Brussels, 11 February 2016
DG CONNECT/B2

COCOM 16-01

COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE

