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Objectives of DAE Going Local assessment

The overall objective of the DAE Going Local exercise was to target the main stakeholders in each Member State in order to (1) raise awareness about the DAE, and (2) generate support for DAE actions.

Summary – Main messages

- **Lessons learned:** the exercise was well received. Nevertheless, the considerable effort involved will only be worthwhile if there is consistent engagement with stakeholders at a national level. This ongoing engagement should be systematically integrated into the DAE implementation in order to be effective in achieving objectives and efficient in inter-Member States of the results achieved for the effort expended.

- **Objectives reached or not?** Yes. The going local exercise has shown that the “shared determination” and “common vision” envisaged by the Implementation and Governance section of the Digital Agenda was achieved: Member States have expressed their full commitment to realizing the DAE's ambitions. What is less clear is whether this declared commitment will be translated into active support in the DAE implementation.

- **Right type of stakeholders reached?** Yes, the most important categories such as administrations, regulators, industry, members of parliaments, universities, and NGOs, including consumer associations were reached although in certain MEMBER STATES it was not possible to engage new stakeholders, beyond usual suspects. Overall number of participants: approximately 1900; average participation per Member State: 75.

- **Good stakeholder involvement, lively debate?** Yes. The Going Local exercise proved valuable in triggering the first wave of stakeholder discussions following the launch of the DAE and stimulating engagement as foreseen in its governance section. Enthusiasm for the Going Local event and commitment to the DAE objectives were expressed by the stakeholders in all the MEMBER STATES. The DAE Ambassadors successfully "initiated" the local stakeholders to the DAE ambitions and actions. The visits stimulated lively debate on a number of issues resulting in constructive comments (both on the governance and on specific action areas).

- **Did implementation and governance ideas emerge from the exercise?** Yes. The common request from local stakeholders is "coordination". Member States expect the European Commission to assume a supervisory role and set clear reporting procedures and monitoring of implementation. It was stressed repeatedly that the broad and cross-cutting nature of the Digital Agenda means that it is envisaged to structure stakeholder dialogue without neglecting intra-state level dialogue. It was suggested that cooperation with the local stakeholders should be engaged more consistently and on a long-term basis. The Digital Agenda Scoreboard could prove instrumental in facilitating such cooperation.

- **Strong Media coverage achieved?** Partly, only in a few MEMBER STATES. Media presence was not an objective of the exercise per se; some Going Local ambassadors actively decided not to seek media attention.

- **Registrations at website?** In this, the exercise was moderately successful, generating 215 to date. The majority (63%) of registrations are derived from only 5 MEMBER STATES. A diverse range of registered stakeholders has been achieved.

- **Going Local 2.0?** Yes. Evidence of the initiative's success can be inferred from the multiple requests for follow-up visits from stakeholders in most Member States. In
addition, a majority of Going Local ambassadors insisted that the exercise must not be an isolated event and that an active follow-up is necessary. For follow-up exercises, participants would favour focussing on specific issues with well defined objectives and actions, rather than covering the entire scope of DAE.
Part 1: Going Local – what we did and who we reached

Assessment methodology

This evaluation covers the Going Local events in all 27 MEMBER STATES and builds on mission reports- structured interviews with a member of each country team per MEMBER STATES - and a short survey of the EC delegations to obtain information on media coverage and attendance lists.

The mission reports provide a good overview of the policy lessons, i.e. what was learned but they provide limited information on the format and other organisational aspects of the Going Local events and few suggestions, if any, about the Going Local follow-up. Therefore structured interviews with members of country teams were essential to explore those areas further. Additional information on media coverage and stakeholders present from the representations was sought.

Format of the events: clear and consistent message

Individual country teams were able to decide on how Going Local should be conducted in their given MEMBER STATES. A plenary meeting was organised in every MEMBER STATES, to provide a general presentation of DAE, followed by discussion. In Latvia and in Ireland, the plenary sessions were web-streamed.

A range of formats for communicating the DAE was used: in 10 MEMBER STATES group meetings were organised, usually either with the participation limited to certain categories of stakeholders or focused on selected areas of DAE; in 12 MEMBER STATES a number of bilateral meetings were held with high-level stakeholders (usually representatives of government). The latter were considered particularly relevant to achieve political support for the DAE actions. Various other formats were used, for example a presentation of the DAE at a high-level conference on IT and human rights in Sweden.

