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**1. Introduction**

Since 2011, the EU has put in place a EU Standardization framework that recognizes the specificity of ICT standardization with two main tools set up in this area: the EU Rolling Plan for ICT standardization that identifies the needs of interoperability in support of EU policies and the European multi-stakeholders platform (MSP).

Time has come to hold an internal discussion on the functioning of the MSP, its tasks and rules of procedure, also in the light of the recent and future developments, i.e. the adoption of the ICT Standardization Priorities Communication in April, the future European Catalogue, and the adoption of the Standardization Package including the Joint Initiative on Standardization in June, and in particular Action 7 – Optimization of operational aspects of Regulation (EU)1025/2012 whereby *'an analysis of the available planning instruments for standardization at EU level and a gathering of best practices as evidence to support EU policy objectives would help to clarify the different roles, responsibilities, processes, objectives and deliverables, and would contribute to better plan further actions (e.g. complementary coordination actions)*'.

|  |
| --- |
| The final goal is to be fit to support the implementation of the Communication on ICT Standardization Priorities for the DSM. |

**2.** **MSP Tasks: stock tacking**

The MSP is an advisory body to the Commission set up by Commission Decision 2011/349 to advise in all matters related to ICT standardization.

The MSP Decision was approved on 28 November 2011 and the kick-off meeting was held on 26 March 2012. Since then, the Platform met in 15 occasions. It has approved Rules of Procedure and various procedural documents, set up tasks forces and evaluation working groups and hold discussions around a variety of issues related to ICT standardization.

Particular emphasis was put during these years on two main tasks: the advice provided on the elaboration of the EU Rolling Plan for ICT Standardization (Article 2 (b) and the advice provided prior to the identification of ICT Technical specifications (Article 2 (f). Only recently, with the advice on the Priority ICT Standards Plan, has the MSP *'identified potential future ICT standardisation needs in support of European legislation, policies and public procurement*' (Article 2 (c)).

However the following tasks listed in Article 2 have only been partially fulfilled:

(a) Al matters related to European ICT Standardisation policy and its effective implementation;

(d) Possible standardisation mandates concerning ICT for ESOs and activities which may be carried out by other bodies in cooperation with ESOs;

(e) Progress of ICT standardisation and related activities in support of legislation and policies;

(g) Cooperation between SDOs and ESOs to improve the integration of their work in European ICT standardisation and ensure availability of ICT standards supporting interoperability

(h) Gather information on the work programmes of ICT SDOs to help ensure coordination and avoid unnecessary duplication or fragmentation of efforts.

If we look at the full list of tasks, one must conclude that the MSP has not exploited its full potential and there is room for improvement. Perhaps there is a need to refocus and the MSP could shift from current work to fulfil other kind of tasks. A deep reflection of the future role of the MSP is particularly important in the light of the implementation of the ICT Standardisation Priorities Communication where the MSP is called to play an active advisory role.

|  |
| --- |
| The future involvement of the MSP on its various work items should be reviewed with a view to have a real impact and to boost confidence in the Platform among the standardization community. |

**3. Overlaps & Resources**

The advisory role given to the MSP on the ICT standardisation field is therefore large and requires a big amount of resources that it does not have. The fact that the Decision gives the MSP a cross-cutting remit does not mean that MSP can be present everywhere and that it can give advice on every topic. The MSP should intervene where it can provide some added-value mainly due to its diverse composition in one single forum. Moreover, there is a number of sector-specific groups (i.e. e-health, cybersecurity) with whom the MSP could cooperate in order to streamline ICT standardisation governance.

|  |
| --- |
| The MSP should intervene where it can provide some added-value mainly due to its diverse composition in one single forum. |

**4. Decision-making process**

The MSP adopted a consensus-based decision-making process involving all of its members in all working levels (Plenary, task forces, and evaluation working groups). This has proved to be a good working method because it allows making progress. However, less than half of the MSP members contribute actively to the work so the question arises about the legitimacy of the MSP advices.

|  |
| --- |
| The MSP should review its working method to be more effective and to gather participation of all its members |

**5.** **the way forward**

This aim of this exercise is to animate an internal debate with a view to analyzing the current functioning of the Platform, gathering best practices and detecting where there is room for improvement. The final outcome is still not known but could be the adoption of recommendations, new rules of procedure or new methods of work.

|  |
| --- |
| The MSP should decide in this meeting how to proceed and which aspects should be analyzed first. |

We propose the following preliminary list of questions.

**What** are we doing?

* Rolling plan
* Advice on the identification of ICT technical specifications
* Did your country ever request the identification of at least one ICT technical specification?  If not, why?
* Does your country plan to request the identification of ICT technical specification(s) in future?  If yes, in which domain(s)?

77 ICT technical specifications have been submitted so far.  Was any of them used in a public tender issued in your country?  If yes, how many times?

* Does the identification of a ICT technical specification create value / has it a spill-over effect on other processes/domains?
* Given the resources constraints, should the identification process be subject to annual planning and prioritization?
* Other comments?
* Support to policy making (i.e. advice on ICT standards plan)

**Why** are we doing it? (For each of our tasks)

* What do we want to achieve?
* Different stakeholders – different objectives?
* Trade-offs?

**How** are we doing it? (For each of our tasks)

* Inputs: do we get all the inputs we would need?
* Outreach: Openness/transparency
* How do we decide on things? Are there other mechanisms?
* How do we interact with other expert/advisory groups?
* Do we use the appropriate tools?
* Are the processes in place feasible?

**Who** is doing it? (For each of our tasks)

* Who are the main actors (in theory and in practice)?
* What are the expectations of the different actors?
* Trade-offs?

**What is the impact** of our work? (For each of our tasks)

**Where are we absent and why?**