Consultation on the revision of the NIS Directive

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Contents

Introduction

As our daily lives and economies become increasingly dependent on digital technologies and internet- based services and products, we become more vulnerable and exposed to cyber-attacks. We are witnessing that the threat landscape is constantly evolving and the attack surface constantly expanding, putting network and information systems at greater risk than ever before. The COVID-19 crisis and the resulting growth in demand for internet-based solutions has emphasised even more the need for a state of the art response and preparedness for a potential future crisis. Maintaining a high level of cybersecurity across the European Union has become essential to keep the economy running and to ensure prosperity.

Directive (EU) 2016/1148 concerning measures for a high common level of security of network and information systems across the Union ("NIS Directive" or "the Directive") is the first horizontal internal market instrument aimed at improving the resilience of the EU against cybersecurity risks. Based on Article 114 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the NIS Directive provides legal measures to boost the overall level of cybersecurity in the EU by ensuring:

- a high level of preparedness of Member States by requiring them to designate one or more national Computer Security Incident Response Teams (CSIRTs) responsible for risk and incident handling and a competent national NIS authority;
- cooperation among all the Member States by establishing the Cooperation Group to support and facilitate strategic cooperation and the exchange of information among Member States, and the CSIRTs network, which promotes swift and effective operational cooperation between national CSIRTs;
- a culture of security across sectors which are vital for our economy and society and moreover rely heavily on ICTs, such as energy, transport, banking, financial market infrastructures, drinking water, healthcare and digital infrastructure. Public and private entities identified by the Member States as operators of essential services in these sectors are required to undertake a risk assessment and put it place appropriate and proportionate security measures as well as to notify serious incidents to the relevant authorities. Also providers of key digital services such as search engines, cloud computing services and online marketplaces have to comply with the security and notification requirements under the Directive.

Article 23 of the NIS Directive requires the European Commission to review the functioning of this Directive periodically. As part of its key policy objective to make "Europe fit for the digital age" as well as in line with the objectives of the Security Union, the Commission announced in its Work Programme 2020 that it would conduct the review by the end of 2020. This would advance the deadline foreseen under Article 23(2) of the Directive, according to which the Commission shall review the Directive for the first time and report to the European Parliament and the Council by 9 May 2021.

As part of this process, this consultation seeks your views on the topic of cybersecurity as well as on the different elements of the NIS Directive, which are all subject to the review. The results of this consultation will be used for the evaluation and impact assessment of the NIS Directive.

This consultation is open to everybody: citizens, public and private organisations, trade associations and academics. The questionnaire is divided in three sections:

- Section 1 contains general questions on the NIS Directive that are accessible to all categories of stakeholders.
- Section 2 contains technical questions on the functioning of the NIS Directive. This section is mainly targeted at individuals, organisations or authorities that are familiar with the NIS Directive and cybersecurity policies.
- Section 3 aims to gather views on approaches to cybersecurity in the European context currently not addressed by the NIS Directive. This section is mainly targeted at individuals, organisations or authorities that are familiar with the NIS Directive and cybersecurity policies.

Written feedback provided in other document formats can be uploaded through the button made available at the end of the questionnaire.

The survey will remain open until 02 October 2020 - 23h00.

About you

* Language of my contribution → English

* I am giving my contribution as

=> association

Transparency register number

☐ I agree with the personal data protection provisions

* Can you specify further your capacity in which you are replying to the questionnaire on the review of the NIS Directive?

Trade association representing entities currently covered by the NIS

Please specify the sector you are responsible for:

Please specify what type of digital services you provide:

Please state in which capacity are you replying to this questionnaire:

* Before starting this survey, are you aware of the objectives and principles of the EU Directive on security of network and information systems (the NIS Directive)?

- ○ Not aware at all
- ○ Slightly aware
- ○ Aware
- ○ Strongly aware
- ○ Don't know / no opinion

* Has your organisation been impacted by the adoption of the NIS Directive (for example by having to adopt certain measures stemming directly from the Directive or from national laws transposing the Directive, or by participating in the various cooperation fora established by the Directive)?

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

Section 1: General questions on the NIS Directive

Sub-section 1.a. – Relevance of the NIS Directive

The NIS Directive envisages to (1) increase the capabilities of Member States when it comes to mitigating cybersecurity risks and handling incidents, (2) improve the level of cooperation amongst Member States in the field of cybersecurity and the protection of essential services, and (3) promote a culture of cybersecurity across all sectors vital for our economy and society.

Q1: To what extent are these objectives still relevant?

	Not relevant at all	Not relevant	Relevant	Very relevant	Don't know / no opinion
Increase the capabilities of Member States				X	
Improve the level of cooperation amongst Member States				X	
Promote a culture of security across all sectors vital for our economy and society				X	

Q1: Since the entry into force of the NIS Directive in 2016, how has in your opinion the cyber threat landscape evolved?

	Cyber threat level has decreased significantly
	Cyber threat level has decreased
	Cyber threat level is the same
X	Cyber threat level has increased
	Cyber threat level has increased significantly
	Don't know / no opinion

Q2: How do you evaluate the level of preparedness of small and medium-sized companies in the EU against current cyber threats (on a scale from 1 to 5 with 5 indicating that companies score highly on cyber resilience)?

	1
	2
X	3
	4
	5

	Don't know / no opinion

Sub-section 1.c. – Technological advances and new trends

Technological advances and new trends provide great opportunities to the economy and society as a whole. The growing importance of edge computing (which is a new model of technology deployment that brings data processing and storage closer to the location where it is needed, to improve response times and save bandwidth), as well as the high reliance on digital technologies especially during the COVID-19 crisis increases at the same time the potential attack surface for malicious actors. All this changes the paradigm of security resulting in new challenges for companies to adapt their approaches to ensuring the cybersecurity of their services.

Q1: In which way should such recent technological advances and trends be considered in the development of EU cybersecurity policy?

The EU cybersecurity policy should focus on cyber hygiene and raising the bar on minimum cyber security requirements, and not focus too much on technological details and trends.

Sub-section 1.d. – Added-value of EU cybersecurity rules

The NIS Directive is based on the idea that common cybersecurity rules at EU level are more effective than national policies alone and thus contribute to a higher level of cyber resilience at Union level.

Q1: To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know/no opinion
Cyber risks can propagate across borders at high speed, which is why cybersecurity rules should be aligned at Union level				X	
The mandatory sharing of cyber risk related information between national authorities across Member States would contribute to a higher level of joint situational awareness when it comes to cyber risks.				X	
XAll entities of a certain size providing essential services to our society should be subject to similar EU-wide cybersecurity requirements.				X	

Sub-section 1.e. – Sectoral scope

Under the current NIS Directive, certain public and private entities are required to take appropriate security measures and notify serious incidents to the relevant national authorities. Entities subject to these requirements include so-called operators of essential services (OES) and digital service providers (DSP).

Operators of essential services are entities operating in seven sectors and subsectors: energy (electricity, oil and gas), transport (air, rail, water and road), banking, financial market infrastructures, health sector, drinking water supply and distribution, and digital infrastructure (IXPs, DNS providers and TLD registries). Digital service providers are either cloud service providers, online search engines or online marketplaces.

Q1: Should the following sectors or services be included in the scope of the Directive due to their exposure to cyber threats and their importance for the economy and the society as a whole?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know / no opinion
Public administration				X	
Food supply				X	
Manufacturing				X	
Chemicals				X	
Waste water				X	
Social networks				X	
Data centres				X	

Q2: Should undertakings providing public communications networks or publically available electronic communications services currently covered by the security and notification requirements of the EU telecom framework be included in the scope of the NIS Directive?

X	Yes
	No
	Don't know / no opinion

If yes, please elaborate your answer:

1000 character(s) maximum

Including all sectors and services under the same policies, foster cross sector and services collaboration.

Q3: Do you consider that also other sectors, subsectors and/or types of digital services need to be included in the scope of the Directive due to their exposure to cyber threats and their importance for the economy and the society as a whole?

X	Yes
	No
	Don't know / no opinion

If yes, please specify which sectors, subsectors and/or digital services:

1000 character(s) maximum

On top of the digital service providers that is included in the NIS directive, it could also include:
- digital identity providers
- all digital service providers with a significant (e.g. over 10 000) amount of registered users that has provided personal information and/or payment information

Sub-section 1.f. – Regulatory treatment of OES and DSPs by the NIS Directive

As regards the imposition of security and notification requirements, the NIS Directive distinguishes between two main categories of economic entities: operators of essential services (OES) and digital service
providers (DSP). While in the case of OES, Member States are allowed to impose stricter security and notification requirements than those enshrined in the Directive, they are prohibited to do so for DSPs. Moreover, competent authorities can only supervise DSPs "ex-post" (when an authority is provided with evidence that a company does not fulfil its obligations) and not "ex-ante" as in the case of OES. These are elements of the so-called "light-touch" regulatory approach applied towards DSPs, which was motivated by the lower degree of risk posed to the security of the digital services and the cross-border nature of their services.

Q1: Do you agree that the "light-touch" regulatory approach applied towards DSPs is justified and therefore should be maintained?

	Yes
X	No
	Don't know / no opinion

Please elaborate your answer:

1000 character(s) maximum

The light-touch approach does not seem justified as:
- The importance of the digital services to the society is constantly increasing
- The amount of data and security breaches has not declined, on the contrary it seems that they have increased.
- Digital crime is a constant threat to EU citizens

Sub-section 1.g. – Information sharing

Under the NIS Directive, Member States must require operators of essential services (OES) and digital service providers (DSP) to report serious incidents. According to the Directive, incidents are events having an actual adverse effect on the security of network and information systems. As a result, reportable incidents constitute only a fraction of the relevant cybersecurity information gathered by OES and DSPs in their daily operations.

Q1: Should entities under the scope of the NIS Directive be required to provide additional information to the authorities beyond incidents as currently defined by the NIS Directive?

X	Yes
	No
	Don't know / no opinion

If yes, please specify which types of information they should make available and to whom:

1000 character(s) maximum

- It would be good to share information about prevented attacks to get better national and EU wide situational awareness of what types of attacks are ongoing and on what scale.
- Indicators of compromise information would also be good to share between the service providers through the authorities to fight united against cybercrime.

Section 2: Functioning of the NIS Directive

Sub-section 2.a. – National strategies

The NIS Directive requires Member States to adopt national strategies on the security of network and information systems defining strategic objectives and policy measures to achieve and maintain a high level of cybersecurity and covering at least the sectors referred to in Annex II and the services referred to in Annex III of the Directive.

Q1: In your opinion, how relevant are common objectives set on EU level for the adoption of national strategies on the security of network and information systems in order to achieve a high level of cybersecurity?

	Not relevant at all
	Not relevant
	Relevant
X	Very relevant
	Don't know / no opinion

Q2: Taking into account the evolving cybersecurity landscape, should national strategies take into account any additional elements so far not listed in the Directive?

	Yes
	No
X	Don't know / no opinion

If yes, please specify which elements:

500 character(s) maximum

Sub-section 2.b. – National competent authorities and bodies

The Directive requires Member States to designate one or more national competent authorities on the security of network and information systems to monitor the application of the Directive on a national level. In addition, Member States are required to appoint a single point of contact to ensure cross-border cooperation with the relevant authorities in other Member States and with the Cooperation Group and the CSIRT network as well as one or more computer security incident response teams (CSIRTs) responsible for risk and incident handling for the sectors and services covered by Annex II and III of the Directive.

Q1: In your opinion what is the impact of the NIS Directive on national authorities dealing with the security of network and information systems in the Member States?

	No impact	Low impact	Medium impact	High impact	Don't know / no opinion
Level of funding					X
Level of staffing					X
Level of expertise					X
Cooperation of authorities across Member States					X
Cooperation between national competent authorities within Member States					X

Q2: In your opinion, what is the impact of the NIS Directive on national Computer Security Incident Response Teams (CSIRTs) in the Member States?

	No impact	Low impact	Medium impact	High impact	Don't know / no opinion
Level of funding					X
Level of staffing					X
Level of operational capabilities					X
Level of expertise					X
Cooperation with OES and DSP			X		
Cooperation with relevant national authorities (such as sectoral authorities)					X

Q3: How do you evaluate the quality of services provided by the national Computer Security Incident Response Teams to OES (on a scale from 1 to 5 with 5 indicating a very high level of quality)?

	1
	2
	3
X	4
	5
	Don't know / no opinion

Q4: How do you evaluate the quality of services provided by the national Computer Security Incident Response Teams to DSPs (on a scale from 1 to 5 with 5 indicating a very high level of quality)?

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
X	Don't know / no opinion

Q5: Under the NIS Directive, competent authorities or the CSIRTs shall inform the other affected Member State(s) if an incident has a significant impact on the continuity of essential services in that Member State. How do you evaluate the level of incident-related information sharing between Member States (on a scale from 1 to 5 with 5 indicating a very high degree of satisfaction with the information shared)?

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
X	Don't know / no opinion

Q6: If you are an OES/DSP: Has your organisation received technical support from the national CSIRTs in case of an incident?

	Yes
	No
X	Don't know / no opinion

If yes, please rate the usefulness of this support (on a scale from 1 to 5 with 5 indicating a very useful support)

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
X	Don't know / no opinion

Q7: Should the CSIRTs be assigned additional tasks so far not listed in the NIS Directive?

	Yes
	No
X	Don't know / no opinion

If yes, please specify which tasks:

500 character(s) maximum

Q8: How do you evaluate the functioning of the single points of contact (SPOCs) since their establishment by the NIS Directive as regards the performance of the following tasks (on a scale from 1 to 5 with 5 indicating a very high level of performance)?

	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / no opinion
Cross-border cooperation with the relevant authorities in other Member States						X
Cooperation with the Cooperation Group						X
Cooperation with the CSIRTs network						X

Q9: Should the single points of contact be assigned additional tasks so far not listed in the NIS Directive?

	Yes
	No
X	Don't know / no opinion

If yes, please specify which tasks:

500 character(s) maximum

Q10: How do you evaluate the level of consultation and cooperation between competent authorities and SPOCs on the one hand, and relevant national law enforcement authorities and national data protection authorities on the other hand (on a scale from 1 to 5 with 5 indicating a very high level of cooperation)?

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
X	Don't know / no opinion

Sub-section 2.c. – Identification of operators of essential services and sectoral scope

Operators of essential services are organisations that are important for the functioning of the economy and society as a whole. While the NIS Directive provides a list of sectors and subsectors, in which particular types of entities could become subject to security and incident reporting requirements, Member States are required to identify the concrete operators for which these obligations apply by using criteria set out in the Directive.

Q1: To what extent do you agree with the following statements regarding the concept of identification of operators of essential services (OES) introduced by the NIS Directive and its implementation by Member States?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know / no opinion
The current approach ensures that all relevant operators are identified across the Union.		X			
OES are aware of their obligations under the NIS Directive.			X		
Competent authorities actively engage with OES.				X	
The cross-border consultation procedure in its current form is an effective element of the identification process to deal with cross-border dependencies.					X
The identification process has contributed to the creation of a level playing field for companies from the same sector across the Member States.					X

Please elaborate your answer:

1000 character(s) maximum

Member states has identified on very different level and amounts the providers of essential services. Some kind of common criteria would be needed to be defined.

Q2: Given the growing dependence on ICT systems and the internet in all sectors of the economy, to what extent do you agree with the following statements regarding the scope of the NIS Directive when it comes to operators of essential services?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know / no opinion
Definitions of the types of entities listed in Annex II are sufficiently clear.		X			
More sectors and sub-sectors should be covered by the Directive.			X		
Identification thresholds used by Member States should be lower (i.e. more companies should be covered).			X		

Please elaborate your answers:

1000 character(s) maximum

Member states has identified on very different level and amounts the providers of essential services. Some kind of common criteria would be needed to be defined.

Q3: If you agree with the statement above that more sectors and sub-sectors should be covered by the Directive, which other sectors should be covered by the scope of the NIS Directive and why?

1000 character(s) maximum

On top of the digital service providers that is included in the NIS directive, it could also include:
- digital identity providers
- all digital service providers with a significant (e.g. over 10 000) amount of registered users that has provided personal information and/or payment information

Q4: How has the level of risk of cyber incidents in the different sectors and subsectors covered by the NIS Directive evolved since the Directive entered into force in 2016?

	Very significant decrease in risk	Significant decrease in risk	No increase or decrease in risk	Significant increase in risk	Very significant increase in risk	Don't know / no opinion
Electricity						x
Oil						x
Gas						x
Air transport						x
Rail transport						x

Water transport						x
Road transport						x
Banking				X		
Financial market infrastructures				X		
Health sector						x
Drinking water supply and distribution						x
Digital infrastructure (IXPs, DNS providers, TLD registries)						x

Q5: How do you evaluate the level of cybersecurity resilience when it comes to the different sectors and subsectors covered by the NIS Directive?