The format of the Going Local events organised in September and October was generally more developed. Bilateral meetings were organised in the majority of the MEMBER STATES (including Denmark, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland and Slovakia) and achieved positive results by involving key stakeholders. Group meetings were organised in Denmark, Greece and Slovakia.

In the majority of MEMBER STATES the Going Local took the form of a one day event. However, in several MEMBER STATES (Spain, Poland, Portugal and Greece) the duration of the event was longer to allow more time for discussion with key stakeholders.

Graph 1 illustrates an approximation of the effectiveness of particular formats of Going Local based on mission reports and interviews with members of country teams, where "5" is a baseline (objectives of the Going Local appropriately achieved at an average level) and "10" is the maximum score.1

---

1 We first categorised formats used in each MEMBER STATES covered. Then we estimated the effectiveness of the Going Local exercise both on the basis of: 1) objective parameters, such as: diversity of stakeholders, level of commitment expressed, breadth of discussion and various other factors specific to particular MEMBER STATES, for example whether an important category of stakeholders was omitted and 2) subjective view of interviewed members of country teams of the appropriateness of the format to meet the Going Local objectives. The results were quantified as follows: 1 – much below baseline, 2 – below baseline, 3 – baseline, 4 – above
Graph 1. Effectiveness of the Going Local according to the format used

Going Local was most successful in MEMBER STATES where more than one format was used: for each such category the score was above the average baseline scenario, with particularly high scores for MEMBER STATES where three or more different types of formats were used. For example, in Germany a plenary meeting presentation was followed by discussion in thematic blocks and then by a meeting with young entrepreneurs and a small meeting with government. In Netherlands, due to large stakeholder numbers, two sessions were organized with the same agenda, including a plenary session and three break-out groups: Research and Innovation for an Intelligent Economy, ICT addressing societal challenges and Regulation, availability and access, followed by an informal lunch. A separate off site lunch meeting was organised for representatives of employers' associations.

A unified message outlining the DAE goals, tailored for local issues, was sent to participants. Slides listing actions, speaking points and defensives and other background documents were used in some MEMBER STATES as well as additional and general ICT documentation. These slides were much appreciated by the Going Local ambassadors.

Going Local members felt that the format of the event was generally "very appropriate" or "appropriate" in meeting the objectives of the exercise. Certain minor organisational issues were raised by the interviewees: planning of the event could have started earlier, to allow for better stakeholders' representations; attention could have been paid to avoid organising events during traditional holiday season and, for some MEMBER STATES, only a plenary event was organised so the opportunity to engage high-level stakeholders through targeted bilateral meetings was to some extent missed.

**Nearly 1900 stakeholders reached**

From a diversity perspective, Going Local was very successful and the most important categories of stakeholders, in particular administrations, regulators, industry (both associations and individual companies) and NGOs, including consumer associations were reached. Various other stakeholders, such as members of parliaments, universities, embassies,
local government, cultural institutions and law firms were also present in some MEMBER STATES. In most of countries, stakeholder involvement went beyond the 'usual (institutional) suspects' but occasionally some important categories were missed, like regional and local government as well as members of parliament.

The overall number of stakeholders reported by representations was 1885 but it is probable that the actual number of stakeholders reached was well above 2000.

The number of stakeholders present differed from approximately 240 in Netherlands to around 40 in smaller MEMBER STATES (Graph 2, below). The average for 25 MEMBER STATES (for which data are available) is 75 attendees. However, the average for 15 MEMBER STATES with lower turnout (all MEMBER STATES except the 10 MEMBER STATES individually shown in the table) is about half i.e. 40 persons. The number of stakeholders reached was not always proportionate to the size of the country, as demonstrated by excellent participation in several small MEMBER STATES, including Slovenia and Malta.

Potential stakeholders were usually identified by Commission representations, in consultation with DG INFSO. Sometimes more effort was spent, for example in Germany, where the initial list of 'usual suspects' was gradually expanded by frequent consultations between DG INFSO and the representation.

