



SIBIS

IST-2000-26276

Statistical Indicators Benchmarking the Information
Society

SIBIS – Workpackage 4: Methodology for key eEurope Actions Evaluations

Deliverable no. 4.1

4th draft 21 June 2001

Report Version:

Report Preparation Date: May 2001

Classification:

Contract Start Date: 1st January 2001

Duration: 30 Months

Project Co-ordinator: Empirica (Germany)

Partners: Work Research Centre (Ireland), Danish Technological Institute (Denmark), Technopolis (UK), Databank Consulting (Italy), Stichting RAND Europe (Netherlands), Fachhochschule Solothurn (Switzerland)



Project funded by the European Community under the
"Information Society Technology" Programme (1998-2002)

Index

INTRODUCTION: METHODOLOGY FOR KEY EUROPE ACTIONS EVALUATIONS	1
WP4 WORKPLAN	2
LIST OF E-EUROPE ACTIONS FOR EVALUATION	4
SELECTION CRITERIA OF ACTIONS TO EVALUATE	8
STRUCTURE OF NATIONAL REPORTS	10
EU BENCHMARKING INDICATORS	12
INDICATIVE DEFINITION OF BENCHMARKING INDICATORS	13
QUESTIONNAIRE – DRAFT	15
1. CHEAPER AND FASTER INTERNET ACCESS	16
2. FASTER INTERNET FOR RESEARCHERS AND STUDENTS	20
3. SECURE NETWORKS AND SMART CARDS	21
4. EUROPEAN YOUTH INTO THE DIGITAL AGE	24
5. WORKING IN THE KNOWLEDGE-BASED ECONOMY	28
6. PARTICIPATION FOR ALL IN THE KNOWLEDGE-BASED ECONOMY	33
7. ACCELERATING E-COMMERCE	35
8. GOVERNMENT ONLINE: ELECTRONIC ACCESS TO PUBLIC SERVICES	39
9. HEALTH ONLINE	42
10. EUROPEAN DIGITAL CONTENT FOR GLOBAL NETWORKS	43

Introduction: methodology for key eEurope Actions Evaluations

This report indicates the methodology of the "Key eEurope actions evaluation reports" and criteria applied in the selection of the 30 key eEurope actions that will be evaluated within WP4.

This task will be performed by considering and exploiting all the synergies among the work to be carried out in the other SIBIS workpackages, while avoiding useless duplication of work.

This raises the issue that, beside the outcomes of WP2 a WP3, a more policy oriented approach is needed.

In our opinion, the real added value of this report is given by the availability of an overview of the eEurope implementation in each European states. This will not be limited to the quantitative data emerging from the analysis, but will be supported by comments and remarks provided by SIBIS, which is aiming at becoming – as far as possible – a neutral observatory.

Since the starting point of our work a policy measure, the evaluation criteria applied in the report are basically converting to highlight the relevance of each single action within each member state. Quantitative data provided in the report have been used only when a too policy-oriented approach was considered unsuitable to reflect the implementation of that single actions in the country and other quantitative parameters - i.e. ICT equipment, technical infrastructure available - were considered necessary give an overview of issues dealt by one single action.

Since deadlines fixed by the action plan distributed into 3 years (2000, 2001 and 2002) and the release of the eEurope evaluation reports planned only 2 times, the first in 2001 and the second in 2002, it was necessary to find out a selection criteria independent from the action plan's deadline. With the issue of the second eEurope evaluation reports, it may be necessary to reorganise work to be done in the selection of the eEurope actions to be evaluated and, where necessary, workplan will be modified, according to the outcome of WP 3 Surveys, which may give interesting input to the second release of the "eEurope evaluation report".

Here follows complete list of the eEurope actions, together with the indication of those ones which will be evaluated by SIBIS.

WP4 Workplan

15 May 2001 – D 4.1 Methodology for key E-Europe Actions Evaluation – draft document

The document will be prepared by DBC and will be presented to partners for their feedback and comments. It will contain the explication of the methodological approach to follow in the collection of data and in the preparation of national E-Europe reports.

While preparing D 4.1 we will consider partner's contribution/suggestions about the identification of E-Europe actions to be evaluated, indicators and structure of workplan.

The document will contain the index of the E-Europe Evaluation Report, together with explicatory notes necessary for the compilation of the reports by partners.

Actor: DBC

20 May 2001 – comments to DBC

By that date, all partners will send their comments on Draft questionnaire to DBC

Actor: all partners

25 May 2001 – D 4.1 Methodology for key E-Europe Actions Evaluation

After collecting the partner's feedback, the final release of D 4.1 will be issued by DBC.

Actor: DBC

1 June 2001 – start collecting data for E-Europe evaluation

Our aim is to structure the report in a way suitable to allow us to retrieve data principally from the national E-Europe implementation reports, beside other info collected while preparing Topic Reports. Due to budgetary problems, the number of fields and experts interviews will be limited as much as possible: interviews will be intended as a way to gather a general overview of a specific theme, rather than for collecting quantitative data.

Possible synergies between WP4 and WP3 e-Europe Surveys will be investigated later on. Basically, due to the mismatch in the release of e-Europe Surveys and the first e-Europe Evaluation Report, results provided by the Surveys may be used – if necessary - only for the release of the 2nd E-Europe Evaluation Reports

Actor: all partners

15 September 2001 – delivery of national reports to DBC

DBC is in charge of the collection and merging of the national reports provided by partners into one single "E-Europe Evaluation Reports".

Not later than 30 September 2001, all the partners will send their contribution to DBC for the final integration of data and the output of the first draft of the E-Europe Evaluation report.

Actor: all partners

30 November 2001 – delivery of eEurope reports to partners for approval

By that date, DBC will finalise the preparation of a draft of the E-Europe Evaluation Report. This draft will be circulated among partners to receive their feedback and comments.

