The dual-use export control policy review - Online questionnaire for companies

The European Commission is currently carrying out an impact assessment for a review of the EU export control regime for dual-use items. It has contracted SIPRI, who together with Ecorys is to support the impact assessment through the collection and analysis of data and information. Further information on the review process is available here.

In this survey you are invited to provide information regarding the impact of the current dual-use export control regulation and the possible impact of its review options. The survey focuses on issues like compliance costs but also on competitiveness issues.

If you want to download the questions before you start filling out the survey, please click here. If you want more information about the review options, please click here.

Please note that the questions marked by an asterisk (*) are mandatory. In case the information required by these questions is not available, you can select the option ‘I do not know’.

You have the option that the information you give us will be treated as strictly confidential and anonymous. In that case, it will feed into the report of the project, but no reference to the survey respondents will be made in the report. However, by providing the name of your company, we could provide a list of respondents (without the responses) to the European Commission.

In case anything is unclear to you or you would like to receive additional information, please do not hesitate to send an email to dualusereview@sipri.org. We would like to thank you in advance for taking part in this survey.
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Company overview
This section aims at clarifying the profile of EU dual-use companies and providing key data in view of the assessment of specific impacts (e.g. administrative burden, implications for SMEs).

* 1. Please select the department you work in.
   - Internal Compliance/Export Control
   - Legal Department
   - Production
   - Management
   - Sales
   - Other, please specify
2. Where is your company located?

- Austria
- Bulgaria
- Cyprus
- Denmark
- Finland
- Germany
- Hungary
- Italy
- Lithuania
- Malta
- Poland
- Romania
- Slovenia
- Sweden
- Belgium
- Croatia
- Czech Republic
- Estonia
- France
- Greece
- Ireland
- Latvia
- Luxembourg
- Netherlands
- Portugal
- Slovakia
- Spain
- United Kingdom

3. Is your company part of a multinational corporation?

- Yes
- No

4. Where is the headquarters of your company located?

- Austria
- Bulgaria
- Cyprus
- Denmark
- Finland
- Germany
- Hungary
- Belgium
- Croatia
- Czech Republic
- Estonia
- France
- Greece
- Ireland
5. Following the EU definition, your company (all offices) can be classified as:

- Large (≥250 employees)
- Medium-sized (50-249 employees)
- Small (10-49 employees)
- Micro (1-9 employees)

6. Does your company export military items listed in the EU Common Military list?

- Yes
- No

* 7. Does your company export dual-use items listed in Annex I to Regulation 428/2009 or products that contain dual-use items to non-EU countries?

- Yes
- No

8. Could you please indicate the percentage of your company's turnover generated by the export of dual-use items to non-EU countries?
7. Does your company export dual-use items listed in Annex I to Regulation 428/2009 or products that contain dual-use items to non-EU countries?

- No

9. Please explain why your company doesn't export dual-use items

- No products we export to non-EU countries contain dual-use items
- We are not interested in exporting dual-use items to non-EU countries
- We have tried to export dual-use items to non-EU countries but have faced difficulties in obtaining licences
- We wanted to export dual-use items to non-EU countries but the administrative burden was so heavy and time-consuming that we decided not to
- We wanted to export dual-use items to non-EU countries but the procedures were so complex and unpredictable that we decided not to
- Other, please specify

10. Please select the HS codes of dual-use products typically exported by your company.

- HS84: Nuclear reactors, boilers, machinery and mechanical
- HS85: Electrical machinery and equipment and parts

Categories of dual-use items and destinations

This section aims at collecting information on the codification of the dual-use products exported by your company and on the most important destination countries for the export of dual-use items.
appliances; parts thereof

☐ HS88: Aircraft, spacecraft, and parts thereof

☐ HS27: Mineral fuels, mineral oils and products of their distillation; bituminous substances; mineral waxes

☐ HS90: Optical, photographic, cinematographic, measuring, checking, precision, medical or surgical instruments and apparatus; parts and accessories thereof

☐ HS71: Natural or cultured pearls, precious or semi-precious stones, precious metals, metals clad with precious metal, and articles thereof; imitation jewellery; coin

☐ HS39: Plastics and articles thereof

☐ HS89: Ships, boats and floating structures

☐ HS38: Miscellaneous chemical products

☐ HS72: Iron and steel

☐ HS7: Vehicles other than railway or tramway rolling-stock, and parts and accessories thereof

☐ HS40: Rubber and articles thereof

☐ HS76: Aluminum and articles thereof

☐ HS32: Tanning or dyeing extracts; tannins and their derivatives; dyes, pigments and other colouring matter; paints and varnishes; putty and other mastics; inks

☐ HS70: Glass and glassware

☐ Other, please specify

Additional options (question 10)
» Order responses: alphabetically

11. If possible, please provide the specific HS(4 or 6-digit)/CN (8 digit) or Dual-Use Classification Number (as per Annex I to Regulation 428/2009) of the 10 dual-use products most commonly exported by your company.