In MEMBER STATES where stakeholders' turnout was lower than expected, this was due to holiday season or lack of proper coordination (usually because of lack of time) between DG INFSO and representations.

**Media coverage**

Media coverage of Going Local varied greatly between MEMBER STATES. It is worth noting that Going Local was not primarily intended to include media events.

In smaller MEMBER STATES, Going Local was too considered as newsworthy and received relatively more attention. In Malta, for example, the event was covered on the news bulletins of the main television stations and reported in the main newspapers. In Bulgaria, where media engagement was sought actively, we recorded 32 media reports, including 14 press articles.
and 6 audiovisual broadcasts. The Going Local event in Romania also received extensive media coverage.

In total, 116 individual cases of media coverage were reported by the representations. The real number is likely to be much higher, due mainly to difficulties in counting the exact number of media reports.

The format of the media coverage was well balanced, as illustrated in Graph 3. The visibility in audio-visual media should be highlighted; for example in the Netherlands, interviews with the Going Local ambassador were broadcast by the main TV and radio stations.

![Graph 3. Media coverage by category](image)

**Online registration survey (IPM)**

The DAE website online survey (using the Commission's Interactive Policy Making tool) is designed to register interest and/or support for DAE actions and to better prepare Going Local sessions. Stakeholders can provide information about their interest in the DAE, current actions in support of the DAE (beyond main business) and actions envisaged for 2011.

To date, the exercise has been moderately successful, with 215 registrations from 25 MEMBER STATES and 10 registrations from outside the EU (see Annex 1 for full overview). The registered stakeholders are relatively diverse and represent the most important categories. 80% represent organisations and 20% are individuals. However, almost 63% of the registrations have originated from only five MEMBER STATES, as illustrated by Graph 4.
The number of registrations so far (215) represents only 11% of the number of stakeholders present at Going Local events (almost 1900). This might be explained partly by the lack of a deadline, which means there is no sense of urgency to sign up. In comparison, a similar number of registrations (over 200) were achieved in just 2 weeks for the DAE Stakeholder Day, where the call for input and incentive to contribute was very specific.

Therefore, aspects such as clear purpose and incentive, a defined timeframe and, above all, more interactive and truly transparent Web 2.0 tools can enhance stakeholder interest in signing up to the DAE community.
Part 2: Assessment of the Policy lessons – what we heard and what we learned

A. What we heard: Country specific issues for each DAE action area

This section highlights extracts from the Ambassadors’ mission reports as regards to each DEA action area. The overall enthusiastic acknowledgement of the DAE initiative and its itinerant dissemination campaign\(^2\) suggests our engagement has been successful. Stakeholders were supportive and keen to actively participate in the debate and provide constructive contributions. Some concerns and criticisms were raised and these are addressed in the sections dedicated to each pillar.

A vibrant digital single market

This pillar was the subject of lively debate in most Member States. In general the consumer perspective and the involvement of users in the policy making spectrum was identified as crucial for successful implementation of this pillar. In several MEMBER STATES a dedicated meeting on copyright issues would be welcomed (FI, EE, RO).

In most Member States the various aspects of payment security were addressed. Some stakeholders stressed the key role of eID interoperability (DE) and of the liability of intermediaries (FI). It was also suggested that the Commission should focus on enabling infrastructures like eIDM and eSignature, through pilots, standards and regulation (NL).

Interoperability and Standards

Debate on this pillar focused primarily on eID interoperability. The importance of consumer-friendly standards (AT) and of better and faster standard setting was stressed (NL). A lack of stakeholder interest in standards, resulting in the need to be pushed by the public sector, was highlighted (DE). Public authorities should lead some important standardization initiatives and be able to impose some results to the public sector (ES).

Trust and Security

Trust and Security issues were raised by stakeholders in several MEMBER STATESs. It was felt the DAE did not give enough emphasis to this action area (EE). A deep reflection on regulatory burdens caused by privacy rules needs to be stimulated (NL, SI). SMEs should be involved in the IA of the review of the regulatory framework for data protection (NL).

Fast and ultra fast Internet access

This pillar drew the attention of stakeholders in most of the MEMBER STATES. Broadband targets\(^3\) were the subject of lively discussion, particularly from the point of view of funding and statistical indicators. The latter were also the target of sharp criticism in one case (BG). Concerns surrounding a meaningful measure of broadband penetration were raised: the

---

\(^2\) Only in one case (CY) the overall enthusiasm was not shared as a consequence of structural barriers the country has to face in making IT a priority for the Government.

\(^3\) In one case the DAE broadband targets were depicted as very ambitious (CZ); in another case the national plan for BB will be more ambitious than the DAE as the optical access by household is above the European average (SI).
Commission should assure that benchmarks are assessed by EU-wide equal standards to enable meaningful comparative analysis (Digital Scoreboard) (SK).

With regards to next generation networks, one of the issues raised was at which point and to what extent should the Member State governments intervene if the private sector does not invest? (MT). The need for studies on the socio-economic impact and a cost-benefit analysis for superfast broadband was highlighted (UK). In order to incentivize investment, more clarity on NGA regulation would be needed (UK). The importance to respect the principle of technological neutrality was also stressed (CZ, LU); radio spectrum policy is a key issue as wireless solution could help achieve the 'Broadband for all' objective (FI).

Research and Innovation

The debate on this pillar raised several issues. The need for simplification of research administration was stressed (DE, NL). Multiplication of instruments Joint Technology Initiatives and Private Public Partnerships was considered to be the opposite of reducing fragmentation (DE). The need for rethinking structural funds to favour innovation, adopting a trust based model running higher risks but more effective was also stressed. European Pilots (including CIP) with a mix of committed public/private actors could be an effective way of accelerating pre-deployment phases (PT). The DAE failed to explicitly make reference to its support for digital entrepreneurs/e-business (UK). There is the need to connect institutions (companies, authorities) and innovative digital natives (ES). Increasing SMEs' access to research funding was seen as crucial (FR, NL). It was also noticed that the target of 3% of GDP invested in R&D is still a distant goal in some MEMBER STATES (SI, DK) while in others it was not perceived as a realizable goal given the specificity of the country (CY).

Enhancing digital literacy, skills and inclusion

e-Inclusion is perceived as a priority. The common message emerging from the Going Local discussions underlines mainly the lack of e-skills, the need to tackle the digital divide at school (SE) and to involve parents and teachers in the process (CZ, EE, LV, NL). The risks of digital exclusion need to be tackled through: engaging the people affected, promoting the benefits of going on line, facilitating access to equipment and services (subsidies), accessible design of both equipment and service which are built around the needs of the excluded, deploying intermediaries such as health and care workers, voluntary groups, pharmacies, libraries, raising the incentives for adoption and use both by citizens and their helpers (who can act as mentors) (UK); establishing local points of presence (pharmacies, libraries) (SE, UK). The role of libraries and primary schools in teaching digital skills was emphasized: a programme where children teach their parents was mentioned as particularly successful (EL). In the field of digital literacy and eSkills, better coordination is required both in policy and in the organization among INFSO, EAC, ENT (NL). Benchmarking could be a key policy tool to develop the field of e-skills.

---

4 Some suggestions (NL): review of heavy handed ex post auditing procedures; complementing top-down defined research programme with a stronger bottom-up scheme; giving young generation space and freedom to reinvent the processes and incentives for turning FP into an innovation programme, instead of only an industry support programme; rethinking R&D support process from a community and an all-encompassing perspective and nominating a high profile CEO for Europe.

5 A best practice case from PT: initiative Magalhães, one laptop per every student with wireless Internet access.
ICT-enabled benefits for EU society
This pillar was the subject of debate only in a few Member States and mainly related to the area of eHealth. It was felt that the focus should be less on the technology push and more on incentives to changes in working practices. The realignment should put patient experience at the centre of clinical practice; there is the need to focus on the utility of innovations to drive take-up. A top down approach is not likely to find wide acceptance amongst practitioners; clinicians are starting to organize to establish practitioner-led standards (UK). With regards to e-Government, direct incentives should be given to encourage citizens to use e-government services, beyond the current indirect incentives, i.e. avoiding the queue (MT).

