by ISA/ISA² (Internal Market Information system, sTESTA, open e-PRIOR) and Connecting Europe Facility (e.g. eID, eSignature, eDelivery and eInvoicing building blocks)</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>*9. Support activities related to access to European/national Base Registries (e.g. population, land, vehicles, criminal, etc.)</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<p>*10. Support activities related to the description, management and publication of information, including public Open Data so that public data are freely available for the use and reuse by others, unless restrictions apply.</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>*11. Support activities related to security and data protection issues of public services</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<p>*12. Support activities that facilitate the flow of information among national, regional and local administrations and between them and businesses and citizens</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>*13. Support activities ensuring that the "digital" dimension is considered when preparing national legislation, the digital impact is properly assessed and proper IT solutions are in place to facilitate decision-making and the national legislative process</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<p>*14. Align with and promote the use of the European Interoperability Reference Architecture (EIRA)</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>*15. Enrich and reuse solutions contained in the European Interoperability Cartography (EICart)</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>*16. Ensure that data is transferrable between public services without restrictions, with respect to data protection and security rules</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

***Please indicate the reason(s) why some actions are not considered as important by your administration.**

Making services and data interoperable is here deemed slightly higher than reusing existing services, although both efforts are needed.

***Q18. Are there any additional important action(s) that could better support interoperability at national level?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / No opinion







Q19. Please indicate the level of importance of each of the following actions with regard to the benefits that they may generate in the context of cross-border interoperability between your country and other EU Member States in spite of the potential complexity of implementing any individual one.

	Not at all important	Rather not important	Neither important nor unimportant	Rather important	Very important	Don't know / No opinion
*1. Define and promote governance structure/s for the interoperable management of digital public services at European level	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*2. Identify, liaise and share governance practices with relevant policies and their governance structures at EU or national level	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<p>*3. Ensure that interoperability requirements and solutions are taken into account when preparing and evaluating legislation at EU and national level</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>*4. Put in place optimised organisational structures for delivering integrated (end-to-end) digital public services</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>*5. Develop tools and methods to allow public services to align their business processes, thus resulting to interoperable European public services</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<p>*6. Develop and promote monitoring mechanisms to assess the interoperability maturity and to measure the costs and benefits of the digital public services delivered to citizens and businesses</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>*7. Ensure users' involvement in the design of European public services</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>*8. Prepare a communication strategy and have it implemented</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<p>*9. Ensure effective communication channels, informal or under formal agreements, between interoperability stakeholders to collect, share and respond to interoperability needs and raise awareness</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
--	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

<p>*10. Promote the use of interoperable solutions including those produced by EC programmes in particular by ISA/ISA² (Internal Market Information system, sTESTA, open e-PRIOR) and Connecting Europe Facility (e.g. eID, eSignature, eDelivery and eInvoicing building blocks)</p>						
--	---	---	---	---	---	---

<p>*11. Support activities related to the development and operation of Trans European Systems supporting EU policies, including their underlying network infrastructure</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>*12. Support activities related to access to European/national Base Registries (e.g. population, land, vehicles, criminal, etc.)</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>*13. Support activities related to the description, organisation and availability of catalogues of European and national public services</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<p>*14. Support activities related to the description, management and publication of information, including public Open Data so that public data are freely available for the use and reuse by others, unless restrictions apply.</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>*15. Support activities related to security and data protection issues of public services</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<p>*16. Support activities that facilitate the flow of information between national, regional and local administrations and between them and businesses and citizens</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>*17. Support activities ensuring that the "digital" dimension is considered when preparing EU legislation, the digital impact is properly assessed and proper IT solutions are in place to facilitate decision and law making</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<p>*18. Define, maintain and promote the European Interoperability Reference Architecture (EIRA)</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>*19. Put in place and operate the European Interoperability Cartography (EICart) and feed it with reusable and interoperable solutions from the EC, the Member States' administrations and other sources</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<p>*20. Ensure that data is transferrable between the European public services without restrictions, with respect to data protection and security rules</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
---	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

***Please indicate the reason(s) why some actions are not considered as important by your administration.**

Benchmarking and promoting services is important on an european level. Also facilitating sharing of knowledge is important.

***Q20. Are there any additional important action(s) that could better support interoperability at Eu ropean level as part of the EIS?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / No opinion

5.2 Assessment of the revision of the EIF

The revised and extended EIF will be the enhanced structure to provide guidance to public administrations regarding the definition, design and implementation of public services in the European Union. The EIF will have to be updated to reflect the recent evolution of the EU legislation and digital strategies as well as the emerging technological trends.

This section deals with the collection of input in relation to the importance of the proposed revised recommendations, the complexity of their implementation and impacts that they may produce (costs and benefits).

***Q21. Please select up to 10 areas in which you expect the EIF to contribute the most with regard to the implementation of interoperability in your country as well as in Europe in general.**

at most 10 choice(s)

- Cost savings
- Time savings
- Increased revenue
- Reduced operational costs
- Software vendor lock-in avoidance
- Support innovation
- Support employment
- Facilitate reuse, sharing and adoption of future solutions
- Increase transparency
- Increase growth and competitiveness
- Protection of fundamental rights
- Reduced CO2 emissions
- Better decision making
- Advance public and private policy goals
- Higher satisfaction levels in services for the direct beneficiaries of interoperability solutions
- Improved compliance for organisations implementing, operating and maintaining interoperability solutions
- Better data quality
- Better data availability
- Improved security
- Don't know / No opinion

Q22. Please indicate the level of importance of the following recommendations with regard to the benefits they may generate in your country in spite of the potential complexity of implementing any individual one.

The EIF adheres to certain interoperability principles; notably subsidiarity and proportionality, reusability, technological neutrality and adaptability, openness and transparency, user-centricity, inclusion and accessibility, security and privacy, multilingualism, administrative simplification, preservation of information, effectiveness and efficiency.

The EIF will be effective and serve its purpose to boost interoperability at European and national levels, when National Interoperability Frameworks (NIFs) are aligned with it. NIFs could be further tailored and extended to better meet the national context and needs.

The Members States should aim for openness and transparency, reuse and share solutions (including data) which are technologically neutral, easily accessible, secure, multilingual and also cater for proper preservation of exchanged information.

You can access a full description of each recommendation by clicking [here](#).

	Not at all important	Rather not important	Neither important nor unimportant	Rather important	Very important	Don't know / No opinion
*1. Data transferability	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*2. User involvement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*3. Once-only submission of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*4. Administrative simplification	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*5. Effectiveness and efficiency	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

For the establishment of European Public Services, public administrations should adopt service models that allow the reuse, whenever possible, of existing services and data components (building blocks, preferably loosely coupled with each other) and put in place and maintain the necessary infrastructure.

For this purpose, the EIF proposes a **Conceptual Model** the components of which, and corresponding recommendations, are presented below.

	Not at all important	Rather not important	Neither important nor unimportant	Rather important	Very important	Don't know / No opinion
*6. Base Registries	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*7. Open data	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*8. Service Catalogues	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*9. Security and privacy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The EIF proposes a **layered interoperability model** and recommends that public administrations should ensure proper “Interoperability governance” of their interoperability activities, also through alignment with the European Interoperability Framework and continuous monitoring.

Recommendations stemming from the proposed model are listed below.

	Not at all important	Rather not important	Neither important nor unimportant	Rather important	Very important	Don't know / No opinion
*10. Standards and specifications	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*11. Open specifications	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*12. Interoperability and public services governance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*13. Legal interoperability	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*14. Organisational interoperability	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*15. Information interoperability	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*16. Technical interoperability	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

***Please indicate the reason(s) why some recommendations are not considered as important by your administration.**

Technical interoperability is the "easy part" given the use case and a set of well established standards and specifications.

Different impacts may result from the implementation of the aforementioned actions. These impacts can be positive (also referred to as "benefits" in the remainder of this questionnaire) or negative (also referred to as "costs" in the remainder of this questionnaire) and can be grouped into the following three categories:

- Economic impacts: changes in costs (compliance cost, increased revenue, reduced operational cost, etc.), changes in time needed to perform an activity (that could often be translated in economic impact), administrative burdens to businesses and citizens, impact on the potential for innovation, competitiveness, technological development, etc.
- Social impacts: impacts on fundamental/human rights, changes in employment levels or job quality, social inclusion, impacts on health, security (including crime and terrorism), education, accessibility to and quality of public services, citizens' participation in decision-making, etc.
- Environmental impacts: positive and negative impacts associated with the changing status of the environment such as climate change, air, water and soil pollution, etc.

Q23. Please indicate, if any, the expected types of benefits resulting from the implementation of the following recommendations.

You can access a full description of each recommendation by clicking [here](#).

	Economic (for businesses and/or citizens)	Economic (for public administrations)	Social	Environmental	Other	None	Don't know / No opinion
*1. Data transferability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
*2. User involvement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
*3. Once-only submission of information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
*4. Administrative simplification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
*5. Effectiveness and efficiency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*6. Base Registries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
*7. Open data	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
*8. Service Catalogues	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
*9. Security and privacy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
*10. Standards and specifications	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
*11. Open specifications	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
*12. Interoperability and public services governance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
*13. Legal interoperability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
*14. Organisational interoperability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*15. Information interoperability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
*16. Technical interoperability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

***Please indicate which other type(s) of benefits the implementation of some recommendations will result in.**

Yields higher trust in the administration of Sweden and EU.

Q24. Please indicate the level of complexity to implement the following recommendations within your administration.

You can access a full description of each recommendation by clicking [here](#).

	Very easy	Easy	Neither easy nor complex	Complex	Very complex	Don't know / No opinion
*1. Data transferability	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*2. User involvement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*3. Once-only submission of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

*4. Administrative simplification	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*5. Effectiveness and efficiency	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*6. Base Registries	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*7. Open data	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*8. Service Catalogues	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*9. Security and privacy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*10. Standards and specifications	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*11. Open specifications	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*12. Interoperability and public services governance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*13. Legal interoperability	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*14. Organisational interoperability	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*15. Information interoperability	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*16. Technical interoperability	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

***Please indicate the reason(s) that make(s) some recommendations complex to implement.**

Making data and specifications available is less complex than making it interoperable.

