

Export Date	18/02/2016 09:51		
Country	Item 0: Opening and Agenda adoption - Opinion	Intervention: Take the floor?	Comments
Belgium	I agree	Don't know yet	
Bulgaria	I agree	No	
Czech Republic	I agree	No	
Estonia	I agree	No	No comments.
France	I agree	No	
Italy	I agree	No	
Cyprus	I agree	No	
Latvia	I agree	No	
Lithuania	I agree	No	
Luxembourg	I agree	No	
Hungary	I agree	No	
Malta	I agree	No	
Netherlands	I agree	Don't know yet	Many items of the agenda consist of progress reports or presentations without concrete proposals (items 3, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16), leaving ample room for actual strategic discussion.
Austria	I agree	No	
Poland	I agree	No	
Portugal	I agree	No	
Slovenia	I agree	No	
Slovakia	I agree	No	
Finland	I agree	No	
Norway	I agree	No	

Country	Item 1: ESS Vision 2020: ESS.VIP VALIDATION - Opinion	Intervention: Take the floor?	Comments
Belgium	I agree	Yes	We support the idea of standardisation also in the field of the validation of results to be sent to EUROSTAT as well as the tool to be used especially as it is developed in SAS. We will have more comments on the premises.
Bulgaria	I agree	No	
Czech Republic	I agree	Don't know yet	We agree that Eurostat should provide member states with the list with obligatory validation rules. However, we suggest that there should be clearly stated mechanism for approval of any changes of these obligatory validation rules. We ask for clarification of the action "Implementation of the methodological handbook in statistical domains".
Estonia	I agree	No	No comments
France	Abstention	Don't know yet	The methodological handbook for validation is very complete, interesting but theoretical. It takes into account the whole process of validation from data collection to data dissemination. On the other hand, the draft ESS business architecture for validation seems much narrower, focused on the final step (final validation between NSIs and Eurostat of data sent to Eurostat). The standard validation language for describing the validation rules is not operational yet. Before taking decisions on the follow-up actions, it would be preferable to wait for the results of the questionnaire on the deployment of the main deliverables within the NSIs (Will Validation project be implemented in NSIs ?). The implementation of the methodological handbook in specific statistical domains is not obvious as it is very general and complete and much wider than the definition of specific validation rules to be applied to data sent to Eurostat.
Italy	I agree	No	
Cyprus	I agree	No	CYSTAT takes note of the outcomes of the ESS Vision 2020 Validation project. We agree with the proposal to set up a task force on validation and an essnet. We also agree with the proposed roadmap.
Latvia	I agree	No	
Lithuania	I agree	No	
Luxembourg	Don't know yet	Don't know yet	
Hungary	I agree	Don't know yet	Hungary agrees with the summary report on ESS.VIP VALIDATION and is currently discussing internally the methodological handbook and the ways of implementing its deliverables. In line with the opinion of the DIME/ITDG Steering Group, we propose that the development of a standard validation language should continue. Immediate steps require considerable improvement of the current version of VTL to be carried out with involvement of ESS members (establish a VTL User Group composed of Member States). Pilot test focusing on practical implementation of common validation rules and a roadmap for its implementation in the relevant processes is important for future actions.
Malta	I agree	No	
Netherlands	Don't know yet	Don't know yet	- Given the nature of the issues with VTL pointed out by the ESSnet on validation, Q2 2016 seems a very ambitious deadline to finish improvements. We feel it is better to take the time (e.g. until Q4 2016) to resolve these issues fundamentally. - The proposed TF will pilot VTL in statistical domains. We feel this is only sensible after the issues with VTL have been resolved. - Before implementing VTL as an actual language for the ESS, it should go through the standardisation procedure the ESS has been developing recently. - The usability and user-friendliness of the services mentioned in medium-term goal strongly depend on 1) the availability of an agreed-upon language (we do not have one at the time) and 2) the chosen architecture. These should be developed prior to implementing services. - The current proposal only describes activities, but does not mention which actors are involved.
Austria	I agree	Yes	It should be clarified what is meant by implementation at national level
Poland	I agree	Don't know yet	The core of the project is VTL language. It should cover all necessary validation rules. So called business rules should be transformed into technical rules. This raises several questions. Is transformation (from business to technical rules) planned? Our experience is that even designed strong VTL language may require additional programming during implementation. What is proposed for such cases? Could it be explained?
Portugal	I agree	Don't know yet	
Slovenia	I agree	Don't know yet	
Slovakia	I agree	Don't know yet	We appreciate the work carried out within ESS Vision 2020 Validation project. But we would like to express certain doubts towards the VTL; in case it is developed in the way to be unambiguous and complex one and it meets all requirements concerning validation rules, it will still remain heavily understandable for community of statistician.
Finland	I agree	Don't know yet	