Actor: DBC

10 December 2001 – comments to DBC

By that date, all partners will send their comments to DBC on the first draft of eEurope evaluation report

Actor: all partners

15 January 2002 – delivery of first eEurope report

By that date, DBC will collect the partner's comments and will release the final version of the D. 4.2 e-Europe Key Actions Evaluation and Benchmarking Report.

Actor: DBC

Distribution of countries among partners:

Partner	Countries covered
Empirica	Germany Austria
Work Research Centre	Ireland
Danish Technology Institute	Denmark Sweden Finland
Technopolis	United Kingdom France
Databank Consulting	Italy Greece* Spain Portugal
RAND Europe	Netherlands Belgium Luxembourg

List of E-Europe actions for evaluation

eEurope 2002 – An Information Society for All , *Action Plan*

Prepared by the Council and the European Commission for the Feira European Council 19 – 20 June 2000

Table 1

1 - Cheaper and faster Internet Access		
#	Action	
1.1	Achieve significant reductions in Internet access tariffs towards the lowest levels in the world by reinforcing competition and clear benchmarking at European and national level.	
1.2	Adopt the five directives (concerning the overall framework, access and interconnection, authorisation and licences, universal service and data protection) for the new framework for electronic communications and associated services; Adopt the new Commission Directive on Competition in Communication Services.	
1.3	Work towards introducing greater competition in local access networks and unbundling of the local loop.	To be evaluated
1.4	Improve the co-ordination of the European frequency policy framework.	
1.5	Co-ordinated allocation of frequencies for multimedia wireless systems.	
1.6	Where necessary and without distorting competition, public financing instruments will give increased priority to supporting the development of information infrastructure and projects, notably in the less-favoured regions.	To be evaluated
1.7	Move towards full conversion to IPv6 through pilot implementation in Europe. Key telecom and manufacturer industries will be mobilised together with service providers and users.	
1.8	Reduce prices for leased lines by increasing competition and ensuring implementation of the Commission Recommendation.	
2 - Faster Internet for Researchers and Students		
#	Action	
2.1	Adequate funds (in addition to the 80m Euros already allocated to the upgrade of the trans-European backbone interconnecting the National Research and Education Networks) will be earmarked for the research networking aspects of the IST Programme, with the objective of establishing Europe as a global connectivity leader and initiating the evolution towards a fully optical backbone with improved capacities in terms of bandwidth and services.	To be evaluated
2.2	National research Networks should be upgraded to ensure that researchers and students across Europe benefit from powerful networks, for example, using structural funds and EIB support.	To be evaluated
2.3	High speed Internet access and intranets should be established in universities, for example, using structural funds and EIB support.	
2.4	Foster World Wide Grid (WWG) technology through development of middleware and the deployment of testbeds driven by the requirements of a wide range of scientific communities and aimed at the integration, validation, and uptake of the relevant technology. Adequate funding will be provided for this activity within the IST Programme. Through its research programmes, the Commission will support the uptake of Grid technologies for scientific work and collaboration in all areas.	

3 – Secure Networks and Smart Cards

#	Action	
3.1	Improve the overall security of on-line transactions by:	
	1) Ensuring the availability of products (in particular network cards, software and routers) capable of supporting secure transmissions based on IPSec and IPv6	
	2) Supporting the industry-led security certifications through co-ordination of efforts and mutual recognition, including information security professional certification.	To be evaluated
	3) Promotion privacy-enhancing technologies and supporting their deployment, including proper codes and the consolidation of practice.	
3.2	4) Stimulating public/private co-operation on dependability of information infrastructures (including the development of early warning systems) and improve co-operation amongst national "computer emergency response teams".	
	Promote the development and deployment of open source software security platforms for effective "plug and play".	
3.3	Develop a co-ordinated European approach to cybercrime.	To be evaluated
3.4	Availability of a core of common specifications for smart-cards interoperability and security.	
3.5	Improve human interface of secure card terminals including better usability for people with special needs and support for multiple languages.	
3.6	Availability of cost-effective smart card solutions to enable secure electronic transactions.	To be evaluated

4 - European youth into the digital age

#	Action	
4.1	Provide all schools, teachers, and students with convenient access to the Internet and multimedia resources, where appropriate using the Structural Funds.	To be evaluated
4.2	Connect schools progressively to the research networks, where appropriate using the Structural Funds.	
4.3	Ensure availability of support services and educational resources on the Internet, as well as e-learning platforms, for teachers, pupils and parents (e.g. access for disadvantaged children, access to digitised cultural heritage, multilingual multimedia learning materials, European open source software initiative, collective of best practice). European Commission to support these efforts via the education, training and culture programmes and to provide adequate funding within the IST Programme.	To be evaluated
4.4	Provide training, using Structural Funds where appropriate, to all teachers, in particular adapt teacher curricula and offer incentives to teachers to actually use digital technologies in teaching. European Commission will ensure exchange of best practice and co-ordinate research efforts through its education, training, and IST Programmes.	To be evaluated
4.5	Adapt school curricula to enable new ways of learning using information technologies.	
4.6	Ensure that all pupils have the possibility to be digitally literate by the time they leave school. European Commission to support pilot projects, exchange of best practice and co-ordinate research efforts, via its IST and education programmes.	To be evaluated

5 - Working in the knowledge-based economy

#	Action	
5.1	Give the labour force the chance to become digitally literate through life-long learning.	To be evaluated
5.2	Significantly increase information technology training places and courses and promote gender equality in such courses (both in work and in educational institutions), using European Social funds where appropriate.	To be evaluated
5.3	Establish a European diploma for basic information technology skills, with decentralised certification procedures.	To be evaluated
5.4	Support greater flexibility in the workplace, e.g. teleworking and part-time working, where appropriate through agreements by Social Partners and backed up by Member States.	To be evaluated
5.5	Promotion of a network of learning and training centres for demand-driven information and communications technology training and retraining of postgraduates.	
5.6	Set up public Internet access points in public spaces and establish multimedia telecentres in all communities providing access to training and e-work facilities, where appropriate using the Structural Funds.	To be evaluated

