



Brussels, 7 September 2006

Hon. MEP Marcin LIBICKI  
Chairman, Committee on Petitions  
European Parliament  
B-1047 Brussels  
BELGIUM

by fax at 00322-284-6844

Subject: Petition No 0688/2005

Dear Mr. Libicki,

Thank you for your letter of 20 July 2006 and for your decision to include our petition in the agenda of your 13/14 September 2006 meeting.

I also thank you for the honour the Committee bestows upon the European Emergency Number Association (EENA) by allowing me to make a five minute statement during the meeting (confirmed by your secretariat for the 13<sup>th</sup> September at 16:00). I hereby enclose a draft of the statement as well as some additional elements on the petition, pertaining to events which happened after we lodged the petition with the European Parliament.

Looking forward to the meeting, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

Olivier PAUL-MORANDINI

- Annex 1. Draft Statement
- 2. Additional elements concerning Petition 0688/2005
- 3. Supporting CD-ROM

Annex 1

**Statement by Olivier PAUL-MORANDINI,**

*Founder/President of the European Emergency Number Association (EENA)*

during the meeting of the Committee of Petitions on 13/14 September 2006

Honourable Members of the European Parliament

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am sorry that I have to come here today to denounce the citizen unfriendly attitude of the European Commission concerning the implementation of the single European emergency call number, the 112.

For more than ten years the Commission has repeatedly told you, the European Parliament, that the implementation of the 112 was without problems. Now they say they cannot launch an information campaign because there are too many problems.

To hide more than 15 years of inaction the Commission told you, the European Parliament, that the legal obligation for the 112 was established in 2002, and that it was transposable in 2003. However, the 112 was part of the citizens' component of the Internal Market, and was established back in 1991.

In the December 2005 Eurobarometer, the Commission conveniently changed the question asked about the 112 back in April 2000. They got a better response and they declare being happy that ONE in every THREE Europeans seem to know the 112 compared with one in every five, back in 2000. We are unhappy, when this means that 19 million of German and 12,6 million of British tourists are every year unaware of the 112 when on holidays. Maybe they should carry with them some phone books to consult in case of an accident.

We are unhappier when the lack of adequate information about the existence and use of the 112, in connection with the growing implementation of caller localisation, means that citizens are unaware that their location is known to operators and emergency services. This contradicts the legal obligation for transparent procedures to override privacy, as provided for in article 10 of the Directive on Privacy and Electronic Communications.

When I read Article 26, for calls to the 112 to be *«appropriately answered and handled»*, I consider that the Commission is fully responsible for the *«absence of harmonised rules at Community level»*, and its unwillingness to *«enforce common requirements for police, ambulance and other emergency services in the Member States»*.

And I am sure that you will agree with me that some 15 years after the establishment of the 112, such a position from the Commission, the Guardian of the Treaties, the most ardent supporter of European integration, the defender of the safety and security of European citizens is at least unacceptable.

Many other elements prove the citizen unfriendly attitude of the Commission. In at least one case we could prove, the Commission published inaccurate information about Belgium in its official report to the Council and the European Parliament. I submit in a separate document further information about the Commission's unacceptable attitude towards the EENA over the last year.

What I ask you to consider, Honourable Members of the European Parliament when deciding upon your further action on the issue of the 112, are the following:

1. The dozens of millions of tourists who every year are unaware of the 112 when on holidays. Are they facing an increased risk when abroad because of the Commission's unwillingness to take action or not? And if the 112 service is inadequate, does this mean that calling the 112 is in a certain way putting the caller in a position less favourable compared with people calling their national emergency call numbers. How this compares with the Commission's own effort to justify further steps of European integration?

2. Isn't it evident that the 112 is a horizontal issue touching many areas of Community action? Health, Safety in the workplace, Civil protection, Road safety, protection from terrorist attacks, home and leisure accidents, Tourism as well as safety and security in general? When the Community acts for the safety of toys and for tobacco control should the 112 be treated as a purely telecommunications issue?
3. The Commission may not dispose the legal basis for forcing the Member States to improve the quality of the 112 service. But it could act at political level. By evaluating on the basis of the already available methodology, financed with Community money, the quality of the 112 and making the results public. It is called «name and shame» and the Commission uses it in several cases.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I do believe in the future of Europe. And I do believe that you, our elected representatives, can make a difference.