	Very low	Low	Medium	High	Very high	Don't know / no opinion
Electricity						X
Oil						X
Gas						X
Air transport						X
Rail transport						X
Water transport						X
Road transport						X
Banking					X	
Financial market infrastructures					X	
Health sector						X
Drinking water supply and distribution						X
Digital infrastructure (IXPs, DNS providers, TLD registries)						X

Q6: How do you evaluate the level of cyber resilience and the risk-management practices applied by those small and medium-sized companies that are not covered by the NIS Directive (on a scale from 1 to 5 with 5 indicating that companies score highly on cyber resilience)?

	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / no opinion
Small companies						X
Medium-sized companies						X

Please elaborate your answers for both small and medium-sized companies:

	Your elaboration
Small companies	
Medium-sized companies	

Q7: Do you think that the level of resilience and the risk-management practices applied by companies differ from sector to sector for small and medium-sized companies?

	Yes
	No
X	Don't know / no opinion

If yes, please elaborate:

1000 character(s) maximum

Sub-section 2.d. – Digital service providers and scope

Digital service providers (cloud service providers, online search engines and online marketplaces) shall also put in place security measures and report substantial incidents. For this type of entities, the Directive envisages a "light-touch" regulatory approach, which means inter alia that competent authorities can only supervise DSPs "ex-post" (when an authority is provided with evidence that a company does not fulfil its obligations). Member States are not allowed to impose any further security or reporting requirements than those set out in the Directive ("maximum harmonisation"). Jurisdiction is based on the criterion of main establishment in the EU.

Q1: To what extent do you agree with the following statements regarding the way in which the NIS Directive regulates digital service providers (DSPs)?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know / no opinion
Annex III of the NIS Directive covers all relevant types of digital services.		X			

Definitions of the types of digital services listed in Annex III are sufficiently clear.		X			
DSPs are aware of their obligations under the NIS Directive.					X
Competent authorities have a good overview of the DSPs falling under their jurisdiction.					X
Competent authorities actively engage with DSPs under their jurisdiction					X
Security requirements for DSPs are sufficiently harmonized at EU level.		X			
Incident notifications requirements for DSPs are sufficiently harmonized at EU level.					X
Reporting thresholds provided by the Implementing Regulation laying down requirements for Digital Service Providers under the NIS Directive are appropriate.					X

Q2: If you disagree with the statement above that Annex III of the NIS Directive covers all relevant types of digital services, which other types of providers of digital services should fall under the scope of the NIS Directive and why?

1000 character(s) maximum

On top of the digital service providers that is included in the NIS directive, it could also include:
- digital identity providers
- all digital service providers with a significant (e.g. over 10 000) amount of registered users that has provided personal information and/or payment information

Q3: To what extent do you agree with the following statements regarding the so- called "light-touch approach" of the NIS Directive towards digital service providers (DSPs)?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know / no opinion
The more harmonised regulatory approach applied towards DSPs as compared to OES is justified by the cross-border nature of their services.			X		
Subjecting DSPs to the jurisdiction of the Member State where they have their main establishment in the EU minimises the compliance burden for those companies.			X		

The limitation related to the supervisory power of the national authorities, notably to take action only when provided with evidence (ex-post supervision), in the case of the DSPs is justified by the nature of their services and the degree of cyber risk they face.		X			
The exclusion of micro- and small enterprises is reasonable considering the limited impact of their services on the economy and society as a whole.			X		

Please elaborate your answers:

1000 character(s) maximum

Q4: How do you evaluate the level of preparedness of digital service providers covered by the NIS Directive when it comes to cybersecurity related risks?

	Very low	Low	Medium	High	Very high	Don't know / no opinion
Online marketplace						X
Online search engines						X
Cloud computing services						X

Q5: In the previous question, you have been asked about the level of preparedness of different types of digital service providers. Please explain your assessment of the level of preparedness:

	Your explanation
Online marketplace	
Online search engines	
Cloud computing services	

Q6: How has the level of risk of cyber incidents in the different sectors and subsectors covered by the NIS Directive evolved since the Directive entered into force in 2016?

	Very significant decrease in risk	Significant decrease in risk	No increase or decrease in risk	Significant increase in risk	Very significant increase in risk	Don't know / no opinon

Online marketplace				X		
Online search engines				X		
Cloud computing services				X		

Q7: How do you evaluate the level of cybersecurity resilience when it comes to the different types of digital service providers covered by the NIS Directive?

	Very low	Low	Medium	High	Very high	Don't know / no opinion
Online marketplace						X
Online search engines						X
Cloud computing services						X

Sub-section 2.e. – Security requirements

Member States are required to ensure that entities take appropriate and proportionate technical and organisational measures to manage the risks posed to the security of network and information systems.

Q1: What is the impact of imposing security requirements on OES by the NIS Directive in terms of cyber resilience?

X	No impact
	Low impact
	Medium impact
	High impact
	Don't know / no opinion

Please elaborate your answer:

1000 character(s) maximum

The NIS directive security requirements on the financial sector in Finland were on such high level that everything was already covered by current national legislation. No new requirements came from the directive.

Q2: What is the impact of imposing security requirements on DSPs by the NIS Directive in terms of cyber resilience?

	No impact
	Low impact
	Medium impact
	High impact
X	Don't know / no opinion

Please elaborate your answer:

1000 character(s) maximum

Q3: To what extent do you agree with the following statements regarding the implementation of security requirements under the NIS Directive?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know / No opinion
Member States have established effective security requirements for OES on a national level.		X			
There is a sufficient degree of alignement of security requirements for OES and DSPs in all MS.		X			

Please elaborate your answers:

1000 character(s) maximum

NIS Directive security requirements were not demanding enough.

Are there sectoral differences for OES regarding how effectivelysecurity requirements have been put in place by the Member States?

	Yes

	No
X	Don’t know / no opinion

If yes, please specify for which sectors and elaborate:

1000 character(s) maximum

Q4: While some Member States have put in place rather general security requirements, other Member States have enacted very detailed requirements featuring a higher degree of prescriptiveness. To what extent do you agree with the following statements regarding these different approaches?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don’t know / no opinion
Prescriptive requirements make it easy for companies to be compliant.			X		
Prescriptive requirements leave too little flexibility to companies.		X			
Prescriptive requirements ensure a higher level of cybersecurity than general risk management obligations.			X		
Prescriptive requirements make it difficult to take into account technological progress, new approaches to doing cybersecurity and other developments.		X			
The different level of prescriptiveness of requirements increases a regulatory burden for companies operating across different national markets.					X
The companies should have the possibility to use certification to demonstrate compliance with NIS security requirements.					X
The companies should be required to use certification for their compliance with NIS security requirements.	X				

Please elaborate your answers:

1000 character(s) maximum

Prescriptive demands on right level, ensures a higher level of cyber security with enough flexibility. There are already enough certifications and certification maintenance, one more would be an additional burden and cost.

Sub-section 2.f. – Incident notification

Member States are required to ensure that entities notify the competent authority or the CSIRT of incidents having a significant impact on the continuity or provision of services.

Q1: To what extent do you agree with the following statements regarding the implementation of notification requirements under the NIS Directive?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know / no opinion
The majority of companies have developed a good understanding of what constitutes an incident that has to be reported under the NIS Directive.					X
Member States have imposed notification requirements obliging companies to report all significant incidents.				X	
Different reporting thresholds and deadlines across the EU create unnecessary compliance burden for OES.					X
The current approach ensures that OES across the Union face sufficiently similar incident notification requirements.					X

Please elaborate your answers:

1000 character(s) maximum

Notification requirements were added to all sectors national legislation in Finland.

Sub-section 2.g. – Level of discretion on transposition and implementation given to Member States

The NIS Directive gives a wide room of discretion to Member States when it comes to the identification of operators of essential services, the setting of security requirements and the rules governing incident notification.

Q1: To what extent do you agree with the following statements regarding this approach from an internal market perspective?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know/No opinion
The approach leads to significant differences in the application of the Directive and has a strong negative impact on the level playing field for companies in the internal market.			X		
The approach increases costs for OES operating in more than one Member State.					X
The approach allows Member States to take into account national specificities.			X		

Please elaborate your answers:

1000 character(s) maximum

Sub-section 2.h. – Enforcement

The Directive requires Member States to assess the compliance of operators of essential services with the provisions of the Directive. They must also ensure that competent authorities act when operators of essential services or digital service providers do not meet the requirements laid down in the Directive. Member States must also lay down rules for penalties that are effective, proportionate and dissuasive.

Q1: To what extent do you agree with the following statements regarding national enforcement of the provisions of the NIS Directive and its

respective national implementations?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know / no opinion
Member States are effectively enforcing the compliance of OES.					X
Member States are effectively enforcing the compliance of DSPs.					X
The types and levels of penalties set by Member States are effective, proportionate and dissuasive.					X
There is a sufficient degree of alignment of penalty levels between the different Member States.					X

Sub-section 2.i. – Information exchange

The NIS Directive has created two new fora for information exchange: the Cooperation Group to support and facilitate strategic cooperation and the exchange of information among Member States, and the CSIRTs network, which promotes swift and effective operational cooperation between national CSIRTs.

Q1: To what extent do you agree with the following statements regarding the functioning of the Cooperation Group and the CSIRTs network?

	Strongly agree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know / no opinion
The Cooperation Group has been of significant help for the Member States to implement the NIS Directive					X
The Cooperation Group has played an important role in aligning national transposition measures.					X
The Cooperation Group has been instrumental in dealing with general cybersecurity matters.					X
The Cooperation Group is dealing with cross- border dependencies in an effective manner.					X
The CSIRTs network has effectively managed to fulfil its tasks as laid down in the NIS Directive.					X
The CSIRTs network has helped to build confidence and trust amongst its members.					X
The CSIRTs network has achieved swift and effective operational cooperation.					X

The Cooperation Group and the CSIRTs network cooperate effectively.					X

Q2: Should the Cooperation Group be assigned additional tasks so far not listed in the NIS Directive?

	Yes
	No
X	Don't know / no opinion

If yes, please specify which tasks:

500 character(s) maximum

Q3: Should the CSIRTs network be assigned additional tasks so far not listed in the NIS Directive?

	Yes
	No
X	Don't know / no opinion

If yes, please specify which tasks:

500 character(s) maximum

Sub-section 2.j. – Efficiency of the NIS Directive

Q1: To what extent have the effects of the NIS Directive been achieved at a reasonable cost? To what extent are the costs of the intervention justified and proportionate given the benefits it has achieved?

	Not at all

	To a little extent
	To some extent
	To a large extent
X	Don't know / no opinion

Please elaborate your answer:

1000 character(s) maximum

Q2: What impact has the NIS Directive had on the overall level of resilience against cyber-threats across the EU when it comes to entities providing services that are essential for the maintenance of critical societal and economic activities?

	No impact
	Low impact
	Medium impact
	High impact
X	Don't know / no opinion

Please elaborate your answer:

1000 character(s) maximum

Sub-section 2.k. – Coherence of the NIS Directive with other EU legal instruments

The NIS Directive is not the only legal instrument on EU level that seeks to ensure more security of our digital environment. EU laws such as the General Data Protection Regulation or the European Electronic Communications Code are pursuing similar objectives.

Q1: To what extent are the provisions of the NIS Directive (such as on security requirements and incident notification) coherent with the

provisions of other EU legal instruments that are aimed at increasing the level of data protection or the level of resilience?

	1
	2
X	3
	4
	5
	Don't know / no opinion

Please elaborate your answer:

1000 character(s) maximum

The provisions don't seem to contradict each other and all are striving to increase cyber security. *However, there is still a misalignment between the different incident reportings with similar data in different formats to different authorities. A more consolidated approach (e.g. single reporting for multiple authorities) would be appreciated.*

Section 3: Approaches to cybersecurity in the European context currently not addressed by the NIS Directive

Sub-section 3.a. – Provision of cybersecurity information

Pursuant to the provisions of NIS Directive, Member States have to require operators of essential services and digital service providers to report incidents above certain thresholds. However, organisations collect a lot of valuable information about cybersecurity risks that do not materialise into reportable incidents.

Q1: How could organisations be incentivised to share more information with cybersecurity authorities on a voluntary basis?

1000 character(s) maximum

- It would be good to share information about prevented attacks to get better national and EU wide situational awareness of what types of attacks are ongoing and on what scale.
- Indicators of compromise information would also be good to share between the service providers through the authorities to fight united against cybercrime.

Q2: Under the NIS Directive, Member States shall require companies to report events having an actual adverse effect on the security of network and information systems (incidents). Should the reporting obligations be broadened to include other types of information in order to improve the situational awareness of competent authorities?

X	Yes
	No
	Don't know / no opinion

If yes, to which other types of information should the reporting obligations be broadened?

1000 character(s) maximum

- It would be good to share information about prevented attacks to get better national and EU wide situational awareness of what types of attacks are ongoing and on what scale.
- Indicators of compromise information would also be good to share between the service providers through the authorities to fight united against cybercrime.

Q3: The previous two questions have explored ways of improving the information available to cybersecurity authorities on national level. Which information gathered by such authorities should be made available on European level to improve common situational awareness (such as incidents with cross-border relevance, statistical data that could be aggregated by a European body etc.)?

