Compliance with the National Interoperability Framework (ENI) follow-up

Situation as at late 2014

In 2013 and 2014, the adaptation process to comply with the National Interoperability Framework (ENI) was followed up for adequacy. Below there is an overview of the situation as at late 2014.

The follow-up of the ENI adaptation process in the autumn of 2014 was based on a survey comprising 53 questions (3 general and 50 specific points), available at the E-Government website. Once again, the Central Administration (AGE) - ministry departments, directorates, related or depending bodies - had active participation, followed by autonomous communities.

The adaptation to comply with ENI was performed in circumstances that involved remarkable effort due to the shortage of the financial and human resources of Public Administration agencies. Against this background, the efforts made by government agencies to take the survey voluntarily and as a self-assessment test as many as six times throughout 2013-2014 are even more valuable.

The conclusions shown below can be drawn from the survey results.
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**Figure 1. Situation overview for individual ENI chapters.**

**About the survey and interoperability monitoring:** This voluntary survey was a useful tool in pursuing the initial goal, i.e. getting an overview of the progress made in the Public Administration towards compliance with the National Interoperability Framework while identifying the main challenges that government changes face in the process.

**About organisational interoperability:** The following services, with a strong semantic interoperability component too, are having a positive influence:

- **Data Mediation Platform**, operating 45 services, with 37,136,419 transactions in 2014 and 24.44% growth in the number of transactions and 36.36% growth in the number of services over 2013. The challenges that lie ahead for it are the extension to new services and transactions, and data mediation in the Spanish university system.

- **Common Directory of Organic Units and Offices (DIR3)**: Database for the general use of the organisational charts in all Public Administration agencies at the local, regional and national level, universities and other institutions, including lists of administrative bodies, registry offices, citizen service centres and financial/budget management units, and the relations between...
them, used in the exchange of e-files, e-documents, e-bills and registry entries, among others. The main challenges for DIR3 have to do with gathering information on all the relevant bodies, with data quality and with regulatory support.

- Interaction between registry offices, Virtual Registry Office (ORVE) and Registry Interconnection System (SIR), growing fast in terms of the number of registry items exchanged.
- Administrative Information System (SIA), which could become the bridge connecting procedures and document management through the classification chart.

Finally, at the organisational level, the challenge should be noted of a general way of entering the formulas and terms of use for common services and infrastructure, with the aim of expanding their use to all interested agencies.

**About semantic interoperability:** It takes a great deal of effort to make progress in this area. On the one hand, although the Technical Interoperability Standard for Data Model Relations is available, with a second version in the implementation guide, the practical application of the provisions in these documents requires the Semantic Interoperability Centre (CISE) to have new functions and instruments – like the new visor, an editor for semantic asset simulation that generates the structure to import assets at CISE, or analysis and comparison tools – for data model handling. On the other, these tools require cooperation for semantic assets to be published and to activate use dynamics.

**About technical interoperability:** The scenario is satisfactory. It should be checked on the field, though, especially regarding interaction with citizens, in the knowledge that some aspects raise specific issues (for instance, multiple technological environments or e-signature). It remains to be seen how the enforcement of Regulation EU No. 1025/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council on European Standardisation affects the ICT technical specifications that can be cited in public procurement to enable interoperability without having national, continental or international status.
About common services and infrastructure: The results of the survey point to specific common services and infrastructure whose use has become widespread which can be further extended or promoted. The Data OBSAE Indicators section of the E-Government website shows data on the activity and development of common services and infrastructure.

Figure 2. Data OBSAE indicators, Solutions for the Public Administration section.

Among the competencies allocated to the Directorate for Information and Communication Technologies (DTIC) by Royal Decree 802/2014, of 19 September, there are several pertaining to common services and infrastructure, such as ‘the drafting, development and enforcement of a Common Service Catalogue including the centrally managed common services, infrastructure, equipment, computer networks and applications whose shared use could be established as compulsory or primary for the Central Administration and its public bodies’ or ‘the definition and planning of common ICT services and infrastructure in the Central Administration and its public bodies.’

In this regard, Royal Decree 806/2014 bestows these and other functions on ICT Strategy Committee: ‘To establish the common services and media under the terms of the National Interoperability Framework (ENI) follow-up Compliance with the National Interoperability Framework (ENI) follow-up Situation as at late 2014’.
set forth in Article 10, to promote cooperation and collaboration with autonomous communities and local governments for the development of integrated inter-administrative services, and for the sharing of common services and technical infrastructure with the aim of rationalising ICT resources at all government levels.’

**About technology transfer and reuse:** In this area there is potential for progress. Work is being done to boost the Technology Transfer Centre and to offer guidance on specific aspects for asset publishing and reuse. To this end, the Guide for Asset Publishing and Licencing has been published. Among the competencies allocated to DTIC by the aforementioned Royal Decree 802/2014 there is ‘the analysis and implementation of models to encourage sector application and infrastructure sharing and reuse, and to promote application development under this model.’

**About Public Administration communications:** One of the areas with the greatest progress, mainly because of the widespread use of the SARA Network. Looking ahead, it would be convenient to back up the Network Addressing and Interconnection Plan for the Public Administration with a technical interoperability standard, based on the technological development of the IPv6 Internet protocol.

**About e-signature and certification policies:** This is one of the areas with the greatest development, both in the Central Administration and in autonomous communities, thanks to the widespread use of @firma and the associated service platform. The E-Signature and Certification Policy in the Central Administration ‘shall be the general interoperability framework for signature authentication and mutual recognition within the relevant scope of operation,’ so that no individual policies should be developed except for domains with special characteristics. Ideally, the policies in this area should be kept in line with EU guidelines, for instance, in connection with the potential impact of Document 2014/148/EU, Commission Implementing Decision of 17 March 2014, and updated accordingly.

**About retrieval and conservation of electronic documents:** The results from the survey show that this chapter still requires considerable effort, mainly for the following reasons:
• The area is often perceived as new, at least by users other than experts in document management.

• It requires cross-section handling, involving all stakeholders and gathering experts in management, storage and IT, and multidisciplinary approaches from committees and groups of experts. A fine example is the **MINHAP E-Document Management Policy.** xxv

• It involves drafting and approving an e-document management policy setting forth the guidelines for the entire organisation and the technical instructions or standards dealing with specifics. The **E-Archives of the E-Government website**xxvi contains examples of e-document management policies.

• It requires agencies to have a clear scenario of existing document and file management and storage tools, as well as necessary tool integrations, taking into account the possible use of such common services as **INSIDE**xxvii for living e-documents and files, and permanent storage services.

• It involves training both the staff performing planning, implementation and management tasks in the document management programme and the employees holding e-document management jobs.

**Concluding remarks**

As this technical summary shows, there has been considerable progress, even when much has to be done in some areas – particularly e-documents, semantic interoperability, and technology transfer and reuse.

A call for cooperation initiatives is in place and joint efforts must be encouraged for adequate regulatory support and for the inclusion of common services and media for rationalisation, more efficiency and improvements in interoperability.

Likewise, it is recommended that Spanish policies are kept in line with EU initiatives, strategies and trends in the field of interoperability, especially with regard to common services and infrastructure – the so-called ‘building blocks’ at the European level through programmes like **ISA**xxviii or **CEF (Telecom).** xxix
Finally, it is advisable to develop more sustainable and efficient monitoring instruments for the progress of interoperability in the Public Administration. Consequently, the survey could be replaced by automated indicators and metrics as far as possible. Tools like the aforementioned Data OBSAE could facilitate effective and sustainable, objective and continuous follow-up, in line with the ENI goals and with the use of common services and infrastructure.
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