You can ask for example the Court of Justice for an interpretation of the position of the Commission. You can set up a web page in all languages to collect experiences citizens had with the use of the 112. You can use your right of initiative to propose new stricter measures.

On the other side of the Atlantic, Ms. Hilary Clinton has already proposed two pieces of legislation on emergency telecommunications. One concerns the upgrading of the 911 (the emergency call number for North America). The other act deals with the interoperability of communication systems used by the emergency services. You can do something similar tailored to Europe's traditions.

Hear also what the London Assembly recently said. *«There is an overarching, fundamental lesson to be learnt from the response to the 7 July attacks [in London] ...The response demonstrated that there is a lack of consideration of the individuals ... Procedures tend to focus too much on incidents, rather than on individuals and on processes rather than people. ... Plans tend to cater for the needs of the emergency and other responding services, rather than explicitly addressing the needs and priorities of the people involved. ... Communications within and between the emergency services did not stand up on 7 July ... ».*

Please act now. Don't wait for the next referendum to hear the people of Europe. The very lives and welfare of many Europeans are at stake.

Thank you.

**Additional elements concerning Petition 0688/2005  
(period 29 July 2005 to 29 August 2006)**

**1. LEGISLATIVE HISTORY**

No new pieces of legislation introduced or adopted on the 112.

**2. IMPLEMENTATION – OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS**

- a. On 14 September 2005, in a press release on the implementation of e-Call<sup>1</sup>, the Commission accepts for the first time publicly that implementation of the 112 is far from perfect, as it pretended over the years in official reports and answers to parliamentary questions. The press release copied the arguments EENA published in a letter to European Voice in June 2005<sup>2</sup>.
- b. On 11 October 2005, the Commission organises a Conference on the 112 in Brussels which is opened by Commissioner Reding<sup>3</sup>. Again, parts of the Commission's Press release copy the article published by the EENA in the December 2004 issue of Redhot, the in-flight magazine of Virgin Express<sup>4</sup> as well as the article published in the International Herald Tribune of February 3, 2005<sup>5</sup>. EENA was invited to the conference as observer and made some remarks<sup>6</sup>. Unfortunately, until today our recommendations have not been followed up by the Commission. However, in a subsequent letter to the EENA, the Head of Cabinet of Commissioner Reding recognised the efforts of the association to improve the knowledge of the 112 in Europe<sup>7</sup>.
- c. In its 11th report on the European Electronic Communications Regulation and Markets 2005<sup>8</sup> of 20 February 2006, the Commission, for the first time mentions the implementation of the 112 extensively. However, the substance of the relevant chapters is rather poor. And some information is clearly misleading. For example the declaration that *«It [the Commission] is also monitoring the situation to ensure that citizens are informed adequately about 112, particularly that they can use it in other Member States when travelling»*, is not exactly accurate given the fact that the Commission bases its evaluations only on the information transmitted by the Member States. Additionally mentioning only the good examples of Finland, the Czech Republic, Latvia and Spain, while forgetting the problems for example in Belgium, France and Italy is also misleading.

The conclusion of the relevant chapter of the Commission Staff Working Paper annexed to the report is clearly in contradiction with the firm declarations of Commissioner Reding four months earlier. The Staff working paper states that *«Overall, the Commission is pleased to note that all end-users are now able to call 112 free of charge in the EU. Nevertheless, there is still some room for improvement. Member States are invited to explore ways of increasing the efficiency of their call centres, in particular by making use of caller location information from both fixed and mobile phones. Member States are further invited to step up their efforts in promoting citizens' awareness of 112»*. In October the

---

<sup>1</sup> IP/05/1137, «Cars will dial 112 - but will anyone answer?»

<sup>2</sup> Annex 3 – eena-05 (Support safety not the gadgets).

<sup>3</sup> SPEECH/05/596 and Press Release IP/05/1239 «Saving travellers' lives: Commission urges Member States to improve their responses to 112 emergency calls». The CD-ROM also contains the Real Video file with the press conference of Commissioner Reding.

<sup>4</sup> Annex 3 – eena-07 (When in distress call 112, the single European number for emergencies).

<sup>5</sup> Annex 3 – eena-06 (Europe slow to dial its emergency number: 112 - Europe's best-kept secret).

