

Interview FPS Mobility and Transports

For more information about this interview, please contact Mr. Maxim Chantillon (KU Leuven Public Governance Institute – maxim.chantillon@kuleuven.be)

Contact with Stakeholders

- **NBMS/SNCB**

The relation with the NMBS is difficult as the NMBS is like “a state in the state” that is very independent in practice. They wonder who is the authority is. They can push for some actions (ex: open data policies) through contracts but don’t have any guarantees of uptake. They have contacts with FEDICT and DAV for Open Data.

- **FEDICT/Digital Transformation Office**

They had regular contacts with FEDICT for the “only-once” principle and for “Open Data” policies. However, the contact was quite weak since they did not have a lot of technical or statistical insights to give. These insights would be welcome in the case of mobility as they have a large database (DIV) with some privacy related data.. They think that nothing is really going to change with the Digital Transformation Office. The fear with the BOSA structure is that they will handle everything as they did with perspective for budgets. In that case, they took IT resources (people) from the different FPS into BOSA. They think that there will be a risk that they are going to do the same thing for everybody. Regarding the aeronautic department, they had a project of making a form available online where people can fill in to ask for documents. They had begun the project with their internal IT service here but then contacted FEDICT. The collaboration went well until FEDICT stopped working because of budget cuts. There was also an interoperability problem between the standards of the internal IT department FEDICT.

- **Smals/G-Cloud**

There are 30 people of Smals that work at the FPS mobility. It is hard to find IT competencies that want to work for low salary. They found a solution with the ASBL “Smals-Egov” to solve this problem. Regarding the G-Cloud, they hear a lot about it but no concrete information or action.

- **NGI**

They especially have contacts with the NGI through the aeronautic department. NGI has closer contacts with Defence and has a lot of activities for Defence. Aeronautic have contacted them in order to work with Obstacles and got “low-air” maps + obstacle data that are used by civilians (Belgocontrol). This collaboration results in the **e-TOD (Electronic Technology on Obstacle Data)** project. Aeronautic works with annexes of OACI that forces them to put at disposition obstacle data. But they don’t have the competences to offer this geospatial data. In this case, the demand of data comes from the practitioners but sometimes the regulation seems to come out of nowhere.

Furthermore, there is another layer of complexity with the European Union concerning the geospatial data with quality criteria (human manipulation, metadata,...). The project started in 2014 and they have only started the implementation in September 2016. Since it is a mega-project where everybody is involved in order not to go to the market.

Now they want that the proprietors of the obstacles themselves notify the obstacles (through a representative like the “géomètres”).

There was another project with the NGI with the CAD they ask from them. Aeronautic Institutions can be damaged with the constructions (which are in the regions competences.) So it is very difficult to install and impose these requirements in the permits. Now they have to negotiate with the different political entities and parties. They have managed to have agreement with Flanders (Mobility is now an “official” body for constructions platform). The necessity of the opinion of Aeronautic will be necessary depending on the height and the zone of the construction. The NGI will produce those cards with the zone and heights that mobility will provide Flanders.

- **Regional**

On practical level, there is a need for collaboration for technical issues. The regional agents are conscious about the fact that “windturbins next to an airport” can be a problem because it is common sense. On political level, there is a big problem because politics link the issues to other issues to force consensus on some issues. They hope that the agreement with Flanders will show the way for other regions and agreements. Today, there have the chance that the regions ask for the Mobility opinion. If they hear about a permits that are issued without they organizations, they go through legal procedures and often win. It is not a way of working and hope for a formal regulation. . Regions and especially Flanders think that if they ask something from Flanders, it means that they are hierarchically above them. In the case of Flanders, it is the change of Ministers that lead to an agreement.

Example of the impact of regionalization with the highways : we have to see from A to B. Until several years, if you build something from Wallonie to Flanders, they had to ask three times. More and more de-centralized even though it should not be regional. At the administrative level, they see the consequences of the decisions of the politics for regionalization. No consultation of the stakeholders because it is purely politicians. They regionalize but the energy necessary to coordinate after this regionalization takes personnel and time to fix the problems of the regionalization (>< other countries where one authority takes the decision and impose it).