6 - Participation for all in the knowledge-based economy

#	Action	
6.1	Policies to avoid info-exclusion will be more effectively co-ordinated at European level through benchmarking of performance and exchange of best practice between Member States.	To be evaluated
6.2	Publication of "Design for all" standards for accessibility of information technology products, in particular to improve the employability and social inclusion of people with special needs.	
6.3	Review relevant legislation and standards to ensure conformity with accessibility principles.	
6.4	Adoption of the Web Accessibility Initiative (WAI) guidelines for public websites.	To be evaluated
6.5	Ensure the establishment and networking of national centres of excellence in design-for-all and create recommendations for a European curriculum for designers and engineers.	

7 - Accelerating e-commerce

#	Action	
7.1	Adoption of outstanding EU legislation on: copyright, distance marketing of financial services, e-money, jurisdiction.	
7.2	Boost consumer confidence in e-commerce in partnership with consumer groups, industry and Member States. Promote alternative dispute resolution, trust marks and effective codes of conduct by working with stakeholders to develop general principles and by creating appropriate incentives. An "online e-confidence forum" managed by the Commission will engage as many stakeholders as possible in this process. Commission and Member States to further develop EEJ-net (European Extra-Judicial Network) linking alternative dispute resolution systems and launch pilot projects at European level through the IST programme.	To be evaluated
7.3	Commission to stimulate increased flexibility in e-commerce regulation by building more on co and self-regulation, inter alia through co-operation with relevant business groups such as the Global Business Dialogue.	To be evaluated
7.4	Improve legal certainty for SMEs offering e-commerce services across the Union through an online information service and awareness actions.	
7.5	Encourage SMEs to "Go Digital" through co-ordinated networking activities for the exchange of knowledge on, best practices, e-commerce readiness and benchmarking. "Reference centres" could help SMEs to introduce e-commerce into their business strategies.	To be evaluated
7.6	Establish a .eu top level domain name.	
7.7	Adoption of two directives regarding Public Procurement incorporating provisions to remove legal obstacles to electronic procurement.	
7.8	Establish electronic marketplaces for public procurement.	To be evaluated
7.9	Adoption of a Directive on Value Added Tax (VAT) on certain services by electronic means to ensure compatibility of the EU VAT system with e-commerce, in particular to provide a level playing field for European content providers.	

8 - Government online: electronic access to public services

#	Action	
8.1	Essential public data online including legal, administrative cultural, environmental and traffic information.	To be evaluated
8.2	Member States to ensure generalised electronic access to main basic public services.	To be evaluated
8.3	Simplified online administrative procedures for business e.g. fast track procedures to set up a company.	
8.4	Develop a co-ordinated approach for public sector information, including at European level.	
8.5	Promote the use of open source software in the public sector and e-government best practice through the IST and IDA programmes).	
8.6	All basic transactions with the European Commission must be available online (e.g. funding, research contracts, recruitment, procurement).	
8.7	Promote the use of electronic signatures within the public sector.	To be evaluated

9 - Health online

#	Action	
9.1	Ensure that primary and secondary healthcare providers have health telematics infrastructure in place including regional networks.	To be evaluated
9.2	Best practice in electronic health services in Europe identified and disseminated, benchmarking criteria set.	
9.3	Publish a Communication on "Legal Aspects of eHealth in 2001".	
9.4	Establish a set of quality criteria for health related websites.	
9.5	Establish health technology and data assessment networks.	

10 - European digital content for global networks

#	Action	
10.1	Launch a programme to stimulate the development and use of European digital content on the global networks and to promote the linguistic diversity in the information society, including action to support exploitation of public sector information and establish European digital collections of key datasets.	To be evaluated
10.2	Create a co-ordination mechanism for digitisation programmes across Member States- define common themes, catalogue available resources, ensure interoperability.	

11 - Intelligent transport systems

#	Action	
11.1	Provision of location information to emergency services, including via 112 (new proposed Universal Service Directive).	
11.2	Establishment of the "Single European Sky".	
11.3	Implementation of Recommendation on "Participation of the private sector in deploying traveller information services in Europe".	
11.4	Deployment plan for Intelligent Transport Systems for road transport.	
11.5	Commission decision on adoption of specifications for wireless communication for high speed trains.	
11.6	Adoption of a Directive for a European maritime and inland shipping reporting and information system.	
11.7	Adoption of Decision on the future development of the Galileo infrastructure.	

Selection criteria of actions to evaluate

This will be done through focussing on those eEurope actions which have been considered the most relevant within the whole eEurope action plan.

Selection criteria of the above indicated eEurope actions, may be synthesized as follows:

- **Representativeness for each subject area**

It was considered necessary, as far as possible, to give an exhaustive overview of the state of the art Information Society in each member state. All the eEurope actions very specific and target oriented; therefore it was opted to guarantee a sort of balance between the 11 Areas these actions have been organised by the Commission;

Even if the application areas of some of the actions listed by the Commission under different themes may partly overlap, a particular effort was devoted to guarantee that all these areas are sufficiently investigated and – therefore – covered by the SIBIS evaluation.

- **Suitability to capture relevant data within every country**

The primary goal of the eEurope evaluation that of benchmarking the results achieved within each member state; therefore have been considered only those actions whose implementation is conditioned by every single country policy, economic and regulatory measures. Therefore, were not considered those actions whose unique actors are the European Bodies and that do not require a fundamental contribution from public as well as private sector actors in the member states

- **Suitability to benchmarking**

When the quality of information collected was qualitative, it will be structured in a way to make it comparable among member states, as far as possible.

- **Synergy with the general framework of the SIBIS project**

Since in the SIBIS project has a key aspect in the WP3 survey (and in particular a DMS – decision makers survey), it was necessary to make WP4 effort as efficient as possible. While expecting interesting results from DMS, it was decided to handle research within WP4 basically desk – starting from national eEurope reports - and making use of interviews only in those cases where data requested were not available in a country or, when only an interview may help researchers to have a clear overview on a specific issue.

The balance between direct – or phone – interviews will be decided by the partners according to the quantity and quality of information they will be able to retrieve within their country.

This will be conditioned of course by the number of resources that partners performing the research will be able to retrieve through desk research. In this phase of the project, it is not possible to foresee the exact number of interviews that will be needed for replying to the whole questionnaire. A preliminary estimate has however be done through highlighting those sectors, where, for the type of information required, an interview will be probably necessary.

Since the same interview is suitable to collect data necessary for measuring more than one action, they have been subdivided according to the subject areas, without specifying to which specific question these interviews are expected to give an answer

Table 2

Areas	Nr. Actions evaluated	Nr. Interviews
1 - Cheaper and faster Internet Access	2	
2 - Faster Internet for Researchers and Students	2	1
3 - Secure Networks and Smart Cards	3	1
4 - European youth into the digital age	4	1
5 - Working in the knowledge-based economy	5	1
6 - Participation for all in the knowledge-based economy	2	1
7 - Accelerating e-commerce	3	
8 - Government online: electronic access to public services	3	
9 - Health online	1	
10 - European digital content for global networks	1	
TOTAL	27	5

Structure of national reports

National reports should include the following elements:

1) A detailed description of the country context (3 – 5 pages)

Every partner is requested to provide a country context, to be articulated according to this structure:

- political awareness and sensibility to eEurope in the country
This description should provide all elements demonstrating the commitment of the country to acknowledge the issues of eEurope. Moreover, the paragraph should clarify to what extent the country technological innovation has been prompted by eEurope or derives from private or public spontaneous initiative.
- national context for the implementation of eEurope within public structure
This paragraph should indicate specific measures adopted by the country for the implementation of eEurope : have it been set up a public office, a task force or a responsible in charge of monitoring the eEurope action? Do these bodies act within the National Governments or are they independent structures?
- main policies in support of the development of ICT networks and high-speed infrastructure within the country
This paragraph may give a general overview of the evolution in the country regarding the development of TLC networks and high speed not only from a political point of view.
- commitment of the country in the introductions of e-Healthcare, e-Education and e-Government and, more in general, in the speeding up of technological innovation in traditionally public services.
This aspect is requested because it needs to provide a general overview of the approach of the country to the digitalisation of public services.
- capability of the country to create a political climate able to stimulate the diffusion of e-commerce.
To get the feeling of the aptitude towards the diffusion of the e-commerce within the country.
- any other information needed to understand country's specificities related to eEurope issues and to better comprehend the following questionnaire answers
It is possible that some of the questions will not raise all the aspects related to technological innovation in the country; any additional information useful to get an overview on these themes will be useful and will probably provide a more satisfactory information about the country.

2) completed questionnaire

Together with Commission representatives, SIBIS consortium identified “first priority eEurope actions” to be monitored with particular care in “Key eEurope actions evaluation”; SIBIS partners are required to guarantee a complete overview on them.

These actions (and related questions) have been indicated in blue in the questionnaire.

- “Cheaper and faster internet access” : action 1.6
- “Faster Internet for researchers and students”: action 2.1; action 2.2
- “Secure networks and smart cards”: action 3.1 – part 2 ;
- “Working in the knowledge based economy”: action 5.3
- “Accelerating e-commerce”: action 7.2; action 7.3; action 7.8

It is extremely important to get a complete answer to these actions and – where possible – to collect any additional comment and information suitable to give an overview of the implementation of those areas of intervention within every country.

- 3) bibliography and list of sources of data indicated
- 4) list of contacts (organisations, companies, public bodies, etc.) contacted for the compilation of the questionnaire
- 5) A table specifying the level of aggregation for the country , according to the scheme indicated in Table 4 at page 15 of this document

EU benchmarking indicators

Research carried out in every country, will provide policy progress evaluation indicators as well as performance indicators.

In particular, all those actions that will be measured in term of policy implementation/actions undertaken/regulatory framework established, will be measured according to the following scoring table.

Policy progress evaluation

- ? = no explicit activities identified
- = activities planned, but not yet started
- = activities launched, but no progress yet visible / measurable
- = activities launched and underway with some measurable progress already achieved
- = mission fully completed, i.e. objective has been realised and is documented

Scoring will be attributed in a second phase, during the elaboration and consolidation of data, according to the type of contribution provided by the questionnaire.

When it will be considered necessary, it will be asked to carrying out the eEurope evaluation to give a "policy progress evaluation" of that specific action analysed.

Some of the questions will provide performance indicators for the specific action. This will happen for all those actions that will not be evaluated through the "policy progress evaluation" and will be more useful for us to collect quantitative data. Criteria applied to "assign a score" to a country will be defined in a further step, when the research results will be available and it will be easier to set up criteria to be applied to all the EU countries. Performance indicators are likely to be expressed according to the following structure.

Performance indicators for action

- ☺☺☺ = among best countries in EU
- ☺☺ = reaches at least 70% of leader in benchmarking
- ☺ = between 30% and 50% of leader in benchmarking
- (-) = under 30% of leader

Here follows a table with the type of indicators we expect to obtain from the questions indicated in draft questionnaire.

Indicative definition of benchmarking indicators

Table 3

ACTION EVALUATED Question number	INDICATORS		
	Policy	Performance variation	Performance average
1.1	X		
1.2	X		
2		X	
3.1	X		
3.2	X		
3.3	X		
3.4	X		
4.1	X		
4.2	X		
5			X
6.1		X	
6.2		X	
6.3		X	
7.1	X		
7.2	X		
8.1	X		
8.2	X		
9.1			X
9.2			X
10		X	
11.1	X		
11.2	X		
11.3	X		
11.4	X		
12	X		
13.1	X		
13.2	X		
13.3	X		
13.4	X		
14.1	X		
14.2	X		
15.1	X		
15.2	X		
16.1	X		
16.2	X		
16.3	X		
16.4	X		
17.1	X		
17.2	X		
18			X
19.1	X		
19.2	X		
20.1			X
20.2			X
21.1	X		
21.2	X		
22.1	X		
22.2	X		
22.3	X		
22.4	X		
23.1	X		
23.2	X		

Follows

ACTION EVALUATED	INDICATORS		
Question number	Policy	Performance variation	Performance average
24.1	X		
24.2	X		
25.1	X		
25.2	X		
26	X		
27.1	X		
27.2	X		
27.3	X		
27.4	X		
28.1	X		
28.2	X		
28.3	X		
29			X
30.1	X		
30.2	X		
31.1	X		
31.2	X		
31.3	X		
32.1		X	
32.2	X		
32.3	X		
33.1	X		
33.2	X		
34	X		

Questionnaire – Draft

General remarks:

- Numeric data referred to prices as well as other entities should be indicated into units (i.e.: not Millions or Billions)
- in case it is requested to collect data concerning the commercial offer of a service provider, will be consider commercial offer available starting from 1st June 2001 (or not expired in that date)
- territorial validity of the above mentioned bodies will be reorganised into 3 different levels as follows:

Table 4

National	Regional	Local
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Federal Government (Ger) • Central government (i.e.: UK) • ... other? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Region • Lander • ... other? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Township • Province • Country • Metropolitan areas • Departments • ...other?

- Each partner should compile the following questionnaire referring to the countries he/she is responsible for, to the best of his/her abilities
- In case one partners is responsible to provide data for more than one countries, he/she is requested to compile separate reports for each country.
- When quantitative data will be indicated, partners are requested to specify the source used
- Number of actions hereafter indicated refer to the general list of eEurope actions indicated in table 1, at page 2

1. Cheaper and faster Internet Access

Action 1.3

Please tick the corresponding box in the following table concerning the status of the implementation of the unbundling of the local loop in your country.

Question 1.1

When has the law (regulation) introducing the unbundling of the local loop been approved?

- Before/in 2000
- In 2001
- Still to be approved

Question 1.2

When will "unbundling of the local loop" be mandatory in your country?

- Before/in 2000
- In 2001
- Still to be approved

According to policy progress evaluation scheme, please mark the appropriate box, referring to this action

?	●	●●	●●●	☑
---	---	----	-----	---

Policy progress evaluation

- ? = no explicit activities identified
- = activities planned, but not yet started
- = activities launched, but no progress yet visible/measurable
- = activities launched and underway with some measurable progress already achieved
- ☑ = mission fully completed, i.e. objective has been realised and is documented

Question 2

How many insurgent telephony operators – excluding incumbent operator - have launched "unbundled" fixed phone services directly to end users?

	On a national level	On a local level*
up to/ in 2000		
in 2001		

(*) are here intended as "local" operators those whose commercial offer is limited to one (or more) regions or municipalities.

Comments:

Action 1.6

Question 3.1

Is there in your country a *national* "umbrella" programme or action plan for supporting "the development of information infrastructure in less favoured regions"¹?

- Yes
- No
- Partially
- Under discussion/planned for (please specify): _____

Question 3.2

If yes, please fill in the following table

• Title of action plan _____
• Date of approval _____
• Scope (national, regional, local) _____
• Key relevant objectives _____
• Timing _____
• Funding (to be indicated in EURO) _____

Question 3.3

Are there *regional* programmes/action plans for supporting "the development of information infrastructure in less favoured regions"?

- Yes
- No
- Partially
- Under discussion/planned for (please specify): _____

¹ Excluding research networks (see following question)

Question 3.4

If yes, please name some relevant examples.

Question 4.1

Have national specific R&D investment plans been approved for supporting "the development of information infrastructure in less favoured regions" in your country?

- Yes
- No
- Partially
- Under discussion/planned for (please specify): _____

Question 4.2

If yes, please fill in the following abstract for the above indicated law/regulatory framework/investment plan

- Title of the law (or investment plan) _____
- Date of approval _____
- Scope (national, regional, local) _____
- Key relevant objectives _____
- Timing _____
- Funding (to be indicated in EURO) _____

"Disadvantaged area" will be all those ones considered as such by the policy measure defining devolving the funding.

Will be excluded all the initiatives entirely promoted and supported by private companies (namely ICT equipment suppliers).

Will be included the funding aimed at support:

- ICT infrastructures (i.e.: ICT equipment for schools, students and disadvantaged regions);
- education and ICT training initiatives (ICT courses addressed to unemployed, elderly etc).

According to policy progress evaluation scheme under indicated, please mark the appropriate box:

?	●	●●	●●●	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	---	----	-----	-------------------------------------

Policy progress evaluation

- ? = no explicit activities identified
- = activities planned, but not yet started
- = activities launched, but no progress yet visible / measurable
- = activities launched and underway with some measurable progress already achieved
- = mission fully completed, i.e. objective has been realised and is documented

Comments:

2. Faster Internet for Researchers and Students

Action 2.1

Question 5

Does your National Research Network have a fully optical backbone?

- Yes
- No
- planned for (please specify): _____

Action 2.2

Question 6.1

Please fill in the following table.