<sup>6</sup> Annex 3 – eena-08

<sup>7</sup> Annex 2 – 006-20051018.

<sup>8</sup> COM(2006)68 final, 20.2.2006

Commissioner declared that «*With international business travel soaring and countless families taking regular holidays abroad, this pan-European emergency number is an absolute essential, not a luxury add-on. What number do you call if you are British and you need an ambulance in Greece on holiday? What number do you call on your mobile if you are involved in a road accident in Sweden, or if there's a fire in your apartment in Prague? We must end the days when this 112 emergency number is 'one of Europe's best kept secrets'. And governments must invest the necessary resources to make this a service you can rely on. We cannot afford not to make a success of this service. Failure to act now could add to emergency response times, and hence endanger human lives*». It is also in contradiction with the rest of the Press Release IP/05/1239 (see below).

Furthermore, the Commission, in the same Staff Working paper, declares that «*According to information available to the Commission services, caller location information is not available in the following countries: Greece (for mobile phones), Italy (for mobile phones), Cyprus (for mobile phones), Latvia (not before 2007 for all phones), Lithuania (for mobile phones), Luxembourg (for mobile phones), Hungary (for all phones), the Netherlands (for mobile phones only in 2007), Portugal (for mobile phones) and Slovakia (for all phones)*». In his answer to a parliamentary question by Belgian MP Alain Courtois<sup>9</sup>, the Belgian Minister of the Interior clearly states on the 4<sup>th</sup> of May 2006 that localisation for calls from mobiles is still under negotiation in Belgium.

- d. In its answer to Written Question E-1694/06 by Frédérique Ries<sup>10</sup>, the Commission mentions that «*Depuis plusieurs années, la Commission a fait figurer dans ses rapports annuels sur la mise en œuvre du cadre réglementaire des informations relatives au 112 collectées sur place dans les États membres par la Commission*». This however is misleading as previous reports mentioned the 112 only very briefly or not at all while all information on the implementation of the 112 is collected through questionnaires replied by the Member States and never verified *in situ* by independent bodies. The only case of independent evaluation of the 112 service chain was the 2003 evaluation in Portugal (see main text of the petition).

Furthermore in the same answer the Commission states that «*as it announced in press release IP/05/1239 of October 2005, "once the Commission is satisfied with the overall quality of service, it will launch a communication campaign to raise the awareness of the public at large of the benefits that 112 can offer". Many States have undertaken a complete overhaul of the organisation of their emergency services, in view mainly to establish unified call centres and this means that the conditions are not yet fulfilled for a large scale promotion of the 112*».

The same statement is made in the relevant fact sheet on the 112 (dated October 2005) published on the internet site of DG Information Society<sup>11</sup>. It states that «*When the Commission is satisfied with progress made on the operation of 112 across the EU, it will launch a communication campaign targeted at the general public at large, to further improve knowledge of the single European emergency number*».

This is a clear admission that 15 years after the introduction of the 112 in Europe, the number faces major problems of implementation.

- e. In December 2005/January 2006 the Commission conducted a Eurobarometer survey (E-Communications Household Survey - published in July 2006<sup>12</sup> and announced on the 25<sup>th</sup> of August 2006<sup>13</sup>) which included two questions on emergency call numbers. According to the Commission «*In the EU 25 overall, more*

---

<sup>9</sup> Question No 944 by M. Alain Courtois dated 23 March 2006, Annex 2 003-2006/05/25)

<sup>10</sup> See Annex 3.

<sup>11</sup> Annex 3 – rep-07.

<sup>12</sup> Annex 1-015.

<sup>13</sup> IP/06/1122, 25 August 2006

than one in three respondents were able to cite 112 as the single emergency number to call from any location in the EU against one in five as measured five years ago». However, by comparing the question asked in the context of the 2000 survey with the two questions asked in the context of the 2005 survey, it is evident that the improvement is more due to the guidance of the questioner than to the real knowledge of the responder.

The question in 2000 was «*Imagine you are on a trip to another country of the European Union and you have an emergency (an accident, you are attacked, a fire). Which telephone number would you call for help? (INT: DO NOT READ OUT)*».