12. The EU developed a correlation table linking dual-use items (Annex I of the dual-use regulation) to custom codes (HS or CN). Please indicate to what extent there is a good match between the dual-use codes and the HS categories.

☐ More than 75% of products under the HS codes relevant

☐ Between 50-75% of products under the HS codes relevant
13. If you can provide more information on which specific HS codes are particularly strong or weak in representing dual-use products, please provide this information in the box below.


14. In terms of the value of exports, which were the most important destination countries (among non-EU countries) for the export of dual-use items (or products that contain dual-use items) during the last five years?

1

2

3
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**Licensing and compliance**

This section aims at clarifying the types of licences used for dual-use products by your company, the obtaining and managing of licences for dual-use items and the related compliance costs.

15. Which type of licence has your company used most often in order to export dual-use items in the last five years?

- Individual licence
- EU general licence (EUGEA)
- Global licence
- National general licence
- I don't know
16. Please estimate the time necessary for control of the export control process under the following modalities.

- Individual licence
- Global licence
- EU general licence (EUGEA)
- National general licence

Additional options (question 16)
- Validation: integer

17. Please rate the efficiency of the export control process under the following modalities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modalities</th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual licence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global licence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU general licence (EUGEA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National general licence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Additional comments:

19. Does your company have an internal compliance programme in place for complying with the dual-use regulation 428/2009 (e.g. as part of your internal quality systems)?

- Yes, we have a formalised internal compliance programme
- Yes, but only informal
- No

20. In your company, the obtaining and managing of licences for dual-use items is usually done:
Internally/in-house staff with dedicated persons ○
Internally/in-house staff but not with dedicated persons ○
Externally (lawyers, consultants etc.) ○
I don’t know ○

21. How often did your company experience the following situations when exporting dual-use items in the last 5 years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Only on very few occasions</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We could not obtain export licences for dual-use items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We lost a deal due to the length of time it took to obtain licences for dual-use items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We lost money due to the length of time it took to obtain licences for dual-use items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Regarding the export of dual-use items, could you please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Do not agree at all</th>
<th>Do not agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Fully agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The administrative burden related to compliance with the dual-use export requirements is heavy and time-consuming</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The procedures are complex</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The licencing process is predictable</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We experience delays at customs when seeking to export dual-use items</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Has your company experienced a case or cases where you received a denial for a licence application, when another EU or non-EU exporter fulfilled the deal through an identical export?

- Yes, the export was done from another Member State ○
- Yes, the export was done from a non-EU country ○
- No ○
24. Additional information:

25. Could you estimate the average annual compliance costs for dual-use export controls incurred by your company in terms of number of staff (expressed in Full Time Equivalent FTE)?

Additional options (question 25)
- Validation: integer

26. If possible, would you be willing to share the annual average costs (in €) for this staff input?

Additional options (question 26)
- Validation: integer

27. Do you face other costs related to compliance with dual-use export controls?

- Yes
- No
28. Which of the following costs do you face related to compliance with dual-use export controls?

- Licence fees
- Costs for internal compliance programmes (excluding staff), such as software and databases
- Costs for third parties (e.g. outsourcing, training)
- Other, please specify

29. If possible, would you be willing to share the annual average total costs (in €) in relation to the compliance with dual-use export controls?

- Licence fees
- Costs for third parties (e.g. outsourcing, training)
- Costs for internal compliance programmes (excluding staff), such as software and databases
- Other

Additional options (question 29)

- Validation: integer

30. Could you please indicate how the costs of complying with dual-use export controls are distributed among the following activities?

- Administrative burden associated with classifying dual-use items and/or checking if a licence is required
- Administrative burden associated with obtaining licences for dual-use items
- Senior management activities to comply with dual-use export controls
- Training of staff dealing with compliance with dual-use trade controls
- Screening of all aspects of dual-use exports (products; customer and end-user; destination; end-use)
- Procedures for regular internal audits associated with compliance with dual-use trade controls
- Responding and resolving to compliance problems and violations of dual-use trade controls
- Other

Remaining value
30. Could you please indicate how the costs of complying with dual-use export controls are distributed among the following activities?