Stakeholders' interests according to the IPM website
As one of the requirements for registrations at IPM website, stakeholders have to indicate their main area of interest in DAE actions, structured by pillars. As Graph 6 illustrates, stakeholders who have already registered were the most interested in "Enhancing digital literacy, skills and inclusion" (29%), followed by "ICT for social changes" (16%) and "Interoperability and Standards" (15%). For surprisingly few stakeholders (less than 7%) the main interest was "Fast and ultra fast Internet access".

![Graph 6. Registrations at IPM website by stakeholders' main interest](image)

B. What we learned: local voices on implementation and governance
The Going Local exercise has shown that the “shared determination” and “common vision” envisaged by the Implementation and Governance section of the Digital Agenda was achieved: Member States have acknowledged the DAE ambitions and expressed their full commitment to achieving them. It is not possible to assess, at this stage, whether this declared commitment will be translated into a constant and active support in the DAE implementation.

The common message received from the local stakeholders is for an emphasis on "coordination". Member States expect the Commission to lead on supervision of the process and set clear reporting procedures and indications on how the EC will monitor the implementation.
It was stressed repeatedly that given the broad and cross-cutting nature of the Digital Agenda, it is envisaged to structure the stakeholder dialogue without neglecting intra-state level dialogue. Going "more local" (in terMember States of political reach, and not geographical) would be a way to provide importance and responsibility whilst stimulating engagement of key stakeholders for the implementation of the DAE. The most relevant suggestions traceable to a common line are listed below, distinguished between EU, national and intra-state layers.

What we learned on Implementation and Governance

EU level

Coordination
- It is expected that EC assumes the role of supervision of the implementation. Clear reporting procedures at EU level are needed (LV). The EC needs to explain how will monitor the process in reaching the objectives of the DAE (LU).
- Indication of what measures the EC will take against countries that do not make progress towards the DAE targets (EL).
- A management plan needs to be developed. A coordination report is expected. (FI) Detailed implementation plan are needed to avoid the past experience of the Lisbon Strategy (LV).
- It would be appropriate to have a Commission contact point for DAE activities for each MEMBER STATES (with DG INFSO assuming a coordinating role) (LV). Role of the Directorate for the Information Society to coordinate all the Government activity in the ICT field so that there are no uncoordinated calls for proposals by several Ministries active in this field (SI).
- Regular updates of the DAE developments to be sent by DG INFSO and conveyed to stakeholders through the Representations.
- A more explicit coordination between structural funds and DAE (EL).

Stakeholder engagement
- The Commission (EU) is expected to demonstrate leadership across the board and set the example for MEMBER STATES policies; more can be done to link the DAE with national policies and vice versa. Develop ‘citizen’ and ‘use’ side of DAE. Involve users (consumers, SME, patients, practitioners, etc) more across the policymaking spectrum, but in particular in pilots and in the design of policies like eIDM, eInvoicing, eProcurement, copyrights, eHealth, eSkills (NL).
- The cooperation with the local stakeholders needs to be engaged more consistently and on a long-term basis (FR).
- Need to mobilize key stakeholders around achieving a number of key goals, emphasis on bottom-up approaches thus follow-up could be to mobilize voluntary organizations, local intermediary services, colleges and regions, as well as end-users (UK). A better dialogue was requested at EU level (what can companies do to help), similar to the Swedish concept on bredbandsforum, a platform for exchange of ideas (SE).
- Make interaction with stakeholders a sustainable process, in particular using web tools 2.0. This interaction need to be structured around specific topics of interest for targeted stakeholders (ES).

Digital Assembly
- Some doubts have been expressed on whether the General Assembly provides the most appropriate forum for the follow-up (it might remain too high level) (FI) Since the DAE covers topics under responsibility of several ministries, it needs to be ensured that the representative(s) of the DAE assembly have all the mandate needed (DE).
- The DAE General Assembly could be complemented by yearly DAE Local Assemblies. This will increase the commitment of the stakeholders, afraid that their voice will not be heard (LU).

National level
- Coordination of DAE activities at national level via the Council of European Affairs, in particular the Working Group for the Lisbon Strategy, or creation of an ad-hoc working group on the DAE in the Council (BU).
- Regular working relationship should be established with the Regional Development and the other relevant ministries to contribute to their implementation work in specific areas. A stronger EC involvement in the
ground work would be appreciated (LV).