The questions in 2005 were «*Q41: can you tell me the telephone number of emergency services, for example in case someone would urgently need medical assistance?*» and «*Q42: Can you tell me what single telephone number enables you to call emergency services anywhere in the European Union from a fixed or a mobile phone?*»

It is evident that: First, the questions are different and cannot be used to make comparisons. Second, answers to Q41 would give good results in all the countries where the 112 is either the single emergency call number or the number used for medical emergencies. Third, young people who use mobiles extensively will know better the 112 as this is the number used on GSMs. Fourth, the replies to Q42 are also biased, because by mentioning the mobiles, the association with the 112 becomes evident.

Furthermore this report, directly contradicts the 11<sup>th</sup> report on the European Electronic Communications Regulation and Markets 2005. In the 11<sup>th</sup> report is mentioned that «*Denmark and the Netherlands have chosen to make 112 their sole emergency number*». In the Eurobarometer report is mentioned «*It should be noted that several EU25 countries have already chosen to make 112 their single emergency number (covering police, ambulance and fire). This is the case in Denmark, Finland, the Netherlands, Portugal and Sweden. In the other EU25 countries, the 112 number exists but it is used in addition to other national numbers*».

### **3. IMPLEMENTATION - REAL SITUATION**

- a. The 112 is still unknown to the majority of European citizens. As stated in the initial petition of 2005, this is still true (see point 2e above). Additionally the Commission in its reply to our complaint against several Member States for non implementation of article 26.4 of the Universal Service Directive mentions that «*the Directive neither sets targets in terms of percentage of the population who should know about the 112 nor specifies in which way Member States are supposed to make citizens aware of the 112*»<sup>14</sup>. This is unacceptable coming from the European Commission for the following reasons:
  - i. Article 26(1) of the Universal Service Directive provides that access to the 112 must be ensured for «*all end-users of publicly available telephone services, including users of public pay telephones*».
  - ii. Furthermore, Commission recommendation of 25 July 2003 on the processing of caller location information in electronic communication networks for the purpose of location-enhanced emergency call services in point 11 mentions that «*... Member States should provide adequate information to their citizens about the existence, use and benefits of E112 services. Citizens should be informed that 112 connects them to emergency services all across the European Union and that their location will be forwarded. They should also be informed about the identity of the emergency services that will receive their location information and of other necessary details to guarantee fair processing of their personal data*».

- iii. Additionally according to Article 2(a) of Directive 2002/58/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 July 2002 concerning the processing of personal data and the protection of privacy in the electronic communications sector (Directive on privacy and electronic communications) «user means any natural person using a publicly available electronic communications service, for private or business purposes, without necessarily having subscribed to this service».
- b. Answering and handling of calls is highly problematic in several Member States. As stated in the initial petition of 2005, this is still true (see point 2d above)
- c. Caller-localisation is still partially implemented. This is the only area in which the Commission has taken some steps in the right direction, although the situation remains still unclear. However, implementation of localisation without proper information of citizens is in direct contradiction with the provisions of the Directive on privacy and electronic communications (2002/58/EC). Article 9 (Location data other than traffic data) of this Directive mentions that:

*«1. Where location data other than traffic data, relating to users or subscribers of public communications networks or publicly available electronic communications services, can be processed, such data may only be processed when they are made anonymous, or with the consent of the users or subscribers to the extent and for the duration necessary for the provision of a value added service. The service provider must inform the users or subscribers, prior to obtaining their consent, of the type of location data other than traffic data which will be processed, of the purposes and duration of the processing and whether the data will be transmitted to a third party for the purpose of providing the value added service. Users or subscribers shall be given the possibility to withdraw their consent for the processing of location data other than traffic data at any time.*

*2. Where consent of the users or subscribers has been obtained for the processing of location data other than traffic data, the user or subscriber must continue to have the possibility, using a simple means and free of charge, of temporarily refusing the processing of such data for each connection to the network or for each transmission of a communication.*

*3. Processing of location data other than traffic data in accordance with paragraphs 1 and 2 must be restricted to persons acting under the authority of the provider of the public communications network or publicly available communications service or of the third party providing the value added service, and must be restricted to what is necessary for the purposes of providing the value added service.»*

Article 10 (Exceptions) of the same Directive also mentions the following:

*«Member States shall ensure that there are transparent procedures governing the way in which a provider of a public communications network and/or a publicly available electronic communications service may override:*

*(a) ...*

*(b) the elimination of the presentation of calling line identification and the temporary denial or absence of consent of a subscriber or user for the processing of location data, on a per-line basis for organisations dealing with emergency calls and recognised as such by a Member State, including law enforcement agencies, ambulance services and fire brigades, for the purpose of responding to such calls».*

Consequently the lack of «adequate information about the existence and use of the 112» may be causing serious infringements of the privacy of citizens in the EU.

