## Consultation on the revision of the NIS Directive

Fields marked with \* are mandatory.

#### 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.

<u>Directive (EU) 2016/1148</u> 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

Italian

Latvian

	Lithuanian
0	Maltese
	Polish
	Portuguese
	Romanian
	Slovak
	Slovenian
	Spanish
0	Swedish
l am	giving my contribution as
	Academic/research institution
	Business association
0	Company/business organisation
0	Consumer organisation
0	EU citizen
	Environmental organisation
	Non-EU citizen
0	Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
0	Public authority
0	Trade union
0	Other
First	name
Surn	ame
Ema	il (this won't be published)
Scop	pe
0	International
	Local

<ul><li>National</li><li>Regiona</li></ul>				
*Organisation (	name			
200 GHAFAGGEF(S)	maximum			
*Organisation	size			
Micro (1	to 9 employees)	)		
Small (1	0 to 49 employe	es)		
Medium	(50 to 249 empl	oyees)		
Large (2	50 or more)			
<b>-</b>				
1 ransparency 255 character(s)	register number	•		
Check if your organis		cy register. It's a voluntary	database for organisations seek	ing to influence EU decision
making.				
*Country of original	gin			
Please add your cou  Afghanis	ntry of origin, or that of you	ur organisation.	Libya	Saint Martin
Algnams  Aland Is	_	ninica O	Liechtenstein	Saint Martin
/ tiaria is	ands bor	IIIIIOa	Licontension	and Miquelon
Albania	Dor	minican ©	Lithuania	Saint Vincent
	Rep	oublic		and the
				Grenadines
Algeria	© Ecu	ıador	Luxembourg	Samoa
America	n Egy	pt 🔍	Macau	San Marino
Samoa				
Andorra	© EIS	Salvador 💮	Madagascar	São Tomé and
				Príncipe
Angola	•	uatorial <sup>©</sup>	Malawi	Saudi Arabia
		nea		
Anguilla	Erit		Malaysia	Senegal
Antarctic	a Est	onia	Maldives	Serbia