Norway	Don't know yet	Don't know yet	Wich Statistical domains will chosen for the implementation and further dvelopments?

Country	Item 2: ESS Vision 2020: ESDEN and SERV projects - Opinion	Intervention: Take the floor?	Comments
Belgium	I agree	Don't know yet	In any case we have an example time series analysis and lessons learned. An architecture is needed to sustain all these services.
Bulgaria	I agree	No	
Czech Republic	I agree	No	Comments regarding ESDEN were reported within ESSnet2 SIMSTAT. System still needs some development but during the testing phase the system proved to be plausible. We support the development of shared services under the umbrella of SERV project.
Estonia	I agree	No	No comments
France	I disagree	Yes	The ESDEN project is deeply linked to SIMSTAT project for trade in goods statistics. If decision to implement SIMSTAT is taken by next ESSC in may, the common secure IT network for secure exchange and computation of micro-data should be completely operational in each Member State (in a production environment and not only test framework) quite soon, which is very ambitious. Member states will cooperate within SIMSTAT, if they have the assurance that the microdata they send to other member states are completely secured and if the data exchanges are smooth. And even if SIMSTAT pilot shows that it is possible to exchange data securely between NSIs, the conditions are not optimal : at the time being, it is not easy to receive and send data. Automatisation of the data exchanges should be developed, to be able to produce easily monthly statistics. The analysis of the SIMSTAT final report in march/april 2016 will be very important in this context.
Italy	I agree	No	
Cyprus	I agree	No	CYSTAT takes note of the progress of the two projects.
Latvia	I agree	No	SIMSTAT "+" - The CSB of Latvia has direct access to the CCN/CSI Gateway which allows transmitting micro-data in secure way. Data exchange process testing has been successful. The data are transmitted/received to all 19 participating MS. - Latvia is able to benefit from the exchanged micro-data and evaluates them as an important and useful additional data source in terms of the quality. LV stated that the total values of mirror exports were higher than the value of nationally collected imports. - Possibility of re-using mirror data will increase if the partner ID will be collected and exchanged. "- If SIMSTAT will be implemented, than there will be extra burden on respondents in transitional period (at least two years is planned to collect both flows for more analysis) due to mandatory introduction of two additional indicators for dispatches (export) flow - Partner ID number and Country of origin. (It in transitional period) - Although SIMSTAT is evaluated as good additional data source, but there is expected additional burden/workload on NSI. There will be necessity to improve whole technical part of the process in order to make it easily manageable. Pilot exercise revealed the existence of significant triangular trade value in the information received from MSs collecting partner ID number. As these data could not be used for coverage of Intrastat imports, further study with real collected data on all MS is needed.
Lithuania	I agree	No	
Luxembourg	I agree	No	
Hungary	I agree	No	
Malta	I agree	No	
Netherlands	Don't know yet	Don't know yet	The proposed services should be requested by users rather than proposed centrally. For instance, we strongly doubt whether there is a ESS-wide business case for the questionnaire building service mentioned in the example. Most countries have working systems in place, although not necessarily based on DDI.
Austria	Don't know yet	Don't know yet	
Poland	I agree	Don't know yet	
Portugal	I agree	No	
Slovenia	I agree	No	
Slovakia	I agree	No	
Finland	I agree	Don't know yet	
Norway	Don't know yet	Don't know yet	ESDEN: We don't completely understand the implications and consequences of a fully implemetation of the echange of micro data SERV: We appreciate the foundation of the Steering Group and will follow the progress of work also as amember of the SG. Must Ensure close coordination with HLG activities.

Country	Item 3: ESS Vision 2020: Risk Management - Opinion	Intervention: Take the floor?	Comments
Belgium	I agree	Don't know yet	
Bulgaria	I agree	No	
Czech Republic	Don't know yet	Don't know yet	We do not fully agree with the deadlines in IT Security self-assessments "roadmap". Before we adopt any deadlines we need to discuss the IT Security requirements within NSI as well as with ONAs.
Estonia	I agree	No	No comments.
France	I agree	No	same remark as above relative to ESDEN project (common ESS IT security framework to be implemented + IT infrastructure for secure transfer and remote access to microdata to be implemented).
Italy	Don't know yet	No	
Cyprus	I agree	No	CYSTAT takes note of the proposed ESS structures to be involved for the mitigation actions.
Latvia	I agree	No	
Lithuania	I agree	No	
Luxembourg	I agree	No	
Hungary	I agree	Yes	In general, Hungary agrees with the proposed mitigation actions and the involvement of DIME and ITDG. Concerning the risk of „Ensure consistency with ESS/agreed international standards”, the connection of ESS Vision 2020 supporting framework of standards to the process of ESS standardisation adopted by the ESSC is not clear. This topic is dedicated to Eurostat and classified as „ongoing”. We need more information on the currently ongoing work and its connections to the process of ESS standardisation and the involvement of WG on Standards.
Malta	Don't know yet	Don't know yet	
Netherlands	Don't know yet	Don't know yet	
Austria	I agree	Don't know yet	
Poland	I agree	No	
Portugal	I agree	Don't know yet	SP supports the roadmap of risk mitigation actions. However the responsibility of the WG on Methodology in the “Alignment of modernization programmes” should be clarified.
Slovenia	I agree	No	
Slovakia	I agree	No	
Finland	I agree	Don't know yet	
Norway	I agree	Don't know yet	

Country	Item 4: ESS Vision 2020: ESSnets for 2017 - Opinion	Intervention: Take the floor?	Comments
Belgium	Don't know yet	Don't know yet	We need to consult internally and need more time for that *
Bulgaria	I agree	No	
Czech Republic	Don't know yet	Don't know yet	
Estonia	I agree	No	Statistics Estiõnia s interested to participate in ESSnet on User profile testing, visualisation guidelines and communication strategy development, statistical literacy and outreach in the ESS (UVLIT).
France	I agree	No	ESSnet ODESS is particularly interesting.
Italy	Abstention	No	
Cyprus	I agree	No	CYSTAT agrees with the proposed ESSnets for 2017.
Latvia	I agree	No	
Lithuania	I agree	No	
Luxembourg	Don't know yet	Don't know yet	
Hungary	I agree	Don't know yet	Hungary agrees with the remarks formulated in the final opinion of the DIME/ITDG Steering Group. It drew the attention of Eurostat to the importance to clarify the governance of the ESSnet and CoE (as a whole) by specifying the precise roles of the DIME and the VIG in the preparation of the decision of the ESSC. The DIME/ITDG Steering Group also stressed the need to strengthen the work on methodology and considered that quality issues were – compared to the role of quality in the ESS Vision 2020 – over represented.
Malta	I agree	No	
Netherlands	Don't know yet	Don't know yet	The written procedure only allows the DIME/ITDG to (dis)agree on the whole pack of projects. It makes more sense to (dis)agree on a project-by-project basis. - During the meeting only 30 minutes is available for the important topic of ESSnets. This leaves the question on what the role of the DIME-ITDG is for establishment of ESSnets?
Austria	I agree	Don't know yet	
Poland	I agree	No	
Portugal	I agree	No	SP welcomes the proposal for 2017 ESSnets.
Slovenia	I agree	Don't know yet	
Slovakia	I agree	Don't know yet	in line with conclusions of the ESSC workshop on quality of European statistics we would like to make the suggestion, that one of ESSnets would deal with the elaboration of general quality management principles into TQM (Total Quality Management)
Finland	I agree	Don't know yet	
Norway	I agree	Don't know yet	