#### 4. APPROPRIATE ANSWERING AND HANDLING OF CALLS ALSO MEANS.

In our initial petition this chapter dealt with «*Response times and Quality standards*», «*Training of operators*» and the «*Relation with other Community policies*». We have no significant new information to report.

## 5. **COMPLAINTS INTRODUCED**<sup>15</sup>

### a. **Complaints against several Member States lodged with the Commission.**

Our complaints 2004/4073/Germany, 2004/4077/Spain, 2004/4072/France, 2004/4075/Ireland, 2004/4079/Austria, and 2004/4078/United Kingdom were rejected by the Commission, with a formal letter dated 14 June 2006.

Our complaints 2004/4071/Belgium, 2004/4074/Greece, and 2004/4076/Italy have led to the infringement procedures the Commission opened against 11 Member States for non implementation of caller localisation. However, the part of the complaints concerning the non information of citizens were rejected because the Member States in question «*are in the process or reorganizing their call centers*»<sup>16</sup>.

### b. **Complaints against the Commission lodged with the European Ombudsman.**

On the 6<sup>th</sup> of January 2006, the European Ombudsman decided to extend his investigation into complaint 880/2005/TN. We responded to the Commission's reply on the 10<sup>th</sup> of April 2006 and we are waiting for the Ombudsman's reply.

We can only point to the fact that our initial correspondence with the Commission dated from January 2004 and that EENA is a non-for profit association depending on the work of volunteers.

## 6. **THE GENERAL ISSUE OF EMERGENCY TELECOMMUNICATIONS**

### a. **European research projects**

Several on-going Community-funded research projects deal with the issue of emergency telecommunications. They include:

- i) The NARTUS project (European Platform and Roadmap for Future Public Safety Communication). Its goal is to create a European Public Safety Communication (EPSC) Forum<sup>17</sup> i.e. a European platform and roadmap for future public safety communication.
- ii) The U-2010 project (Ubiquitous IP-centric Government & Enterprise NGN Vision 2010)<sup>18</sup>. Its goal is to provide the most capable communication tools and the most effective access to information to all required to swiftly act in case of accident, incident, catastrophe or crisis, while using existing and/or future (tele)communication infrastructures.
- iii) The OASIS project (Open Advanced System for disaster and emergency management)<sup>19</sup>. Its goal is to define and develop an Information Technology framework based on an open and flexible architecture and using standards, existing or proposed by OASIS, that will be the basis of a European Disaster and Emergency Management system.
- iv) The CHORIST project (Integrating Communications for enhanced environmental risk management and citizens safety). Its goal is to develop a system to deliver alerts from heterogeneous sensors, multiple specific agencies and citizens to authorities; to dispatch warning and information messages

<sup>15</sup> All complaints lodged and replies received are available in electronic form on the attached CD-ROM.

<sup>16</sup> Annex 2 – 003-20060420

<sup>17</sup> See <http://www.publicsafetycommunication.eu/>.

<sup>18</sup> See <http://wiki.uni.lu/secan-lab/Ubiquitous+IP-centric+Government+and+Enterprise+NGN+Vision+2010.html>.

<sup>19</sup> See <http://www.oasis-fp6.org/>.

from authorities to citizens in risk areas and, to provide rapidly deployable voice and high data-rate communication means to field response teams.

b. Legislative initiatives in the USA

The Ensuring Needed Help Arrives Near Callers Employing 9-1-1 (ENHANCE) Act, was introduced in the Senate by Senator Hilary Clinton<sup>20</sup> and was signed into law in December 2004<sup>21</sup>. E-911 technology allows emergency dispatchers to locate the exact geographic location of a call coming from a cell phone. This new law creates a national coordination office to help states, cities and towns implement effective E-911 response systems. This is especially needed in New York , where nearly half of all 911 calls are made on cell phones. Until now, the deployment of E-911 has been hampered by a lack of funding for technology and equipment and the diversion of E-911 surcharges for other purposes. This new law addressed these problems by authorizing \$250 million each year for the next five years in matching grants to state and local governments and tribal organizations to enhance emergency communications services.