<ul><li>Antigua and Barbuda</li></ul>	Eswatini	Mali	Seychelles
Argentina	Ethiopia	Malta	Sierra Leone
Armenia	Falkland Islands	Marshall Islands	Singapore
Aruba	Faroe Islands	Martinique	Sint Maarten
Australia	Fiji	Mauritania	Slovakia
Austria	Finland	Mauritius	Slovenia
Azerbaijan	France	Mayotte	<ul><li>Solomon</li><li>Islands</li></ul>
Bahamas	French Guiana	Mexico	Somalia
Bahrain	French Polynesia	Micronesia	South Africa
Bangladesh	French	Moldova	South Georgia
	Southern and		and the South
	Antarctic Lands		Sandwich Islands
			isiarius
Rarhados	Gabon	Monaco	South Korea
<ul><li>Barbados</li><li>Belarus</li></ul>	Gabon Georgia	Monaco  Monacolia	South Korea South Sudan
Belarus	Georgia	Mongolia	South Sudan
<ul><li>Belarus</li><li>Belgium</li></ul>	Georgia Germany	Mongolia Montenegro	<ul><li>South Sudan</li><li>Spain</li></ul>
Belarus	Georgia Germany Ghana	Mongolia	<ul><li>South Sudan</li><li>Spain</li><li>Sri Lanka</li></ul>
<ul><li>Belarus</li><li>Belgium</li><li>Belize</li><li>Benin</li></ul>	Georgia Germany Ghana Gibraltar	<ul><li>Mongolia</li><li>Montenegro</li><li>Montserrat</li><li>Morocco</li></ul>	<ul><li>South Sudan</li><li>Spain</li><li>Sri Lanka</li><li>Sudan</li></ul>
<ul><li>Belarus</li><li>Belgium</li><li>Belize</li></ul>	Georgia Germany Ghana	<ul><li>Mongolia</li><li>Montenegro</li><li>Montserrat</li><li>Morocco</li><li>Mozambique</li></ul>	<ul><li>South Sudan</li><li>Spain</li><li>Sri Lanka</li></ul>
<ul><li>Belarus</li><li>Belgium</li><li>Belize</li><li>Benin</li><li>Bermuda</li></ul>	Georgia Germany Ghana Gibraltar Greece	<ul><li>Mongolia</li><li>Montenegro</li><li>Montserrat</li><li>Morocco</li></ul>	<ul><li>South Sudan</li><li>Spain</li><li>Sri Lanka</li><li>Sudan</li><li>Suriname</li></ul>
<ul><li>Belarus</li><li>Belgium</li><li>Belize</li><li>Benin</li><li>Bermuda</li></ul>	Georgia Germany Ghana Gibraltar Greece	<ul><li>Mongolia</li><li>Montenegro</li><li>Montserrat</li><li>Morocco</li><li>Mozambique</li><li>Myanmar</li></ul>	<ul><li>South Sudan</li><li>Spain</li><li>Sri Lanka</li><li>Sudan</li><li>Suriname</li><li>Svalbard and</li></ul>
<ul><li>Belarus</li><li>Belgium</li><li>Belize</li><li>Benin</li><li>Bermuda</li><li>Bhutan</li></ul>	Georgia Germany Ghana Gibraltar Greece Greenland	<ul><li>Mongolia</li><li>Montenegro</li><li>Montserrat</li><li>Morocco</li><li>Mozambique</li><li>Myanmar /Burma</li></ul>	<ul><li>South Sudan</li><li>Spain</li><li>Sri Lanka</li><li>Sudan</li><li>Suriname</li><li>Svalbard and Jan Mayen</li></ul>
<ul><li>Belarus</li><li>Belgium</li><li>Belize</li><li>Benin</li><li>Bermuda</li><li>Bhutan</li></ul>	Georgia Germany Ghana Gibraltar Greece Greenland Grenada	<ul> <li>Mongolia</li> <li>Montenegro</li> <li>Montserrat</li> <li>Morocco</li> <li>Mozambique</li> <li>Myanmar /Burma</li> <li>Namibia</li> </ul>	<ul><li>South Sudan</li><li>Spain</li><li>Sri Lanka</li><li>Sudan</li><li>Suriname</li><li>Svalbard and Jan Mayen</li><li>Sweden</li></ul>
<ul> <li>Belarus</li> <li>Belgium</li> <li>Belize</li> <li>Benin</li> <li>Bermuda</li> <li>Bhutan</li> <li>Bolivia</li> <li>Bonaire Saint</li> </ul>	Georgia Germany Ghana Gibraltar Greece Greenland Grenada	<ul> <li>Mongolia</li> <li>Montenegro</li> <li>Montserrat</li> <li>Morocco</li> <li>Mozambique</li> <li>Myanmar /Burma</li> <li>Namibia</li> </ul>	<ul><li>South Sudan</li><li>Spain</li><li>Sri Lanka</li><li>Sudan</li><li>Suriname</li><li>Svalbard and Jan Mayen</li><li>Sweden</li></ul>
<ul> <li>Belarus</li> <li>Belgium</li> <li>Belize</li> <li>Benin</li> <li>Bermuda</li> <li>Bhutan</li> <li>Bolivia</li> <li>Bonaire Saint Eustatius and</li> </ul>	Georgia Germany Ghana Gibraltar Greece Greenland Grenada	<ul> <li>Mongolia</li> <li>Montenegro</li> <li>Montserrat</li> <li>Morocco</li> <li>Mozambique</li> <li>Myanmar /Burma</li> <li>Namibia</li> </ul>	<ul><li>South Sudan</li><li>Spain</li><li>Sri Lanka</li><li>Sudan</li><li>Suriname</li><li>Svalbard and Jan Mayen</li><li>Sweden</li></ul>
<ul> <li>Belarus</li> <li>Belgium</li> <li>Belize</li> <li>Benin</li> <li>Bermuda</li> <li>Bhutan</li> <li>Bolivia</li> <li>Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba</li> </ul>	Georgia Germany Ghana Gibraltar Greece Greenland Grenada Guadeloupe	<ul> <li>Mongolia</li> <li>Montenegro</li> <li>Montserrat</li> <li>Morocco</li> <li>Mozambique</li> <li>Myanmar /Burma</li> <li>Namibia</li> <li>Nauru</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>South Sudan</li> <li>Spain</li> <li>Sri Lanka</li> <li>Sudan</li> <li>Suriname</li> <li>Svalbard and Jan Mayen</li> <li>Sweden</li> <li>Switzerland</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Belarus</li> <li>Belgium</li> <li>Belize</li> <li>Benin</li> <li>Bermuda</li> <li>Bhutan</li> <li>Bolivia</li> <li>Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba</li> <li>Bosnia and</li> </ul>	Georgia Germany Ghana Gibraltar Greece Greenland Grenada Guadeloupe	<ul> <li>Mongolia</li> <li>Montenegro</li> <li>Montserrat</li> <li>Morocco</li> <li>Mozambique</li> <li>Myanmar /Burma</li> <li>Namibia</li> <li>Nauru</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>South Sudan</li> <li>Spain</li> <li>Sri Lanka</li> <li>Sudan</li> <li>Suriname</li> <li>Svalbard and Jan Mayen</li> <li>Sweden</li> <li>Switzerland</li> <li>Syria</li> <li>Taiwan</li> </ul>
Belarus Belgium Belize Benin Bermuda Bhutan  Bolivia Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba Bosnia and Herzegovina	Georgia Germany Ghana Gibraltar Greece Greenland Grenada Guadeloupe Guam	<ul> <li>Mongolia</li> <li>Montenegro</li> <li>Montserrat</li> <li>Morocco</li> <li>Mozambique</li> <li>Myanmar /Burma</li> <li>Namibia</li> <li>Nauru</li> </ul> Nepal	<ul> <li>South Sudan</li> <li>Spain</li> <li>Sri Lanka</li> <li>Sudan</li> <li>Suriname</li> <li>Svalbard and Jan Mayen</li> <li>Sweden</li> <li>Switzerland</li> </ul>