Is it the same political problem when they work at the same level ? It is easier. The ministers changes but the workflow stays the same, even when they work.

- **Local**

- Is there a role of the FPS Mobility in the BeST Address project ?

Not in the knowledge of the interviewees. They work with national register and kruispuitbank organisations. – Personal data : plates. Some of them (licenses, ...) have access to national register. But the geolocalisation of this project.

- Low emission zone : making use of geospatial data to check. Collaboration with city of Antwerp. How does the collaboration take place ?

Antwerp decides to have norms about pollution but how will they monitor this ? They will go into our DIV databank to check. It is the same that if the police comes. As they are the authentic source of data.. This is something new as they did not have information about CO2 . These kinds of initiatives multiply due to smart city strategies (gent, bruxelles, ...).

The relation with the local level exists only for operational purposes.

Open Data

- An own open data platform was created : « S'inscrivant dans la démarche Open Data, le SPF Mobilité et Transports a fait le choix de mettre à la disposition de tous une série de données émanant de l'ensemble des services qui le compose. »

- What was the drive for opening up the data ? External or internal ?

The part of Domestitravail has been available since a long time and is widely used. The part of the DIV is less used but is a result of the Open Data. These new regulations pose two resources problems : They need to have the personnel to process these new needs. They have to need legal knowledge about personal data and don't have the feeling that the Privacy Commission will help them. So they don't have a problem on the principle but more on the resources to reach that goal.

They have a view on who use the data with questions after the re-use and frequency of persons going on the pages.

- Are they involved in the ASA discussions about the Licences ?

They don't know but have a collaborator that follows the project closely. They don't have the technical knowhow. Which criteria can they use to choose the licenses ? For instance, for the tesla, it will not be the same danger of re-identification. The problem does not come from their own databases but the combination with other databases.

Now, they will have more technicians and less jurists in the committee to decide. The statistics will be decided with technicians.

- With the new GDPR, there will be a reflection about a Data Protection Officer. How is it advancing in FPS Mobility ?

In this moment, they have one person that is DPO (and that was responsible about data integrity). However, they don't get extra money to have this kind of DPO structure. We ask them to be compliant without giving them the resources to do it. Especially since it is not transposed today and we don't know how it is transposed.

They are quite critical with the European Union that does not take into account the requirements/reality of the states and take budget from them. Same thing applies to cybersecurity.

Involvement of stakeholders

- How can the FPS Mobility and Transports ensure that it has sufficient contact with its 'customers' (citizens, media etc.)?

In general, they make complaint management. On the other side, they contact interest groups. They also organize clientbeveaagingen.

- Do you engage in "co-production" activities with services based on information gathered directly by citizens (thanks to their smartphones/"Citizen Science")

They have more and more this consideration of citizens that assist administrations in their tasks. In the "plezier" department, there are other steps to have an interface between the customers and the back-office to increase the "workload" on the citizens (payment, download, electronic dossier management).

- How are the services developed by the FPS Mobility and Transports (ex: Mercurius) :
 - o Are the public servants or citizens involved in the process ?

They try to demonstrate what we have built to their customer, being the business. Their customers are the businesses being Directorate General Aviation, Road traffic, Maritime and Durable mobility and internal staff services like accounting, HR, etc. If the business wants to show evolution to their customers, sometimes internal employees, sometimes citizens, the IT department of the FPS will assist if requested. ICT does never deal directly with citizens, it's always the business in between.

- o How are the stakeholders involved in this process (AGILE? – SCRUM? development of e-services)?

They apply agile techniques for Java developments but don't use strict rules. They try to deliver at the end of a sprint (3 weeks). At the beginning of a project this is hardly the case. No problem at the end where they evolve to User Acceptance Testing (UAT).

Questions

- Respondent 2 asks if there will be an actor after the project to make the recommendations. We respond that it will more be under the form of managerial recommendations through our Website and Follow-Up Committee.