	Before/in 2000	In 2001	planned for ...
What is the <i>general</i> bandwidth currently available in your National Research Network (specify Mbits or Gbits)? *			
What is the <i>maximum</i> bandwidth currently available in your National Research Network (specify Mbits or Gbits)? *			

* in case more than one NREN have been set up in your country, please indicate their names and split data referred to each of the networks

Question 6.2

	Before/in 2000	In 2001	planned for ...
Does your NREN apply IPv6 protocol?			

Question 6.3

	Before/in 2000	In 2001	planned for ...
How many Universities* are in 2001 connected to your NREN at the maximum bandwidth (in percentage)?			

* please specify what is here intended as "university"

3. Secure Networks and Smart Cards

Action 3.1 (part. 2)

Question 7.1

Is there in your country an industry led security certification activity?

- Yes
- No
- Partially
- Under discussion/planned for (please specify): _____

Question 7.2

If yes, when was it set up?

- Before/in 2000
- In 2001

Action 3.3

Question 8.1

Is there in your country a national law/regulation for the safeguard against cybercrime?

- Yes, approved before/during 2000
- Yes, approved during 2001
- Under discussion/planned for (please specify)
- Not yet approved

Question 8.2

If yes, please fill in the following table for the above mentioned law/regulation

Title of the law (regulatory framework) _____
Date of approval _____
Scope (national, regional, local) _____
Key relevant objectives _____
Timing _____
Funding (to be indicated in EURO) – if applicable _____

For replying to this question, you should consider "Privacy enhancing technologies" any form of illegal activity of intrusions and other behaviour such as: privacy offences, content-related offences, economic crimes, unauthorised access and sabotage, intellectual property offences.

According to the policy progress evaluation scheme under indicated, please mark the appropriate box.

?	●	●●	●●●	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	---	----	-----	-------------------------------------

Policy progress evaluation	
?	= no explicit activities identified
●	= activities planned, but not yet started
●●	= activities launched, but no progress yet visible / measurable
●●●	= activities launched and underway with some measurable progress already achieved
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	= mission fully completed, i.e. objective has been realised and is documented

Comments:

Action 3.6

Question 9.1

Are smart card solutions² available for the following application areas?

Please mark the application areas where you're sure that smart card solutions have been applied.

	Yes	No	Data not available
Public Administration and other public services cards			
Electronic ID cards			
Tax payment			
School enrolment			
Healthcare services			
Prescriptions of healthcare services: prescriptions, medical visits, etc.			
Storage of personal medical data			
Other			
Credit cards			
Electronic wallet			
Shop cards and customer rewards schemes			
Public transport services			
Public utilities supply payment			
Digital TV			
Other			

² with exclusion of SIM used in mobile telephony

Question 9.2

Can you describe a potentially relevant/successful project on smart cards implementation in your country?

- Yes
- No

If yes, please fill in the following table

Name of the project _____
Timing: starting date, conclusion date _____
Scope (national, regional, local) _____
Key relevant objectives _____
Funding (to be indicated in EURO) - if applicable _____
Private or public bodies supporting the initiative _____

According to policy the progress evaluation scheme under indicated, please mark the appropriate box

?	●	●●	●●●	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	---	----	-----	-------------------------------------

Policy progress evaluation

- ? = no explicit activities identified
- = activities planned, but not yet started
- = activities launched, but no progress yet visible/measurable
- = activities launched and underway with some measurable progress already achieved
- = mission fully completed, i.e. objective has been realised and is documented

Comments:

4. European youth into the digital age

Action 4.1

Question 10

Please fill in the following table using Eurobarometer data

	2000	2001
Number of computers available at primary schools		
Number of computers available at secondary schools		
Number of Internet connections available at primary schools		
Number of Internet connections available at secondary schools		
Total number of primary schools in your country		
Total number of secondary schools in your country		

Question 11.1

Is there in your country a *national* "umbrella" programme or action plan "to provide schools, teachers and students with convenient access to the Internet and multimedia resources"?

- Yes
- No
- Partially
- Under discussion/ planned for (please specify): _____

Question 11.2

If yes, please fill in the following table.

Name of the action/investment plan _____
Date of approval _____
Scope (national, regional, local) _____
Key relevant objectives _____
Timing (from 2001-2002 Planned for.....) _____
Funding (to be indicated in EURO) _____

Question 11.3

Are there *regional* programmes/action plans "to provide schools, teachers and students with convenient access to the Internet and multimedia resources"?

- Yes
- No
- Only partially
- Under discussion/ planned for (please specify): _____

Question 11.4

If yes, please name some relevant examples.

According to policy the progress evaluation scheme under indicated, please mark the appropriate box

?	●	●●	●●●	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	---	----	-----	-------------------------------------

Policy progress evaluation

- ? = no explicit activities identified
- = activities planned, but not yet started
- = activities launched, but no progress yet visible/measurable
- = activities launched and underway with some measurable progress already achieved
- = mission fully completed, i.e. objective has been realised and is documented

Comments:

Action 4.3

Question 12

	In 2001
How many primary schools have got a website?	
How many secondary schools have got a website?	

Action 4.4

Question 13.1

Is there a *national* umbrella action plan or initiative aimed at supporting and "offering incentives to teachers to use digital technologies in teaching"?

- Yes
- No
- Partially
- Under discussion/ planned for (please specify): _____

Question 13.2

If yes, please fill in the following table referring to the above mentioned programme

Name of the action/investment plan _____
Date of approval _____
Scope (national, regional, local) _____
Key relevant objectives _____
Timing (from 2001 – Planned for.....) _____
Funding (to be indicated in EURO) devoted in support of training courses _____

Question 13.3

Are there *regional* action plans aimed at supporting and "offering incentives to teachers to use digital technologies in teaching"?

- Yes
- No
- Partially
- Under discussion/ planned for (please specify): _____

Question 13.4

If yes, please name some relevant examples.