- All MEMBER STATES could commit to publish their national digital agendas and appoint a high representative/spokespersons (EL).

- “Best practices”:
  - Creation of an intra-governmental group for the Digital Agenda + at least a Deputy Minister responsible for Digital Agenda issues in order to avoid fragmentation (CZ).
  - In Latvia the Ministry of Regional Development was appointed as the coordinating institution for the EU 2020 Strategy. It will present a plan to the Government on the implementation of the DAE. All the stakeholders will be invited to report on the implementation of their DAE actions (LV).
  - Possible indication of a rapporteur responsible for the DAE matters in the National Parliament (PT).
  - Co-ordination of the DAE assured by the Information Society Department of the Ministry of Administration and Internal Affairs MSWiA, running an inter-service group composed of mid level officials in all Ministries concerned (PL).

Infra-state level
Suggestion to repeat the exercise and to reach also the infra-state level, as the regional and local authorities (FR, EL).
Part 3: Conclusions, "Going Local 2.0" – next steps

Conclusions

The Going local exercise although conceived and concretized with a short term notice, has resulted in a successful initiative. However, the design of future follow-up activities needs to take into consideration the very broad and cross-cutting nature of the DAE, therefore be focused on specific issues, accompanied by a more targeted advertisement.

More focused approach

Most participants expressed the view that a more narrow focus with well defined actions for the second exercise would be more useful than a second general DAE presentation. Indeed, certain country teams like the UK already tried this approach (e-health in the UK case).

A more focused approach will necessitate a prioritization process or a "DAE gap analysis" to assess which issues need addressing in which MEMBER STATES. This could be a centralised analysis by INFSO or fed into the DAE High Level Group agenda.

At the EU level

- As shown in the section “what we learned”, MEMBER STATES demand and expect from the European Commission to take the role of supervisor and set the premises for an enhanced coordination. Clear reporting procedures and monitoring indicators are expected (FI, LV), together with a concrete management plan. Annual publication of the Digital Agenda Scoreboard should contribute to the achievement of this expectation.

At the national level

- All MEMBER STATES could commit to publish their national digital agendas and appoint a high representative/spokespersons (EL). The figure of a national coordinator responsible for the DAE implementation in each MEMBER STATES could indeed be seen as a best practice (CZ, LV) worth spreading in all MEMBER STATES.

At the intra-state level

- Moving the barycenter of the going local exercise to the intra-state level, via the figure of the national coordinator, could be envisageable in order to stimulate engagement of regional, local authorities and stakeholders. The national coordinator could engage cooperation with local stakeholders on a regular and long-term basis and act as their port-parole in the various DAE working groups, HLGs, forthcoming Going Local visits and in the Digital Assembly.

Stakeholder dialogue

- Interaction with stakeholders should be made a sustainable process, in particular using web tools 2.0. This interaction needs to be structured around specific topics of interest for targeted stakeholders.
- Combined communication campaigns (trust + eskills) targeting a restricted range of targets would find it more suitable the local scenario.
Follow-up steps

Timing of Going Local 2.0
The follow-up events will be held in October/November 2011. A press briefing on DAE progress will be organised on the occasion of the Budapest Informal Ministerial Meeting scheduled in April. The timing of the follow-up exercise should give enough time for the "DAE gap analysis," completion of the prioritization process, and the promotion of the outcome of the Digital Agenda Assembly.

The role of the representations
Close coordination will be necessary both within DG INFSO and with DG COMM in scheduling and organising the events. The Heads of Representations will be made aware of the assessment of the exercise and certain suggestions of the follow-up procedure.

Regional level
The role of national authorities in reaching out to stakeholders that have not been touched by the Going Local (e.g. at regional level) will be explored.

DAE High Level Group
It should be further discussed what role the HLG could play in implementing the DAE, for example in the scope for Local Digital Assemblies. The Representations may be involved in this discussion.

IPM website registrations, other stakeholder reactions
Every registration will receive a response indicating what we have done, or will do, with ideas presented by a stakeholder and with indication of the relevant contact person. Going local 2.0 could be used to strengthen the link with the organisations registered on the website i.e. by including actively these organisations in the follow-up.