

Open Public Consultations as part of the Evaluation Study of Council Directive 2008/114 on the identification and designation of European critical infrastructures and the assessment of the need to improve their protection

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

The European Critical Infrastructure Protection Directive (2008/114/EC) of 8 December 2008 establishes a procedure for identifying and designating European Critical Infrastructures (ECI) in the energy and transport sectors, as well as a common approach for assessing the need to improve their protection. It is a key pillar of the European Programme for Critical Infrastructure Protection (EPCIP), which aims to protect critical infrastructures against a range of threats using an all-hazards approach.

Critical infrastructure is defined as an asset, system or part thereof located in a Member State which is essential for the maintenance of vital societal functions, health, safety, security, economic and/or social well-being of people. The disruption or destruction of said infrastructure would have a significant impact in a Member State as a result of the failure to maintain the aforementioned vital societal functions.

The objectives of the European Critical Infrastructure Directive are to:

- Identify European Critical Infrastructures (ECI), defined as those infrastructures, which, if subjected to disruption or destruction, would have a significant impact on at least two Member States;
- Ensure that all identified European Critical Infrastructures are protected, particularly through the creation of an Operator Security Plan (OSP), which should be appropriately and regularly reviewed.

In the years since its introduction in 2008, various issues concerning the current Directive have been identified. These include, for instance, a narrow sectoral scope (limited to the energy and transport sectors), and the slow pace of the ECI identification and designation process on the part of the Member States. For these and other reasons, the Commission recently launched an external evaluation of the Directive that will assess its effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, coherence and EU added value. The evaluation covers all EU Member States and takes account of a heightened terrorist threat since 2008, an awareness of hybrid threats, but also the emergence of new threats, including, for instance, the unlawful use of unmanned aerial vehicles (“drones”).

As part of this evaluation, the European Commission has launched an public consultation, which aims to collect the views of all stakeholders, including European citizens, as to whether the Directive has met and is currently meeting its objectives, namely to improve the protection and ensure the resilience of critical infrastructures. The evaluation will be available for twelve weeks.

Please submit your responses via the online questionnaire below. Respondents may answer the questionnaire in any official EU language, regardless of the language of the questionnaire that the respondent selects. (Should you wish to provide your contribution by other means than online, please contact the European Programme for Critical infrastructure Protection (EPCIP) through its functional mailbox: HOME-EPCIP@ec.europa.eu.)

All individual replies will be made available for analysis by the contractor carrying out the evaluation. They will also be published on the European Commission's consultations webpage (<https://ec.europa.eu/info/consultations>). The contractor's final report, which will account for the public consultation and other forms of consultation as part of the evaluation, will form the basis for a Staff Working Document produced by the Commission, which will be published on DG Migration and Home Affairs' (HOME's) website (<https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/>) during the spring of 2019.

More information concerning the ongoing evaluation is available via the following link on DG HOME's website: https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-is-new/work-in-progress/initiatives/evaluation-council-directive-2008-114_en. Information concerning the European Programme for Critical Infrastructure Protection (EPCIP) specifically and critical infrastructure protection more generally can be found here: https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/crisis-and-terrorism/critical-infrastructure_en.

About you

* Language of my contribution

- Bulgarian
- Croatian
- Czech
- Danish
- Dutch
- English
- Estonian
- Finnish
- French
- Gaelic
- German
- Greek
- Hungarian
- Italian
- Latvian
- Lithuanian
- Maltese
- Polish
- Portuguese
- Romanian

- Slovak
- Slovenian
- Spanish
- Swedish

* I am giving my contribution as

- Academic/research institution
- Business association
- Company/business organisation
- Consumer organisation
- EU citizen
- Environmental organisation
- Non-EU citizen
- Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- Public authority
- Trade union
- Other

* First name

Oliver

* Surname

LOEBEL

* Email (this won't be published)

oliver.loebel@eureau.org

* Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

EurEau

* Organisation size

- Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- Small (10 to 49 employees)
- Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- Large (250 or more)

Transparency register number

255 character(s) maximum

Check if your organisation is on the [transparency register](#). It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

*Country of origin

Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.

- | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Afghanistan | <input type="radio"/> Djibouti | <input type="radio"/> Libya | <input type="radio"/> Saint Pierre and Miquelon |
| <input type="radio"/> Åland Islands | <input type="radio"/> Dominica | <input type="radio"/> Liechtenstein | <input type="radio"/> Saint Vincent and the Grenadines |
| <input type="radio"/> Albania | <input type="radio"/> Dominican Republic | <input type="radio"/> Lithuania | <input type="radio"/> Samoa |
| <input type="radio"/> Algeria | <input type="radio"/> Ecuador | <input type="radio"/> Luxembourg | <input type="radio"/> San Marino |
| <input type="radio"/> American Samoa | <input type="radio"/> Egypt | <input type="radio"/> Macau | <input type="radio"/> São Tomé and Príncipe |
| <input type="radio"/> Andorra | <input type="radio"/> El Salvador | <input type="radio"/> Madagascar | <input type="radio"/> Saudi Arabia |
| <input type="radio"/> Angola | <input type="radio"/> Equatorial Guinea | <input type="radio"/> Malawi | <input type="radio"/> Senegal |
| <input type="radio"/> Anguilla | <input type="radio"/> Eritrea | <input type="radio"/> Malaysia | <input type="radio"/> Serbia |
| <input type="radio"/> Antarctica | <input type="radio"/> Estonia | <input type="radio"/> Maldives | <input type="radio"/> Seychelles |
| <input type="radio"/> Antigua and Barbuda | <input type="radio"/> Ethiopia | <input type="radio"/> Mali | <input type="radio"/> Sierra Leone |
| <input type="radio"/> Argentina | <input type="radio"/> Falkland Islands | <input type="radio"/> Malta | <input type="radio"/> Singapore |
| <input type="radio"/> Armenia | <input type="radio"/> Faroe Islands | <input type="radio"/> Marshall Islands | <input type="radio"/> Sint Maarten |
| <input type="radio"/> Aruba | <input type="radio"/> Fiji | <input type="radio"/> Martinique | <input type="radio"/> Slovakia |
| <input type="radio"/> Australia | <input type="radio"/> Finland | <input type="radio"/> Mauritania | <input type="radio"/> Slovenia |
| <input type="radio"/> Austria | <input type="radio"/> Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia | <input type="radio"/> Mauritius | <input type="radio"/> Solomon Islands |
| <input type="radio"/> Azerbaijan | <input type="radio"/> France | <input type="radio"/> Mayotte | <input type="radio"/> Somalia |
| <input type="radio"/> Bahamas | <input type="radio"/> French Guiana | <input type="radio"/> Mexico | <input type="radio"/> South Africa |
| <input type="radio"/> Bahrain | <input type="radio"/> French Polynesia | <input type="radio"/> Micronesia | <input type="radio"/> South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands |
| <input type="radio"/> Bangladesh | <input type="radio"/> French Southern and Antarctic Lands | <input type="radio"/> Moldova | <input type="radio"/> South Korea |
| <input type="radio"/> Barbados | <input type="radio"/> Gabon | <input type="radio"/> Monaco | <input type="radio"/> South Sudan |
| <input type="radio"/> Belarus | <input type="radio"/> Georgia | <input type="radio"/> Mongolia | <input type="radio"/> Spain |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> Belgium | <input type="radio"/> Germany | <input type="radio"/> Montenegro | <input type="radio"/> Sri Lanka |
| <input type="radio"/> Belize | <input type="radio"/> Ghana | <input type="radio"/> Montserrat | <input type="radio"/> Sudan |
| <input type="radio"/> Benin | <input type="radio"/> Gibraltar | <input type="radio"/> Morocco | <input type="radio"/> Suriname |
| <input type="radio"/> Bermuda | <input type="radio"/> Greece | <input type="radio"/> Mozambique | <input type="radio"/> Svalbard and Jan Mayen |
| <input type="radio"/> Bhutan | <input type="radio"/> Greenland | <input type="radio"/> Myanmar/Burma | <input type="radio"/> Swaziland |
| <input type="radio"/> Bolivia | <input type="radio"/> Grenada | <input type="radio"/> Namibia | <input type="radio"/> Sweden |
| <input type="radio"/> Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba | <input type="radio"/> Guadeloupe | <input type="radio"/> Nauru | <input type="radio"/> Switzerland |
| <input type="radio"/> Bosnia and Herzegovina | <input type="radio"/> Guam | <input type="radio"/> Nepal | <input type="radio"/> Syria |
| <input type="radio"/> Botswana | <input type="radio"/> Guatemala | <input type="radio"/> Netherlands | <input type="radio"/> Taiwan |
| <input type="radio"/> Bouvet Island | <input type="radio"/> Guernsey | <input type="radio"/> New Caledonia | <input type="radio"/> Tajikistan |

- | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Brazil | <input type="radio"/> Guinea | <input type="radio"/> New Zealand | <input type="radio"/> Tanzania |
| <input type="radio"/> British Indian Ocean Territory | <input type="radio"/> Guinea-Bissau | <input type="radio"/> Nicaragua | <input type="radio"/> Thailand |
| <input type="radio"/> British Virgin Islands | <input type="radio"/> Guyana | <input type="radio"/> Niger | <input type="radio"/> The Gambia |
| <input type="radio"/> Brunei | <input type="radio"/> Haiti | <input type="radio"/> Nigeria | <input type="radio"/> Timor-Leste |
| <input type="radio"/> Bulgaria | <input type="radio"/> Heard Island and McDonald Islands | <input type="radio"/> Niue | <input type="radio"/> Togo |
| <input type="radio"/> Burkina Faso | <input type="radio"/> Honduras | <input type="radio"/> Norfolk Island | <input type="radio"/> Tokelau |
| <input type="radio"/> Burundi | <input type="radio"/> Hong Kong | <input type="radio"/> North Korea | <input type="radio"/> Tonga |
| <input type="radio"/> Cambodia | <input type="radio"/> Hungary | <input type="radio"/> Northern Mariana Islands | <input type="radio"/> Trinidad and Tobago |
| <input type="radio"/> Cameroon | <input type="radio"/> Iceland | <input type="radio"/> Norway | <input type="radio"/> Tunisia |
| <input type="radio"/> Canada | <input type="radio"/> India | <input type="radio"/> Oman | <input type="radio"/> Turkey |
| <input type="radio"/> Cape Verde | <input type="radio"/> Indonesia | <input type="radio"/> Pakistan | <input type="radio"/> Turkmenistan |
| <input type="radio"/> Cayman Islands | <input type="radio"/> Iran | <input type="radio"/> Palau | <input type="radio"/> Turks and Caicos Islands |
| <input type="radio"/> Central African Republic | <input type="radio"/> Iraq | <input type="radio"/> Palestine | <input type="radio"/> Tuvalu |
| <input type="radio"/> Chad | <input type="radio"/> Ireland | <input type="radio"/> Panama | <input type="radio"/> Uganda |
| <input type="radio"/> Chile | <input type="radio"/> Isle of Man | <input type="radio"/> Papua New Guinea | <input type="radio"/> Ukraine |
| <input type="radio"/> China | <input type="radio"/> Israel | <input type="radio"/> Paraguay | <input type="radio"/> United Arab Emirates |
| <input type="radio"/> Christmas Island | <input type="radio"/> Italy | <input type="radio"/> Peru | <input type="radio"/> United Kingdom |
| <input type="radio"/> Clipperton | <input type="radio"/> Jamaica | <input type="radio"/> Philippines | <input type="radio"/> United States |
| <input type="radio"/> Cocos (Keeling) Islands | <input type="radio"/> Japan | <input type="radio"/> Pitcairn Islands | <input type="radio"/> United States Minor Outlying Islands |
| <input type="radio"/> Colombia | <input type="radio"/> Jersey | <input type="radio"/> Poland | <input type="radio"/> Uruguay |
| <input type="radio"/> Comoros | <input type="radio"/> Jordan | <input type="radio"/> Portugal | <input type="radio"/> US Virgin Islands |
| <input type="radio"/> Congo | <input type="radio"/> Kazakhstan | <input type="radio"/> Puerto Rico | <input type="radio"/> Uzbekistan |
| <input type="radio"/> Cook Islands | <input type="radio"/> Kenya | <input type="radio"/> Qatar | <input type="radio"/> Vanuatu |
| <input type="radio"/> Costa Rica | <input type="radio"/> Kiribati | <input type="radio"/> Réunion | <input type="radio"/> Vatican City |
| <input type="radio"/> Côte d'Ivoire | <input type="radio"/> Kosovo | <input type="radio"/> Romania | <input type="radio"/> Venezuela |
| <input type="radio"/> Croatia | <input type="radio"/> Kuwait | <input type="radio"/> Russia | <input type="radio"/> Vietnam |
| <input type="radio"/> Cuba | <input type="radio"/> Kyrgyzstan | <input type="radio"/> Rwanda | <input type="radio"/> Wallis and Futuna |
| <input type="radio"/> Curaçao | <input type="radio"/> Laos | <input type="radio"/> Saint Barthélemy | <input type="radio"/> Western Sahara |
| <input type="radio"/> Cyprus | <input type="radio"/> Latvia | <input type="radio"/> Saint Helena Ascension and Tristan da Cunha | <input type="radio"/> Yemen |
| <input type="radio"/> Czech Republic | <input type="radio"/> Lebanon | <input type="radio"/> Saint Kitts and Nevis | <input type="radio"/> Zambia |
| <input type="radio"/> Democratic Republic of the Congo | <input type="radio"/> Lesotho | <input type="radio"/> Saint Lucia | <input type="radio"/> Zimbabwe |
| <input type="radio"/> Denmark | <input type="radio"/> Liberia | <input type="radio"/> Saint Martin | |