According to policy the progress evaluation scheme under indicated, please mark the appropriate box

?	●	●●	●●●	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	---	----	-----	-------------------------------------

Policy progress evaluation

- ? = no explicit activities identified
- = activities planned, but not yet started
- = activities launched, but no progress yet visible/measurable
- = activities launched and underway with some measurable progress already achieved
- = mission fully completed, i.e. objective has been realised and is documented

Comments:

Action 4. 6

Question 14.1

Are there in your country examples of potentially relevant/successful projects aimed at ensuring that "all pupils have the possibility to be digitally literate by the time they leave school"?

- Yes
- No

Question 14.2

If yes, please fill in the following table

Name of the project _____
Timing: starting date, conclusion date _____
Scope (national, regional, local) _____
Key relevant objectives _____
Funding (to be indicated in EURO) – if applicable _____
Private or public bodies supporting the initiative _____

Comments:

5. Working in the knowledge-based economy

Action 5.1

Question 15.1

Is there a *national* regulation/law supporting digital literacy of labour force through lifelong learning in your country?

- Yes
- No
- Partially
- Under discussion/planned for (please specify): _____

Question 15.2

For the above mentioned law/regulation, please fill in the following table

Title of law/regulation act _____
Date of approval _____
Scope (national, regional, local) _____
Key relevant objectives _____
Does the action plan foresee incentives or tax exemptions for companies providing ICT training/retraining of their employees? _____
Timing (from 2001 – Planned for.....) _____
Funding (to be indicated in EURO) devoted in support of training courses _____

According to the policy progress evaluation scheme under indicated, please mark the appropriate box

?	●	●●	●●●	☑
---	---	----	-----	---

Policy progress evaluation

- ? = no explicit activities identified
- = activities planned, but not yet started
- = activities launched, but no progress yet visible/measurable
- = activities launched and underway with some measurable progress already achieved
- ☑ = mission fully completed, i.e. objective has been realised and is documented

Comments:

Action 5.2

Question 16.1

Is there a *national umbrella* action plan or initiative supporting "the increase of information technology training places and courses" for workers in your country?

- Yes
- No
- Partially
- Under discussion/ planned for (please specify): _____

Question 16.2

If yes, please fill in the following table.

Name of the action _____
Date of approval _____
Target: unemployed, disabled and elderly _____
Scope (national, regional, local) _____
Key relevant objectives _____
Timing (from 2001 - Planned for.....) _____
Funding (to be indicated in EURO) devoted in support of training courses _____

Question 16.3

Are there *regional* action plans aimed supporting "the increase of information technology training places and courses" for workers?

- Yes
- No
- Partially
- Under discussion/ planned for (please specify): _____

Question 16.4

If yes, please name some relevant examples.

According to the policy progress evaluation scheme under indicated, please mark the appropriate box

?	●	●●	●●●	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	---	----	-----	-------------------------------------

Policy progress evaluation

- ? = no explicit activities identified
- = activities planned, but not yet started
- = activities launched, but no progress yet visible / measurable
- = activities launched and underway with some measurable progress already achieved
- = mission fully completed, i.e. objective has been realised and is documented

Comments:

Action 5.3

Question 17.1

Has the European Computer Driving Licence been implemented in your state?

- Yes
- No
- Partially
- Under discussion/planned for (please specify ...): _____

Question 17.2

If yes, please specify when it was implemented

- Up to/in 2000
- in 2001

Comments:

Question 18

If ECDL has been implemented, how many ECDL have been released in your country?

Action 5.4

Question 19.1

Are there policies (action plans, programmes) supporting telework in your country?

- Yes
- No
- Partially
- Under discussion/ planned for (please specify): _____

Question 19.2

If yes, please fill in the following table.

Name of the action plan _____
Date of approval _____
Target: unemployed, disabled and elderly _____
Scope (national, regional, local) _____
Key relevant objectives _____
Timing (from 2001 - Planned for.....) _____
Funding (to be indicated in EURO) devoted in support of training courses _____

According to the policy progress evaluation scheme under indicated, please mark the appropriate box

?	●	●●	●●●	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	---	----	-----	-------------------------------------

Policy progress evaluation

- ? = no explicit activities identified
- = activities planned, but not yet started
- = activities launched, but no progress yet visible/measurable
- = activities launched and underway with some measurable progress already achieved
- = mission fully completed, i.e. objective has been realised and is documented

Comments:

Action 5.6

Question 20.1

	Public PIAPS	Private PIAPS	Data not available
How many Public Internet Access Points are there in your country?			

Question 20.2

If data are not available, please describe status

Question 21.1

Can you describe a potentially relevant/successful project on implementation of public internet access points in your country?

- Yes
- No

Question 21.2

If yes, please fill in the following table

Name of the project _____
Timing: starting date, conclusion date _____
Scope (national, regional, local) _____
Key relevant objectives _____
Funding (to be indicated in EURO) - if applicable _____
Private or public bodies supporting the initiative _____

Comments:

6. Participation for all in the knowledge-based economy

Action 6.1

Question 22.1

Are there any *umbrella* action plans/initiatives undertaken in your country in order to avoid physically and mentally disabled "info-exclusion" on a national level?

- Yes
- No
- Partially
- Under discussion/ planned for (please specify): _____

Question 22.2

If yes, please fill in the following table referring to the above mentioned initiative.

Name of the action/ investment plan _____
Date of approval _____
Scope (national, regional, local) _____
Key relevant objectives _____
Timing (from 2001 - Planned for.....) _____
Funding (to be indicated in EURO) devoted in support of training courses _____

Question 22.3

Are there *regional* action plans undertaken in your country in order to avoid physically and mentally disabled "info-exclusion"?

- Yes
- No
- Partially
- Under discussion/ planned for (please specify): _____

Question 22.4

If yes, please name some relevant examples.

Comments:

Action 6.4

Question 23.1

Has the WAI – Web Accessibility Initiative already been implemented in your country?

- Yes
- No
- Partially

Question 23.2

If yes, when was it implemented?

- Up to/in 2000
- In 2001

According to the policy progress evaluation scheme under indicated, please mark the appropriate box

?	●	●●	●●●	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	---	----	-----	-------------------------------------

Policy progress evaluation

- ? = no explicit activities identified
- = activities planned, but not yet started
- = activities launched, but no progress yet visible/measurable
- = activities launched and underway with some measurable progress already achieved
- = mission fully completed, i.e. objective has been realised and is documented

Comments:

7. Accelerating e-commerce

Action 7.2

Question 24.1

Is there a code of conduct in your country, regulating e-commerce transactions?

- Yes
- No
- Under discussion
- Data not available

Question 24.2

If there is one, which stakeholders have subscribed this code of conduct?

- Industry associations
- Consumer associations
- Retailers
- Internet Services Providers
- Others

Question 25.1

If yes, does this code of conduct foresee alternative dispute resolution procedures?

- Yes
- No
- Data not available

Question 25.2

If yes, please fill in the following table for the above mentioned document.

Name of the document (code of conduct) _____
Date of approval _____
Scope (national, regional, local) _____
Key relevant objectives _____
Private or public body supporting the initiative _____

According to the policy progress evaluation scheme under indicated, please mark the appropriate box

?	●	●●	●●●	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	---	----	-----	-------------------------------------

Policy progress evaluation

- ? = no explicit activities identified
- = activities planned, but not yet started
- = activities launched, but no progress yet visible/measurable
- = activities launched and underway with some measurable progress already achieved
- = mission fully completed, i.e. objective has been realised and is documented

Comments:

Action 7.3

Question 26.1

Is there in your country an industry led consortium/association to promote e-commerce self regulation?

- Yes
- No

Comments:

Action 7.5

Question 27.1

Is there a national *umbrella* action plan/programme to support SMEs to "go digital" in your country?

- Yes
- No
- Partially
- Under discussion/ planned for (please specify): _____

Question 27.2

If yes, please fill in the following table for the above mentioned measure.

Name of the action/investment plan _____
Date of approval _____
Scope (national, regional, local) _____
Key relevant objectives _____
Timing (from 2001 – Planned for.....) _____
Funding (to be indicated in EURO) devoted in support of training courses _____

Question 27.3

Are there regional action plans/programmes to support SMEs to “go digital”?

- Yes
- No
- Partially
- Under discussion/ planned for (please specify): _____

Question 27.4

If yes, please name some relevant examples.

Comments:

Action 7.8

Question 28.1

Is there a regulation/national programme supporting the creation of electronic marketplaces for public procurement in your country?

- Yes
- No
- Partially
- Under discussion/ planned for (please specify): _____

Question 28.2

If yes, please fill in the following table for the above mentioned initiative.

Name of the law/ regulation _____
Date of approval _____
Scope (national, regional, local) _____
Key relevant objectives _____
Timing (from 2001 – Planned for.....) _____
Funding (to be indicated in EURO) devoted in support of training courses _____

Question 28.3

If not, please indicate status.

8. Government online: electronic access to public services

Action 8. 1

Question 29

(to be covered with Eurobarometer data)

How many civic webs are there in your country?	
How many municipalities are there in your country?	

Please, apply the following definition of "Civic Web": "Civic Web" is the official site of a local authority (at municipal level), promoted and administered by local authorities (i.e. the municipality), including general websites making civic information available to the public. These websites mostly disseminate information about local authorities' organisation, services, initiatives, and policies, in addition to other information about local culture, sports, business events and so on.

Action 8.2

Question 30.1

Are tax return forms available online for download?

- Yes
- No

Question 30.2

Is it possible to submit tax return forms on line?

- Yes
- No

According to the policy progress evaluation scheme under indicated, please mark the appropriate box

?	●	●●	●●●	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	---	----	-----	-------------------------------------

Policy progress evaluation

- ? = no explicit activities identified
- = activities planned, but not yet started
- = activities launched, but no progress yet visible/measurable
- = activities launched and underway with some measurable progress already achieved
- = mission fully completed, i.e. objective has been realised and is documented

Comments:

Action 8.7

Question 31.1

Is there a law/regulation in your country for the implementation of electronic signature?

- Yes
- No
- Under discussion

Question 31.2

If yes, when was the electronic signature implemented in your country?

- Up to/in 2000
- In 2001
- Planned for (please specify): _____

Question 31.3

For each of the above mentioned documents, please fill in the following table

Name of the law _____
Date of approval _____
Scope (national, regional, local) _____
Key relevant objectives _____
Timing (from 2001 - Planned for.....) _____
Funding (to be indicated in EURO) devoted to implementation of electronic signature, if applicable _____

Comments:

9. Health online

Action 9. 1

Question 32.1

(use Eurobarometer data)

	2000	2001
How many in % of total hospitals in your country are connected to the Internet?		
How many in % of total medical doctors have an access to the Internet in your country?		

Question 32.2

If these data are not be available, please briefly indicate what are the main objectives for the diffusion of telematics networks for healthcare in your country.

Question 32.3

If there is a specific measure for telematics network in healthcare, please fill in the following table for the above mentioned measure.

Name of the action/ investment plan _____
Date of approval _____
Scope (national, regional, local) _____
Key relevant objectives _____
Timing (from 2001 - Planned for.....) _____
Funding (to be indicated in EURO) devoted in support of training courses _____

Comments:

10. European digital content for global networks

Action 10.1

Question 33.1

Are there national and/or regional programmes or strategies to "support exploitation of public sector information"?

- Yes
- No
- Only partially
- Under discussion/ planned for (please specify): _____

Question 33.2

If yes, which specific data sets of public sector information do these programmes focus on?

Question 34

How would you describe your country's allocation of Structural Funds/EU Social Funds with respect to the eEurope goals ?