The Federal Interoperable Communications and Safety (FICS) Act, was introduced in the Senate by Senator Hilary Clinton on May 25, 2006<sup>22</sup>. Under this act interoperability coordination will be led by a new Undersecretary for Emergency Communications, through an Office of Emergency Communications. The new office will help facilitate synergies at the federal, state and local level including information, technology and best practices sharing. Specifically, it will be charged with:

- Fostering the development of interoperable communications capabilities by state and local agencies;
- Promoting the development of standard operating procedures for the use of emergency communications during incident responses;
- Ensuring that the guidelines for the various federal grant programs for interoperability are consistent with the goal of nationwide and regional interoperability
- Coordinating the establishment of a national response capability to deploy backup communications services in the event of an inoperable environment;
- Establishing basic and uniform guidelines for total interoperable emergency communications capabilities for all public safety radio and data communications systems and equipment;
- Establishing a nationwide, integrated public alert warning system;
- Reviewing and advising on State wide and tactical interoperability plans.

The act mandates a National Emergency Communications Strategy to set goals and timeframes for the achievement of redundant, sustainable, and interoperable emergency communications systems throughout the country and requires a national database of all frequencies and equipment used by federal agencies. The database will also include which platforms and frequencies are used by public safety agencies throughout the country so that federal responders, and responders from other localities responding to an incident can immediately know how to communicate with the first responders in that jurisdiction.

It also requires State and local governments to develop State-wide Interoperable Communications Plans before being able to use DHS grant funds for emergency communications. The Interoperability Undersecretary will assess the disparate federal interoperability grants programs and ensure that there are guidelines with these grants to ensure some continuity and consistency in how these grants are dispersed. Transfers authority of the \$1 billion interoperability fund to the DHS from the Commerce Department.

---

<sup>20</sup> See <http://clinton.senate.gov/>.

<sup>21</sup> Annex 3 – rep-06.

<sup>22</sup> Annex 3 – rep-09.

The act requires a national assessment of the nation's interoperability capabilities at all levels at least every five years, and during the five year period it requires continual updates and monitoring of those assessments to identify needs, gaps, and best practices. It also allows for the establishment of regional coordination working groups that involves state and local governments and the private sector so the Interoperability Undersecretary is in constant contact and is aware of the concerns of all levels of government and the private sector. This will be a critical link between the DHS and police, fire-fighters, EMT's and 911 Call Centres to ensure open communication and free exchange of ideas to promote interoperability.

The act provides for the creation of an Emergency Preparedness Centre, a "federal clearinghouse" to ensure cooperation among all of the federal agencies that have an interest in moving forward on nationwide interoperability or already work with state and local governments on this issue, and will be focal point of interagency cooperation. There need to be clear lines of communication between the all of the federal agencies as well as technology and information sharing.

Finally the act provides for a National Alert System and sets a 3 year deadline to create a coordinated national public alert and warning system that is interoperable with state and local warning systems.

c. London Assembly report on the response to the bombings of 7/7/2005

The London Assembly Report of the 7 July Review Committee, published in June 2006, dealt in particular with communications issues. The report contains a detailed analysis of the response to the bombings. There is no doubting the courage and determination of many thousands of individuals who responded to the attacks on London on 7 July. But while the people involved performed outstandingly, the emergency communication systems and equipment that were supposed to support them did not. The report also pointed out that

*There is an overarching, fundamental lesson to be learnt from the response to the 7 July attacks, which underpins most of our findings and recommendations. The response on 7 July demonstrated that there is a lack of consideration of the individuals caught up in major or catastrophic incidents. Procedures tend to focus too much on incidents, rather than on individuals and on processes rather than people. Emergency plans tend to cater for the needs of the emergency and other responding services, rather than explicitly addressing the needs and priorities of the people involved.*

## **7. ANNEXES**

All annexes are included in the attached CD-ROM in electronic form (Acrobat .pdf files). A separate file "petition-annexes.pdf" contains a full list of annexes contained on the CD-ROM.

Annexes 1 Implementation of the 112 (Preparatory acts, Legislation and Implementation reports)

Annexes 2 EENA complaints and related correspondence

Annexes 3 Other related documents (Parliamentary questions, reports, articles, position papers, etc.)