1000 character(s) maximum

- It would be good to share information about prevented attacks to get better national and EU wide situational awareness of what types of attacks are ongoing and on what scale.

Sub-section 3.b. –Information exchange between companies

Some Member States have fostered the development of fora where companies can exchange information about cybersecurity. This includes inter alia public private partnerships (PPP) or sectorial

Information Sharing and Analysis Centres (ISACs). To some extent, such fora also exist on European and international level.

Q1: How would you evaluate the level of information exchange between organisations in their respective sectors when it comes to cybersecurity?

	Very low level	Low level	Medium level	High level	Very high level	Don't know / no opinion
Electricity						X
Oil						X
Gas						X
Air transport						X
Rail transport						X
Water transport						X
Road transport						X
Banking			X			
Financial market infrastructures						X
Health sector						X
Drinking water supply and distribution						X
Digital infrastructure (IXPs, DNS providers, TLD registries)						X
Digital service providers (online marketplaces)						X
Digital service providers (online search engines)						X
Digital service providers (cloud computing services)						X

Q2: How would you evaluate the level of information exchange between organisations across sectors when it comes to cybersecurity?

	Very low level
X	Low level
	Medium level
	High level
	Very high level

	Don’t know / no opinion

Q3: How could the level of information exchange between companies be improved within Member States but also across the European Union?

1000 character(s) maximum

- EU could encourage for more information sharing
- EU could provide a platform for companies to share this type of information securily with other companies security departments.

The collected information could be used anonymized to provide situational awareness and statistics.

Sub-section 3.c. – Vulnerability discovery and coordinated vulnerability disclosure

While the negative impact of vulnerabilities present in ICT products and services is constantly increasing, finding and remedying such vulnerabilities plays an important role in reducing the overall cybersecurity risk. Cooperation between organisations, manufacturers or providers of ICT products and services, and members of the cybersecurity research community and governments who find vulnerabilities has been proven to significantly increase both the rate of discovery and the remedy of vulnerabilities. Coordinated vulnerability disclosure specifies a structured process of cooperation in which vulnerabilities are reported to the owner of the information system, allowing the organisation the opportunity to diagnose and remedy the vulnerability before detailed vulnerability information is disclosed to third parties or to the public. The process also provides for coordination between the finder and the organisation as regards the publication of those vulnerabilities.

Some Member States have put in place coordinated vulnerability disclosure policies that further facilitate the cooperation of all involved stakeholders.

Q1: How do you evaluate the level of effectiveness of such national policies in making vulnerability information available in a more timely manner?

	Very low level
	Low level
	Medium level
	High level
	Very high level

X	Don’t know / no opinion

Q2: Have you implemented a coordinated vulnerability disclosure policy?

	Yes
	No
	Don’t know / no opinion
X	Not applicable

Q3: How would you describe your experience with vulnerability disclosure in the EU

and how would you improve it?

1000 character(s) maximum

This would require a position on Production Security

Q4: Should national authorities such as CSIRTs take proactive measures to discover vulnerabilities in ICT products and services provided by private companies?

1000 character(s) maximum

Sub-section 3.d. – Security of connected products

The constantly growing proliferation of connected products creates enormous opportunities for businesses and citizens but it is not without its challenges: a security incident affecting one ICT product can affect the whole system leading to severe impacts in terms of disruption to economic and social activities.

Q1: Do you believe that there is a need of having common EU cybersecurity rules for connected products placed on the internal market?

X	Yes

	No
	Don't know / no opinion

If yes, please elaborate your answer

1000 character(s) maximum

The common rules, would likely increase the security level of the connected products.

Sub-section 3.e. – Measures to support small and medium-sized enterprises and raise awareness

A few Member States have taken measures to raise the levels of awareness and understanding of cyber risk amongst small and medium-sized enterprises. Some Member States are also supporting such companies in dealing with cyber risk (for example by disseminating warnings and alerts or by offering training and financial support).

Q1: To what extent do you agree with the following statements regarding such measures?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know / no opinion
Such measures have proven to be effective in increasing the level of awareness and protection amongst SMEs.					X
European legislation should require Member States to put in place frameworks to raise awareness amongst SMEs and support them.			X		

Closing section: Submit your responses (and possibility to upload a document)

Thank you for your contribution to this questionnaire. In case you want to share further ideas on these topics, you can upload a document below.