Country	Item 5: ESS Vision 2020: other activities - Take the floor? Opinion	Intervention:	Comments
Belgium	Don't know yet	Don't know yet	The same as *
Bulgaria	I agree	No	
Czech Republic	I agree	No	SIMSTAT goals (p. 7) are fulfilled. We also accept proposals (p. 9).
Estonia	I agree	No	No comments.
France	I agree	No	same remark as above concerning SIMSTAT project.
Italy	Abstention	No	
Cyprus	I agree	No	CYSTAT takes note of the activities.
Latvia	I agree	No	
Lithuania	I agree	No	
Luxembourg	I agree	No	
Hungary	I agree	No	
Malta	I agree	No	
Netherlands	Don't know yet	Don't know yet	
Austria	I agree	Don't know yet	
Poland	I agree	No	
Portugal	Don't know yet	Don't know yet	
Slovenia	I agree	Don't know yet	
Slovakia	I agree	No	
Finland	I agree	Don't know yet	
Norway	I agree	Don't know yet	

Country	Item 6: ESS Vision 2020: Big Data - Opinion	Intervention: Take the floor?	Comments
Belgium	Don't know yet	Don't know yet	The same as *
Bulgaria	I agree	Don't know yet	
Czech Republic	I agree	No	
Estonia	Don't know yet	Don't know yet	Not enough information for preparation.
France	I agree	No	We share the same experience as Slovenia relative to big data issues when trying to use them for statistical purposes.
Italy	I agree	No	
Cyprus	Don't know yet	Don't know yet	
Latvia	Don't know yet	No	
Lithuania	I agree	No	
Luxembourg	I agree	No	
Hungary	I agree	Don't know yet	Hungary supports the „questions” topics for discussion, we also find them extremely relevant. The next steps with Big Data are crucial. According to the Hungarian experience, access to Big Data sources and finding/fine-tuning the right IT tools are crucial to conduct Big Data pilots. The ESS should aim at defining common approaches to ease access to the same/similar potential Big Data sources in the Member States (e.g. if one NSI is successful in acquiring mobile cell information from one big Mobile Company in one country, why couldn't this work with the same company and a different NSI in a different Member State?).
Malta	I agree	No	
Netherlands	Don't know yet	Don't know yet	
Austria	I agree	Don't know yet	
Poland	I agree	Don't know yet	
Portugal	I agree	Don't know yet	
Slovenia	I agree	No	
Slovakia	I agree	No	
Finland	I agree	Don't know yet	
Norway	I agree	Don't know yet	We expect to increase our work in this area.

Country	Item 8: ESS Enterprise Architecture: roadmap - Opinion	Intervention: Take the floor?	Comments
Belgium	I agree	Don't know yet	The same as*
Bulgaria	I agree	No	
Czech Republic	I agree	No	
Estonia	I agree	No	No comments.
France	Abstention	Don't know yet	It is very important to have a complete review on the implementation of the ESS enterprise architecture reference framework within different projects before adopting it (ESBRs project to begin with).
Italy	Abstention	No	
Cyprus	Don't know yet	Don't know yet	
Latvia	I agree	No	
Lithuania	I agree	No	
Luxembourg	I agree	Don't know yet	
Hungary	I agree	Don't know yet	[opinion formulated without the room document as it is not available at the time of the EoV]. Hungary supports the proposed EA roadmap. The HCSO sent its comments on the ESS EARF during the ESS EARF consultation round. We need feedback on the comments received during the consultation from all Member States and if those comments were accepted/neglected. Hungary also supports the mandate of the ESS EA Board (the HCSO does not want to take part in its work at the moment). As the Hungarian new Enterprise Architecture is currently being developed, Hungary cannot provide a „success story at national level” at this time.
Malta	I agree	No	
Netherlands	I agree	Don't know yet	We would like to see relevant ESS.VIP projects implementing the reference architecture based on a comply-or-explain policy sooner rather than later. This will allow projects to gain experience working under architecture and provide valuable feedback for further development for the EA to a next version.
Austria	I agree	Don't know yet	The links to other Standards seems to be of essential importance.
Poland	I agree	Don't know yet	
Portugal	Don't know yet	Don't know yet	
Slovenia	I agree	No	
Slovakia	I agree	No	
Finland	I agree	Don't know yet	
Norway	I agree	Don't know yet	We need to show how EA adds value to guide and add value to developments, coordination and decisions as seen from the top management point of view.

Country	Item 9: Update of recent developments in the area of quality - Opinion	Intervention: Take the floor?	Comments
Belgium	I agree	Don't know yet	The same as *
Bulgaria	I agree	No	
Czech Republic	I agree	No	We very much appreciate the process of e-mail consultations. Our comments were taken into account. We support the current proposal.
Estonia	I agree	No	No comments.
France	I disagree	Yes	Last ESSC in february decided to launch a high level group on the common quality framework in the ESS with the following draft mandate : reviewing and identifying needs for modernisation of the common quality framework of the ESS, further reflection regarding improved communication of different quality profiles of statistics vis-à-vis different user groups and analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of European statistics within the individual quality dimensions defined in regulation 223/2009 and the European Statistics Code of Practice. The mandate of the working group on quality in statistics should take into account this new high level group and the way to interact with it. Another question is important to tackle with : what is the future of the next peer reviews in the context of regulation 223/2009 ?
Italy	Abstention	No	
Cyprus	Don't know yet	Don't know yet	
Latvia	I agree	No	
Lithuania	I agree	No	
Luxembourg	I agree	No	
Hungary	I agree	Yes	[opinion formulated based on the only available mandate of the Working Group on Quality as no other document was available at the time of the EoV]. Hungary supports the proposed update to the Working Group on Quality (WGQ) mandate. Based on the recent report on the QUAL activities, Hungary would like to stress the need to explicitly identify and list all the supporting frameworks of the ESS Vision 2020. The QUAL document lists these frameworks but this list is not commonly agreed on and referred to in ESS.VIP activities. Thus, more coordination is needed with the supporting frameworks. The role of the Working Group on Quality in any future update of the ESS Code of Practice and its supporting instrument, the Quality Assurance Framework is also a topic for discussion. Hungary supports the involvement of the Working Group on Quality in all of these future actions.
Malta	I agree	No	
Netherlands	I agree	Don't know yet	
Austria	I agree	Don't know yet	
Poland	I agree	No	
Portugal	I agree	No	SP supports the mandate of the WG on Quality in Statistics. In our opinion the mandate is quite ambitious and therefore a strong coordination with DIME and other stakeholders is crucial.
Slovenia	I agree	Don't know yet	
Slovakia	I agree	No	
Finland	I agree	Don't know yet	
Norway	Don't know yet	Don't know yet	

Country	Item 10: SDMX Roadmap: The new vision - Opinion	Intervention: Take the floor?	Comments
Belgium	I agree	Don't know yet	Thes ame as *
Bulgaria	I agree	No	
Czech Republic	I agree	No	We produce all SDMX data sets required by Eurostat according to plan. We support the initiative to implement SDMX standards into OpenData and integration of VTL into SDMX standard.
Estonia	I agree	No	No comments.
France	Abstention	No	For the time being, it seems more important to ensure that SDMX is effectively used in existing data transmissions. It could be useful to have an assessment of Census Hub.
Italy	Abstention	No	
Cyprus	I agree	No	CYSTAT takes note of the SDMX Roadmap 2020
Latvia	Abstention	No	
Lithuania	I agree	No	
Luxembourg	I agree	No	
Hungary	I agree	Yes	Hungary welcomes the SDMX roadmap and in general, agrees with the content of the report. Based on the experiences gathered so far, we expect it to be fully in line with SIMS 2.0 and more focus should be dedicated to the stability of MSDs and DSDs. If the MSD and DSD are modified often (e.g. in the domain on national accounts), it will cause instability which is an undesirable side effect. There were discussions earlier about a single-entry-point service with SDMX. The focus was on the operation where Member States provided information to Eurostat only and then Eurostat forwarded the information to the designated European partners. Hungary has no information on the adoption of this envisaged form of operation and needs more information on the current state-of-the-art.
Malta	I agree	No	
Netherlands	I agree	Don't know yet	
Austria	I agree	Yes	The anchoring of DDI as Standard of Metadata on the micro Level as already implemented in some NSI is very important
Poland	I agree	No	
Portugal	I agree	Don't know yet	
Slovenia	I agree	No	
Slovakia	Don't know yet	Don't know yet	
Finland	Don't know yet	Don't know yet	
Norway	I agree	Don't know yet	

Country	Item 11: Standardisation processes - Opinion	Intervention: Take the floor?	Comments
Belgium	I agree	Don't know yet	The same as *
Bulgaria	I agree	No	
Czech Republic	I agree	No	
Estonia	Don't know yet	Don't know yet	
France	Abstention	Don't know yet	The precise objective of this standardisation expert group is not very clear. Why does ESS want to adopt so many standards ? What for ?
Italy	I agree	No	
Cyprus	I agree	No	CYSTAT takes note of the first results of the Standardisation Expert Group
Latvia	I agree	No	
Lithuania	I agree	No	
Luxembourg	I agree	No	
Hungary	I agree	Yes	Hungary fully supports the proposed work of the Expert Group on Standardisation and to take over the ESSC-adopted results of the ESSnet on Standardisation (and its predecessor, the Sponsorship on Standardisation). Connected to our opinion expressed under item 3, Hungary proposes to clarify the relationship between the standardisation processes (in general, the main deliverables of the ESSnet on Standardisation) and the proposed framework on standardisation for the Vision 2020.
Malta	I agree	No	
Netherlands	Don't know yet	Don't know yet	
Austria	I agree	Don't know yet	
Poland	I agree	No	
Portugal	I agree	No	SP takes note of the report and supports the work programme
Slovenia	I agree	No	
Slovakia	I agree	No	
Finland	I agree	Don't know yet	
Norway	I agree	Don't know yet	