*** Publication privacy settings**

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

Anonymous

Only your type, country of origin and contribution will be published. All other personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number) will not be published.

Public

Your personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number, country of origin) will be published with your contribution.

* I agree with the [personal data protection provisions](#)

Questions concerning the ECI Directive

1.1) In your view, to what extent do the following incident types pose a serious threat to critical infrastructures in the EU?

	No opinion	Not at all	To a small extent	To some extent	To a fairly large extent	To a large extent
Natural disasters (earthquakes, fires, floods, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cyberattacks/cyber-enabled attacks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supply chain disruptions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Energy supply disruptions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Terrorist attacks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Transportation accidents	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Accidents involving hazardous materials	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Insider infiltration	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Unlawful intrusion (including by unmanned aerial vehicles ("drones"))	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Attacks of different kinds orchestrated by state-sponsored actors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

1.2) If you have identified other serious threats to critical infrastructures ("other" in the question above), please describe them here.

2.1) In your opinion, to what extent are the provisions of the European Critical Infrastructure (ECI) Directive still relevant and needed to ensure a common level of protection of critical infrastructures across the EU?

	No opinion	Not at all	To a small extent	To some extent	To a fairly large extent	To a large extent
In the energy sector	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In the transport sector	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

2.2) Please elaborate on your responses to the previous question.

Detailed national requirements are in place to protect critical infrastructures. The ECI directive may still be relevant for critical infrastructures with a strong cross-border aspect.

3) Do you believe that additional specific measures should be taken at EU level to better protect critical infrastructures from the threats listed in Question 1.1, or from other threats that you independently identified in Question 1.2?

Coordinated actions of the EU against cyber-attacks (i.e. state-organised or state-supported attacks) in the context of the agreed reinforcement of cyber security (Cyber Security Act).

4.1) Have you seen any improvement in the level of protection of critical infrastructures in the EU over the last decade?

	No opinion	Yes	No
In the energy sector	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In the transport sector	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

4.2) If you indicated "yes" to the previous question, to what extent has the level of protection in the energy and transport sectors increased in your view?

	To a small extent	To some extent	To a fairly large extent	To a large extent
In the energy sector	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

In the transport sector	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
-------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

4.3) Assuming you answered Question 4.2, what in your view are the factors that have contributed to an increase in the level of protection of critical infrastructures?

No opinion.

4.4) In case you have not seen any improvement in the level of protection of critical infrastructures, what in your view explains this?

No opinion.

5) To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

	No opinion	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
The ECI Directive has contributed to achieving common levels of protection for critical infrastructures in the EU.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The ECI Directive has contributed to defining similar and clear responsibilities and obligations for critical infrastructure protection stakeholders in all Member States.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The ECI Directive has contributed to a higher level of protection of the internal market from the effects of any disruption/destruction of critical infrastructures.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The ECI Directive has produced observable operational changes concerning measures and procedures for the protection of critical infrastructures.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The ECI Directive has enhanced cooperation between Member States on matters related to critical infrastructure protection.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The sectoral scope of the ECI Directive (pertaining to the transport and energy sectors) is appropriate in light of the desired impact.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The exclusion of the information and communication technology (ICT) sector from the scope of the ECI Directive has not limited its impact.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

6.1) In your view, is the current approach based on the designation of European Critical Infrastructures (ECI) by Member States appropriate and effective?

- No opinion
- Not at all
- To a small extent
- To some extent
- To a fairly large extent
- To a large extent

6.2) Please elaborate on your response to the previous question. If you feel that the current ECI designation approach is not/minimally appropriate and effective, please explain why, and how the approach might be improved.