British Indian Ocean Territory	Guinea-Bissau	Nicaragua	Thailand
British Virgin	Guyana	Niger	The Gambia
Islands	o a y a n a	. ugo.	me dameta
Brunei	Haiti	Nigeria	Timor-Leste
Bulgaria	Heard Island	Niue	Togo
	and McDonald		
	Islands		
Burkina Faso	Honduras	Norfolk Island	Tokelau
Burundi	Hong Kong	Northern	Tonga
		Mariana Islands	
Cambodia	Hungary	North Korea	Trinidad and
			Tobago
Cameroon	celand	North	Tunisia
		Macedonia	o
Canada	India	Norway	Turkey
Cape Verde	Indonesia	Oman	Turkmenistan
Cayman Islands	Iran	Pakistan	Turks and
			Caicos Islands
Central African	Iraq	Palau	Tuvalu
Republic	O Iroland	Delectine	O Haanda
Chile	Ireland	Palestine	Uganda
Chile	Isle of Man	Panama	Ukraine
China	Israel	Papua New Guinea	United Arab Emirates
Christmas	Italy	Paraguay	United
Island	lialy	Faraguay	Kingdom
Clipperton	Jamaica	Peru	United States
Cocos (Keeling)	Japan	Philippines	United States
Islands	σαραπ	Типрринез	Minor Outlying
10101100			Islands
Colombia	Jersey	Pitcairn Islands	Uruguay
Comoros	Jordan	Poland	US Virgin
			Islands
Congo	Kazakhstan	Portugal	Uzbekistan

	Cook Islands	Kenya		Puerto Rico		Vanuatu
	Costa Rica	Kiribati		Qatar		Vatican City
	Côte d'Ivoire	Kosovo		Réunion		Venezuela
	Croatia	Kuwait		Romania		Vietnam
0	Cuba	Kyrgyzstan		Russia		Wallis and
						Futuna
	Curaçao	Laos		Rwanda		Western
						Sahara
	Cyprus	Latvia		Saint		Yemen
				Barthélemy		
	Czechia	Lebanon		Saint Helena		Zambia
				Ascension and		
				Tristan da		
				Cunha		
0	Democratic	Lesotho	0	Saint Kitts and	0	Zimbabwe
	Republic of the			Nevis		
	Congo					
	Denmark	Liberia		Saint Lucia		