Country	Item 12: Presentation of the ESS IT security framework and proposals for the IT Security Assurance Mechanism - Opinion	Intervention: Take the floor?	Comments
Belgium	Don't know yet	Don't know yet	Thes same as *
Bulgaria	I agree	No	
Czech Republic	I agree	No	
Estonia	I agree	Don't know yet	Statistics Estonia has implemented three-level IT baseline security system ISKE. It is an information security standard that is developed for the Estonian public sector. According to Government Regulation no. 273 of 12 August 2004, ISKE is compulsory for state and local government organisations who handle databases/registers. ISKE is based on a German information security standard – IT Baseline Protection Manual (IT-Grundschutz in German) – which has been adapted to suit the Estonian situation. ISKE should cover all ISO 27001 requirements.
France	I agree	No	The internal audit (self assesment) based on the requirements of the ESS IT security framework seems a good thing to begin with (it should be achieved by the end of 2016). Then Eurostat has to define the conditions/criteria to select independent auditing companies to conduct the assesment and certification.
Italy	I agree	No	
Cyprus	Don't know yet	Don't know yet	
Latvia	Don't know yet	No	- it might not be feasible to implement any kind of security framework for limited scope of data, it sound almost impossible to organize security framework for a part of data processed by NSI, completely omitting any other types of data, especially if thinking of integrated environments and data warehouses where more than one data type is stored and processed; - nothing is mentioned on Eurostat as organization's compliance with proposed security framework; - ESDEN and CCN context - most of the infrastructure for this data exchange is maintained by Eurostat and outsource company (presumably IBM), having only gateway - type endpoints at NSIs' premises. Detailed procedures and security compliance data must be available to NSIs about remaining part of infrastructure in order to be sure that data is handled in a secure way while travelling from one NSI to another.
Lithuania	I agree	No	
Luxembourg	Don't know yet	Don't know yet	
Hungary	I agree	Don't know yet	
Malta	Don't know yet	Don't know yet	
Netherlands	Don't know yet	Don't know yet	The focus of the security standards and audits should be on the microdata exchange part, not on NSI's internally. - The proposal leaves a lot to be discussed. For example, the current proposal leaves open what happens when an organisation does not comply with the proposed standards.
Austria	Don't know yet	Don't know yet	
Poland	I agree	No	
Portugal	I agree	Don't know yet	
Slovenia	I agree	No	
Slovakia	I agree	No	We are missing a deadline regarding the first audit by the ESS member. The material only mentions periodicity of 3 years.
Finland	I agree	Don't know yet	
Norway	Don't know yet	Don't know yet	

Country	Item 13: European Master in Official Statistics (EMOS) Intervention:		Comments
Belgium	Don't know yet		The same as *
Bulgaria	No		
Czech Republic	No		It is necessary that Eurostat offers space for other universities to propose study programs and apply for participation in EMOS.
Estonia	No		
France	No		
Italy	No		
Cyprus	No		
Latvia	No		
Lithuania	No		
Luxembourg	No		
Hungary	No		Hungary welcomes the report on EMOS.
Malta	No		
Netherlands	Don't know yet		
Austria	No		
Poland	No		
Portugal	Yes		SP supports the award of the 12 proposed Master programmes.
Slovenia	No		
Slovakia	Yes		
Finland	Don't know yet		
Norway	Don't know yet		

Country	Item 14: Transmission Coordinators (TCOs) Intervention:		Comments
Belgium	Don't know yet		The same as *
Bulgaria	No		
Czech Republic	No		
Estonia	No		
France	Don't know yet		
Italy	No		
Cyprus	No		
Latvia	No		
Lithuania	No		
Luxembourg	No		
Hungary	No		Hungary welcomes the document and agrees on its content.
Malta	No		
Netherlands	Don't know yet		
Austria	No		
Poland	No		
Portugal	No		
Slovenia	Don't know yet		
Slovakia	Yes		
Finland	Don't know yet		
Norway	Don't know yet		

Country	Item 15: DIME/ITDG Governance: 2016 meetings and WGs reporting Intervention:		Comments
Belgium	Don't know yet		The same as *
Bulgaria	No		
Czech Republic	No		
Estonia	Don't know yet		
France	No		
Italy	No		
Cyprus	No		
Latvia	No		
Lithuania	No		
Luxembourg	No		
Hungary	Don't know yet		As Hungary has interest to join some of the „new” subgroups created under the umbrella of the new DIME/ITDG governance model, we have the question how new partners can join these new groups (such as the Expert Group on Seasonal Adjustment).
Malta	No		
Netherlands	Don't know yet		
Austria	No		
Poland	No		
Portugal	No		SP takes note of the 2016 meetings of the DIME/ITDG and related bodies
Slovenia	No		
Slovakia	Yes		
Finland	No		
Norway	No		