Q25. Please indicate, if any, the foreseen types of costs to implement the following recommendations within your administration.

You can access a full description of each recommendation by clicking [here](#).

	Economic	Social	Environmental	Other cost	None	Don't know / No opinion
*1. Data transferability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
*2. User involvement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
*3. Once-only submission of information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
*4. Administrative simplification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
*5. Effectiveness and efficiency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
*6. Base Registries	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
*7. Open data	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
*8. Service Catalogues	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
*9. Security and privacy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
*10. Standards and specifications	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
*11. Open specifications	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*12. Interoperability and public services governance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
*13. Legal interoperability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
*14. Organisational interoperability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
*15. Information interoperability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
*16. Technical interoperability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

***Please indicate the reason(s) why the implementation of some recommendations will not incur any cost.**

Making specifications open has a very small marginal cost.

Q26. In your opinion, how would you rate the overall cost of implementing the proposed recommendations within your administration?

Please rate each recommendation from 1 to 5 (1 being the least costly and 5 the most costly).

You can access a full description of each recommendation by clicking [here](#).

	1 (least costly)	2	3	4	5 (most costly)	Don't know / No opinion
*1. Data transferability	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*2. User involvement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*3. Once-only submission of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*4. Administrative simplification	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*5. Effectiveness and efficiency	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*6. Base Registries	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*7. Open data	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*8. Service Catalogues	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*9. Security and privacy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*10. Standards and specifications	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*11. Open specifications	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*12. Interoperability and public services governance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*13. Legal interoperability	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*14. Organisational interoperability	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*15. Information interoperability	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*16. Technical interoperability	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please feel free to comment on your answer.

The use of a specific technology can sometimes result in some limitations or restrictions.

***Q27. In your view, are there any technological constraints that may hinder the implementation of the aforementioned recommendations within your administration?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / No opinion

Q28. What is the current level of implementation of each of the following recommendations as well as your future plans in relation to their implementation within your administration?

You can access a full description of each recommendation by clicking [here](#).

	Already implemented	Partially implemented	Will be implemented	Will not be implemented	Don't know / No opinion
*1. Data transferability	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*2. User involvement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
*3. Once-only submission of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*4. Administrative simplification	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*5. Effectiveness and efficiency	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

*6. Base Registries	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*7. Open data	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*8. Service Catalogues	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*9. Security and privacy	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*10. Standards and specifications	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*11. Open specifications	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*12. Interoperability and public services governance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*13. Legal interoperability	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*14. Organisational interoperability	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<p>*15. Information interoperability</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>*16. Technical interoperability</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

*

Please specify to which technological constraints you are referring.

Data quality in legacy systems.

*Q29. In your opinion, would you say that citizens will also benefit from the EIF revision?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / No opinion

*Q30. In your opinion, would you say that businesses will also benefit from the EIF revision?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / No opinion

Administrative burdens are the costs to businesses and citizens for complying with the information obligations resulting from government imposed legislation and regulation.

***Q31. In your opinion, to what extent do you agree that the aforementioned recommendations will contribute to reducing administrative burden for citizens?**

- Fully agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Fully disagree
- Don't know / No opinion

Please feel free to comment on your answer.

***Q32. In your opinion, to what extent do you agree that the aforementioned recommendations will contribute to reducing administrative burden for businesses?**

- Fully agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Fully disagree
- Don't know / No opinion

Please feel free to comment on your answer.

Q33. Taking into account existing constraints (e.g. technological, human and financial resources, skills), please select up to 10 recommendations that will have the highest priority to be implemented within your administration in order to better achieve interoperability during the 2017-2020 period.

at most 10 choice(s)

- Solutions and data reusability
- Openness and Transparency
- Technological neutrality and data transferability
- User centricity (user involvement, once only submission of information...)
- Inclusion and accessibility
- Security and privacy
- Multilingualism
- Once-only submission of information
- Administrative simplification
- Preservation of information
- Effectiveness and efficiency
- Base Registries
- Open data
- Service Catalogues
- Standards and specifications
- Interoperability governance
- Public service governance
- Legal interoperability
- Organisational interoperability
- Information interoperability
- Technical interoperability
- Don't know / No opinion

Q34. As mentioned at the beginning of this consultation, please feel free to express any further comment that you may have on the draft revised EIF text.

6. Subsidiarity

The Impact Assessment also verifies whether EU action in areas beyond its exclusive competence is compatible with the principle of subsidiarity.

As defined in [Article 5\(3\) of the Treaty on European Union](#), the Union should intervene only if it is able to act more effectively than EU countries at their national or local levels.

Q35. Do you agree that, with regard to the revision of the EIS and the EIF, action at EU level provides clear added value compared to action taken at Member State level?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / No opinion

***Please explain the main differentiating benefit(s) of an EU action compared to an action taken at Member States level.**

It ensures a cross country perspective and the alignment of national initiatives.

Contact

DIGIT-ISA2-CONSULTATIONS@ec.europa.eu