#### \*Publication privacy settings

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

## Anonymous

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

### Public

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

- I agree with the <u>personal data protection provisions</u>
- \*Can you specify further your capacity in which you are replying to the questionnaire on the review of the NIS Directive?
  - Citizen
  - Centralised national competent authority in charge of supervision
  - Sectoral national competent authority in charge of supervision

National CSIRT
Other national competent authority
EU body
Operator of essential services currently covered by the NIS Directive
Digital service provider currently covered by the NIS Directive
Economic operator currently not covered by the NIS Directive
Trade association representing entities currently covered by the NIS Directive
Trade association representing entities currently not covered by the NIS
Directive
Trade association representing both entities currently covered and entities
not covered by the NIS Directive
Academia
Cybersecurity professional
Consumer organisation
Other
Please specify the sector you are responsible for:
Please specify the sector you are responsible for:  Please specify what type of digital services you provide:
Please specify what type of digital services you provide:
Please specify what type of digital services you provide:
Please specify what type of digital services you provide:  Please state in which capacity are you replying to this questionnaire:
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
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)?
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
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
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

example by having to adopt certain measures stemming directly from the Directive

8

	rom national laws transposing the I operation fora established by the Di Yes No Don't know / no opinion		or by part	icipating i	n the var	ious
Se	ction 1: General questions on th	ne NIS Di	rective			
Sul	o-section 1.a. – Relevance of the N	IS Directiv	⁄e			
cybe the	NIS Directive envisages to (1) increase the conservative risks and handling incidents, (2) implied of cybersecurity and the protection of escaps all sectors vital for our economy and socie	prove the lev sential servic	el of coope	ration among	gst Member	States in
Q1	: To what extent are these objective	es still rele	vant?			
		Not relevant at all	Not relevant	Relevant	Very relevant	Don't know / no opinior
	Increase the capabilities of Member States	0	0	0	0	0
	Improve the level of cooperation amongst Member States	0	0	0	0	0

#### Sub-section 1.b. - Cyber-threat landscape

Promote a culture of security across all

sectors vital for our economy and society

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
- Cyber threat level has increased
- Cyber threat level has increased significantly
- Don't know / no opinion

4						
© 5						
Don't know / no opinion						
Sub-section 1.c. – Technological advar	ices and r	new trends	8			
Technological advances and new trends provide g whole. The growing importance of edge computing brings data processing and storage closer to the lo and save bandwidth), as well as the high reliance crisis increases at the same time the potential atta paradigm of security resulting in new challenges for cybersecurity of their services.	g (which is a ocation when on digital tec ock surface fo	new model o e it is needeo hnologies es or malicious a	of technolo d, to impro epecially d actors. All	ngy deploymonger response for the CC this changes this changes	ent that times DVID-19 s the	
Q1: In which way should such recent te	chnologic	al advanc	es and	trends be		
considered in the development of EU c	ybersecur	ity policy?	1			
1000 character(s) maximum						
Sub-section 1.d. – Added-value of EU of	cybersecu	rity rules				
The NIS Directive is based on the idea that common national policies alone and thus contribute to a hig	-	-			ective than	
	ha falla		t - O			
Q1: To what extent do you agree with the	ne ioliowir	ig stateme	enis?		D H	
	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	0	•	0	0	0	
The mandatory sharing of cyber risk related information between national authorities						
	0	0	0	0	0	

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

<sup>©</sup> 2

© 3

across Member States would contribute to a higher level of joint situational awareness when it comes to cyber risks					
All entities of a certain size providing essential services to our society should be subject to similar EU-wide cybersecurity requirements	0	0	0	•	•

#### 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	0	0	0	0	0
Food supply	0	0	0	0	0
Manufacturing	0	0	0	0	0
Chemicals	0	0	0	0	0
Waste water	0	0	0	0	0
Social networks	0	0	0	0	0
Data centres	0	0	0	0	0

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?

Vac
163

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>◎</sup> No

Don't know / no opinion

1000 character(s) maximum
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?  Output  Description:
© No
Don't know / no opinion
If yes, please specify which sectors, subsectors and/or digital services:  1000 character(s) maximum
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
O No
Don't know / no opinion
Please elaborate your answer:
1000 character(s) maximum

Sub-section 1.g. - Information sharing

12

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?

Yes

O 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		

#### 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

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

Don't know / no opinion	
yes, please specify which elements:	
500 character(s) maximum	

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

No

lf

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	Medium impact	High impact	Don't know / no opinion
Level of funding	0	0	0	0	0
Level of staffing	0	0	0	0	0
Level of expertise	0	0	0	0	0
Cooperation of authorities across Member States	0	0	0	0	0
Cooperation between national competent authorities within Member States	0	0	0	0	0

# 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	0	0	0	0	0
Level of staffing	0	0	0	0	0
Level of operational capabilities	0	0	0	0	0
Level of expertise	0	0	0	0	0
Cooperation with OES and DSP	0	0	0	0	0

	Cooperation with relevant national authorities (such as sectoral authorities)	0	0	0	0	0
	: How do you evaluate the quality of s		•	•		•
	curity Incident Response Teams to O	ES (on a	a scale t	rom 1 to s	o with 5	indicating
	ery high level of quality)?					
	<sup>©</sup> 1					
	2					
	<sup>©</sup> 3					
	<sup>©</sup> 4					
	5					
	Don't know / no opinion					
Se ind	: How do you evaluate the quality of scurity Incident Response Teams to Dicating a very high level of quality)?  1 2 3 4 5 Don't know / no opinion		-	•		•
oth cor lev from sha	: Under the NIS Directive, competent er affected Member State(s) if an incidentinuity of essential services in that Mel of incident-related information sharm 1 to 5 with 5 indicating a very high ared)?  1 2 3 4	ident ha ember S ring betw	s a signi State. Ho veen Me	ficant imp ow do you mber Sta	oact on t evaluat tes (on a	he e the a scale

Don't know / no opinion

Yes						
No						
Don't know / no opinion						
If yes, please rate the usefulness of this support indicating a very useful support)  1 2 3 4 5 Don't know / no opinion	(on a	scale	e from	າ 1 to	5 wit	h 5
Q7: Should the CSIRTs be assigned additional to	asks	so far	not l	isted	in the	NIS
Directive?						
Yes						
No						
Don't know / no opinion						
If yes, please specify which tasks:  500 character(s) maximum						
Q8: How do you evaluate the functioning of the since their establishment by the NIS Directive as following tasks (on a scale from 1 to 5 with 5 indeperformance)?	s rega	rds th	ie pei	rform	ance	,
	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / no opinion
Cross-border cooperation with the relevant authorities in other Member States	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cooperation with the Cooperation Group	0	0	0	0	0	0

Q6: If you are an OES/DSP: Has your organisation received technical support from

the national CSIRTs in case of an incident?

Cooperation with the CSIRTs network

listed in the NIS Directive?
Yes
O No
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 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?
Don't

Strongly

disagree

Disagree

Q9: Should the single points of contact be assigned additional tasks so far not

know /

no opinion

Strongly

agree

Agree

OES are aware of their obligations under the					
NIS Directive.	0	0	0	0	0
Competent authorities actively engage with OES.	0	0	0	0	0
The cross-border consultation procedure in its current form is an effective element of the identification process to deal with cross-border dependencies.	©	•	0	•	0
The identification process has contributed to the creation of a level playing field for companies from the same sector across the Member States.	0	0	0	0	0

1	Character(s) maximum	

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.	0	0	0	0	0
More sectors and sub-sectors should be covered by the Directive.	0	0	0	0	0
Identification thresholds used by Member States should be lower (i.e. more companies should be covered).	0	0	0	0	0

#### Please elaborate your answers:

10	100 character(s) maximum		

SC	cope of the NIS Directive and why?
1	1000 character(s) maximum

should be covered by the Directive, which other sectors should be covered by the

Q3: If you agree with the statement above that more sectors and sub-sectors

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	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oil	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gas	0	0	0	0	0	0
Air transport	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rail transport	0	0	0	0	0	0
Water transport	0	0	0	0	0	0
Road transport	0	0	0	0	0	0
Banking	0	0	0	0	0	0
Financial market infrastructures	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health sector	0	0	0	0	0	0
Drinking water supply and distribution	0	0	0	0	0	0
Digital infrastructure (IXPs, DNS	•	0	0	0	•	0

providers, TLD			
registries)			