The designation approach must be limited to infrastructures with a strong cross-border impact. Critical infrastructures that are organised locally / regionally with no impact on other EU Member States, such as the water services sector, should not be designated as ECI. They are regulated at the national / regional level. The Member States are best able to assess the critical characteristics of the infrastructure for society.

7.1) In your view, is the current approach calling for Member States to designate ECI in agreement with those Member States that may be significantly affected appropriate and effective?

- No opinion
- Not at all
- To a small extent
- To some extent
- To a fairly large extent
- To a large extent

7.2) Please elaborate on your response to the previous question.

The decision not to designate the water / waste water infrastructure as ECI is appropriate. These are local / regional infrastructures regulated through national / regional legislation.

8.1) In your opinion, to what extent has the ECI Directive provided added value compared to what Member States could achieve in the field of critical infrastructure protection in the absence of the ECI Directive?

	No opinion	Not at all	To a small extent	To some extent	To a fairly large extent	To a large extent
In the energy sector	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In the transport sector	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

8.2) Please elaborate on your response to the question above.

No opinion.

9.1) In your opinion, have the costs (administrative, budgetary, in terms of personnel, etc.) related to the transposition and application of the ECI Directive been proportionate to its contribution in terms of the protection of critical infrastructures?

	No opinion	Very disproportionate	Disproportionate	Proportionate	Very proportionate
In the energy sector	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In the transport sector	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

9.2) Based on your response to the previous question, please explain why you deem the costs related to the ECI Directive to be proportionate or disproportionate in relation to the demonstrated effects.

No opinion.

10.1) In your opinion, would the effects of the ECI Directive on the protection of critical infrastructures be likely to remain in the years to come were the Directive to be repealed?

	No opinion	No, not at all	Yes, to a small extent	Yes, to some extent	Yes, to a fairly large extent	Yes, to a large extent
In the energy sector	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In the transport sector	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

10.2) Please elaborate on your response to the previous question.

No opinion.

11.1) In your opinion, to what extent is the ECI Directive coherent with/complementary to other existing measures/mechanisms aimed at enhancing critical infrastructure protection?

	No opinion	Not at all	To a small extent	To some extent	To a fairly large extent	To a large extent
In the energy sector (besides the ECI Directive)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In the transport sector (besides the ECI Directive)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Space-based services sector	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Banking sector	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Health sector	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Drinking water/food supply sector	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Land-based digital infrastructure sector	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

11.2) If applicable, please elaborate on your responses to the previous question.

Drinking water supply is organised nationally / regionally and is not crossing borders. Hence, the consequences of a possible drinking water supply failure have no cross-border implications and the water infrastructure should not fall under the definition of ECI. Requirements are set through national / regional regulations. In particular drinking water supply security is covered by detailed national requirements which do not require an additional European layer. As regards information systems, the water sector applies the NIS directive. Other water-related EU legislation (directives on drinking water, urban waste water treatment and the water framework) exclude security-related aspects as they can be better addressed at the national level.

11.3) Can you identify other relevant measures/mechanisms in sectors not listed above? If so, to what extent are they coherent with/complementary to the ECI Directive?

The directives on drinking water, urban waste water treatment and the water framework exclude security-related aspects as they can be better addressed at the national level.

12.1) In your view, is the current scope of the Directive, limited to the energy and transport sectors, effective in protecting the most important critical infrastructures in the EU?

- No opinion
- Yes
- No

12.2) Please elaborate on your response to the question above.

From a water sector point of view, it clearly is. Drinking water supply is organised nationally / regionally and is not crossing borders. Hence, the consequences of a possible drinking water supply failure have no cross-border implications and the water infrastructure should not fall under the definition of ECI. Requirements are set through national / regional regulations.

Final comments and document upload

If you wish to provide additional comments or suggestions within the scope of this evaluation, please feel free to do so here.

Water services (including drinking water supply) are organised nationally / regionally and are not crossing borders. Hence, the consequences of a possible drinking water supply failure have no cross-border implications and the water infrastructure should not fall under the definition of ECI. Requirements are set through national / regional regulations.

Here you may upload a document containing additional remarks related to the evaluation of the ECI Directive.

The maximum file size is 1 MB

Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

Contact

Christer-Matteson.BROWN@ec.europa.eu