- Is Other

31. You indicated that (some of) the costs of complying with dual-use export controls can be classified as other, please specify these costs below.

---

**Other issues linked to dual-use export controls**

The section aims at collecting information on the potential impacts of the export controls on the cooperation with the research partners and the brokers/freight forwarder/transporting companies.

32. Does your company work with research partners such as academia and institutes?

- Yes
- No

33. Are export controls currently affecting this cooperation?

- Yes
- No
33. Are export controls currently affecting this co-operation?
   is Yes

34. How are export controls currently affecting this co-operation?

35. Do export controls affect the innovative capacity of your company?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

36. How do export controls affect the innovative capacity of your company?
37. In 2009 brokers/freight forwarder/transporting companies also became subject to dual-use trade controls. Since then, please indicate if your company recognizes any of the following changes in the co-operation with these actors.

- Prices for the services of brokers/freight forwarders/transporting companies have increased
- Administrative requirements have increased
- There are no changes in relation to these actors as a result of the regulation
- Transactions have been delayed
- Number of companies willing to broker/transport/trade the products has decreased
- Other, please specify

Assessing the impact of review options
This section aims at identifying the potential impacts of the following review issues on your company.

Review issue 'Develop EU export control network'
The Communication 'The Review of export control policy: ensuring security and competitiveness in a changing world' identifies options to enhance information exchange and develop IT infrastructure.

38. Please indicate which of the following statements most closely represents the situation of your company in relation to a standardised IT support tool and electronic licensing system across the EU:

- We can already apply for licences electronically and we significantly benefit from it
- We can already apply for licences electronically but we do not significantly benefit from it
- We can't apply for licences electronically but we could significantly benefit from it
- We can't apply for licences electronically and we could not significantly benefit from it
- I don't know

Review issue 'Private Sector Partnership'
The Communication 'The Review of export control policy: ensuring security and competitiveness in a changing world' identifies options to forge a partnership with the private sector, and suggests in particular facilitating controls by setting clear industry compliance standards and enhancing transparency and outreach to companies.
39. In view of supporting and facilitating the dual-use export procedures, your company would:

- Benefit the most from soft law measures such as guidelines including a list of compliance standards
- Benefit the most from legally binding requirements to set up and implement an internal compliance programme
- No major difference between the two options above
- Be negatively affected by these measures
- Not benefit from either option
- I don’t know

40. Could you please rate the impact of consistent EU-wide legal requirements for industry compliance, combined with transparency and outreach, on the following aspects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Very negative impact</th>
<th>Negative impact</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Positive impact</th>
<th>Very positive impact</th>
<th>I don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compliance/adjustment costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputational benefit, investment and production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation and research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-operation with academia/research institutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level playing field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Review issue 'Catch-all controls'
Currently, there is some degree of divergence in the way EU Member States apply the catch-all clause in the EU dual-use Regulation (Art. 4), which makes dual-use items that are not included in the control list (Annex I) subject to control if they are or may be used in connection with a WMD (nuclear, biological, chemical weapon) end-use, a military end-use in an embargoed destination, or for use as parts or components of previous illegally exported military items.

41. Could you please indicate whether, in your experience, the differences in application/interpretation of catch-all controls across the EU have any of the following effects?

- Legal uncertainty
- Distortion of competition
42. Additional comments:


43. Could you please rate the impact of the differences in the application/interpretation of catch-all controls in EU member states on the following aspects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very negative impact</th>
<th>Negative impact</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Positive impact</th>
<th>Very positive impact</th>
<th>I don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company’s exports (trade effect)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance costs</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment and production</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level playing field</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Review issue 'Optimisation of licensing architecture'

To optimise the licensing architecture in the EU, a number of review actions are under consideration, including the introduction of additional European Union General Export Authorisations (EUGEAs), which are trade facilitation measures that exempt certain exports to specified destinations from individual licensing requirements and only require reporting of these exports by the exporter.

44. Please select from which of the following EU General Export Authorisations your company would expect to highly benefit.
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44. Please select from which of the following EU General Export Authorisations your company would expect to highly benefit. . . .

is Low-value shipments
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44. Please select from which of the following EU General Export Authorisations your company would expect to highly benefit. . . .

is Encryption

46. Could you please rate the economic impact of the introduction of an EU General Export Authorisation for encryption on the following aspects?
44. Please select from which of the following EU General Export Authorisations your company would expect to highly benefit:

- Intra-company technology transfers for R&D

47. Could you please rate the economic impact of the introduction of an EU General Export Authorisation for intra-company technology transfers for R&D on the following aspects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company's exports (trade effect)</th>
<th>No/Negative impact</th>
<th>Positive impact</th>
<th>Very positive impact</th>
<th>I don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compliance costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment and production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level playing field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
44. Please select from which of the following EU General Export Authorisations your company would expect to highly benefit....

is Intra-EU transfers of Annex IV items large projects

48. Could you please rate the economic impact of the introduction of an EU General Export Authorisation for intra-EU transfers of Annex IV items large projects on the following aspects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>No/Negative impact</th>
<th>Positive impact</th>
<th>Very positive impact</th>
<th>I don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company's exports (trade effect)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment and production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level playing field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Review issue 'Legal clarifications/amendments'

Under the heading of an EU system update involving changes to existing regulations a number of legal clarifications and amendments are being considered.

49. Do you see a need for legal clarification on:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>If yes, which changes would you propose and why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic notions such as the definition of export and exporter, the definition of brokering, the determination of the competent authority etc.?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of technical assistance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of intangible technology transfer (ITT)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency of transit provisions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review option 'EU system modernisation'
This review option covers the modernisation of existing controls, including adding a new dimension for controlling exports of cyber-surveillance technologies. This would potentially involve:

- Apply human security criteria to exports of cyber-surveillance technologies
- Obligatory self-regulation on the part of industry producing cyber-surveillance technologies
- Introduction of EU autonomous list for cyber-surveillance technologies
  Via technical or descriptive list
- Introduction of EU cyber-surveillance catch-all mechanism
  Dedicated catch-all for cyber-surveillance technologies or application of general catch-all

No agreed definition of ‘cyber-surveillance technologies’ has been created at the EU level thus far, but it could potentially include certain types of the following technologies:

- Mobile telecommunications interception or jamming equipment
- IP Network Surveillance Systems
- Intrusion Software
- Lawful Intercept data retention and mediation
- Big data and analytics
- Digital forensics
- Location tracking devices
- Biometrics

50. Does your company produce cyber-surveillance technologies?

- Yes
- No
51. Please indicate which types of cyber-surveillance technologies your company produces.

- [ ] Mobile telecommunications interception or jamming equipment
- [ ] Intrusion Software
- [ ] Big data and analytics
- [ ] Location tracking devices
- [ ] Other, please specify

- [ ] IP Network Surveillance Systems
- [ ] Lawful Intercept data retention and mediation
- [ ] Digital forensics
- [ ] Biometrics

52. Are you aware of exports of cyber-surveillance technologies from the EU that may pose a threat in terms of security or pose a risk of human rights violations?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

53. Are you aware of exports of cyber-surveillance technologies from third countries that may pose a threat in terms of security or pose a risk of human rights violations?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

54. Could you please rate the potential impact of licensing authorities applying human security criteria to exports of cyber-surveillance technologies for the following aspects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very negative impact</th>
<th>Negative impact</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Positive impact</th>
<th>Very positive impact</th>
<th>I don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company’s export (trade effect)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment and production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level playing field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
55. Could you please rate the potential impact of obligatory self-regulation on the part of the industry producing cyber-surveillance technologies for the following aspects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Very negative impact</th>
<th>Negative impact</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Positive impact</th>
<th>Very positive impact</th>
<th>I don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company’s export (trade effect)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment and production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level playing field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

56. Could you please rate the potential impact of introducing an EU autonomous list for cyber-surveillance technologies for the following aspects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Very negative impact</th>
<th>Negative impact</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Positive impact</th>
<th>Very positive impact</th>
<th>I don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company’s export (trade effect)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment and production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level playing field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57. Could you please rate the potential impact of introducing an EU cyber-surveillance catch-all mechanism for the following aspects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Very negative impact</th>
<th>Negative impact</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Positive impact</th>
<th>Very positive impact</th>
<th>I don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company’s export (trade effect)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment and production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level playing field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
58. Please list the review actions which are perceived to have a strong positive economic impact on your company.


59. Please list the review actions which are perceived to have a strong negative economic impact on your company.


60. Please list the review actions which are perceived to have a strong positive security impact on your company.


61. Please list the review actions which are perceived to have a strong negative security impact on your company.
* 62. Could you please indicate if we can use the name of your company for:

Providing a list of respondents (without the answers) to the EC?

- Yes
- No

* 63. Could you please indicate if we can use your contact details for:

Contacting you for further contribution to the study?

- Yes
- No

* 64. Please enter the name of your company:
65. Please enter the email address on which we may contact you for further contribution to the study:

Your responses have been registered!

Thank you for taking the time to complete the survey, your input is valuable to us.

Click here to view your responses