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	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oil	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gas	0	0	0	0	0	0
Air transport	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rail transport	0	0	0	0	0	0
Water transport	0	0	0	0	0	0
Road transport	0	0	0	0	0	0
Banking	0	0	0	0	0	0
Financial market infrastructures	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health sector	0	0	0	0	0	0
Drinking water supply and distribution	0	0	0	0	0	0
Digital infrastructure (IXPs, DNS providers, TLD registries)	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0
Medium-sized companies	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

	Your elaboration:
Small companies	
Medium-sized companies	

<b>,</b>
applied by companies differ from sector to sector for small and medium-sized
companies?
Yes
No
Don't know / no opinion
If yes, please elaborate:
1000 character(s) maximum

Q7: Do you think that the level of resilience and the risk-management practices

#### 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.	0	0	0	0	0
Definitions of the types of digital services listed in Annex III are sufficiently clear.	©	0	0	0	0
DSPs are aware of their obligations under the NIS Directive.	0	0	0	0	0
Competent authorities have a good overview of the DSPs falling under their jurisdiction.	0	0	0	0	0
Competent authorities actively engage with DSPs under their jurisdiction.	0	0	0	0	0
Security requirements for DSPs are sufficiently harmonised at EU level.	0	0	0	0	0

Incident notification requirements for DSPs are sufficiently harmonised at EU level.	0	0	0	0	0
Reporting thresholds provided by the Implementing Regulation laying down requirements for Digital Service Providers under the NIS Directive are appropriate.	•	•	0	0	•

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?

1	000 character(s) maximum

Q3: To what extent do you agree with the following statements regarding the socalled "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.	0	0	0	0	0
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.	0	0	0	0	0
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.	•	•	•	©	©
The exclusion of micro- and small enterprises is reasonable considering the limited impact of their services on the economy and society as a whole.	0	0	0	0	0

#### Please elaborate your answers:

1	00 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 marketplaces	0	0	0	0	0	0
Online search engines	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cloud computing services	0	0	0	0	0	0

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 marketplaces	
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 opinion
Online marketplaces	0	0	0	0	0	0
Online search engines	0	0	0	0	0	•
Cloud computing services	0	0	0	0	0	0

# 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 marketplaces	0	0	0	0	0	•
Online search engines	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cloud computing services	0	0	0	0	0	0

#### 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?

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

## Please elaborate your answer:

1	1000 character(s) maximum	

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
- Don't know / no opinion

#### Please elaborate your answer:

1	000 character(s) maximum

Q3: To what extent do yo	u agree with the following	statements regarding the
implementation of securit	y 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.	•	•	0	©	•
There is a sufficient degree of alignment of security requirements for OES and DSPs in all MS.	•	•	0	•	0

ers
(

1	000 character(s) maximum						

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

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

If yes, please specify for which sectors and elaborate:

1000 character(s)	000 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.	0	0	0	©	0
Prescriptive requirements leave too little flexibility to companies.	0	0	0	0	0

Prescriptive requirements ensure a higher level of cybersecurity than general risk management obligations.	0	0	0	0	0
Prescriptive requirements make it difficult to take into account technological progress, new approaches to doing cybersecurity and other developments.	0	•	0	•	•
The different level of prescriptiveness of requirements increases a regulatory burden for companies operating across different national markets.	0	0	0	•	•
The companies should have the possibility to use certification to demonstrate compliance with the NIS security requirements.	•	•	0	•	0
The companies should be required to use certification for their compliance with NIS security requirements.	0	•	0	©	0

#### Please elaborate your answers:

1	000 character(s) maximum

#### 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.	0	0	0	0	•
Member States have imposed notification requirements obliging companies to report all significant incidents.	0	0	0	0	0
Different reporting thresholds and deadlines across the EU create unnecessary compliance burden for OES.	0	0	0	0	0

The current approach ensures that OES across the Union face sufficiently similar incident notification requirements.	0	0	0	0	0
			ı		
ease elaborate your answers:					

## 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.	0	0	0	0	•
The approach increases costs for OES operating in more than one Member State.	0	0	0	0	0
The approach allows Member States to take into account national specificities.	0	0	0	0	0

#### Please elaborate your answers:

Ρ

1	000 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.	0	0	0	0	0
Member States are effectively enforcing the compliance of DSPs.	0	0	0	©	0
The types and levels of penalties set by Member States are effective, proportionate and dissuasive.	0	•	0	0	0
There is a sufficient degree of alignment of penalty levels between the different Member States.	0	0	0	0	0

#### 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 disagree	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.	0	0	0	0	0
The Cooperation Group has played an important role in aligning national transposition measures.	0	0	0	0	0
The Cooperation Group has been instrumental in dealing with general cybersecurity matters.	0	0	0	0	0
The Cooperation Group is dealing with cross- border dependencies in an effective manner.	0	0	0	0	0

The CSIRTs network has effectively managed to fulfil its tasks as laid down in the NIS Directive.	0	0	0	0	•
The CSIRTs network has helped to build confidence and trust amongst its members.	0	0	0	0	0
The CSIRTs network has achieved swift and effective operational cooperation.	0	0	0	0	0
The Cooperation Group and the CSIRTs network cooperate effectively.	0	0	0	0	0

	effective operational cooperation.					
	The Cooperation Group and the CSIRTs network cooperate effectively.	0	0	0	0	0
	: Should the Cooperation Group be NIS Directive?	assigned a	additional	tasks s	o far not li	sted in
	Yes					
	<sup>™</sup> No					
	Don't know / no opinion					
-	es, please specify which tasks:  O character(s) maximum					
	: Should the CSIRTs network be ass S Directive?	signed add	ditional tas	sks so fa	ar not liste	d in the
	Yes No					
	Don't know / no opinion					
-	es, please specify which tasks:					
<i>50</i>	00 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	al	I
-----	----	----	---

To a little extent

To some extent

To a large extent
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
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
© 3
© 4
© 5
Don't know / no opinion

Please elaborate your answer:

1000 character(s) maximum
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
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?  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
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

#### 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	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oil	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gas	0	0	0	0	0	0
Air transport	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rail transport	0	0	0	0	0	0
Water transport	0	0	0	0	0	0
Road transport	0	0	0	0	0	0
Banking	0	0	0	0	0	0
Financial market infrastructures	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health sector	0	0	0	0	0	0
Drinking water supply and distribution	0	0	0	0	0	0
Digital infrastructure (IXPs, DNS providers, TLD registries)	0	0	0	0	0	©
Digital service providers (online marketplaces)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Digital service providers (online search engines)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Digital service providers (cloud computing services)	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Verv	low	level

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
Tool character(3) maximum
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  Don't know / no opinion
Q2: Have you implemented a coordinated vulnerability disclosure policy?  Ves  No
Don't know / no opinion
Not applicable

	How would you describe your experience with vulnerability disclosure in the EU how would you improve it?
10	00 character(s) maximum
dis co	Should national authorities such as CSIRTs take proactive measures to cover vulnerabilities in ICT products and services provided by private npanies?  On character(s) maximum
Su	o-section 3.d. – Security of connected products
and	constantly growing proliferation of connected products creates enormous opportunities for businesses citizens but it is not without its challenges: a security incident affecting one ICT product can affect the le 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?
	Yes
	No No
	Don't know / no opinion
If v	es, please elaborate your answer
-	00 character(s) maximum
	o-section 3.e. – Measures to support small and medium-sized enterprises and se awareness
risk con	w Member States have taken measures to raise the levels of awareness and understanding of cyber amongst small and medium-sized enterprises. Some Member States are also supporting such panies in dealing with cyber risk (for example by disseminating warnings and alerts or by offering hing and financial support).
Q1	To what extent do you agree with the following statements regarding such
	asures?

	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.	0	0	0	0	0
European legislation should require Member States to put in place frameworks to raise awareness amongst SMEs and support them.	0	0	0	0	•

# 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.

#### Please upload your file

The maximum file size is 1 MB
Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed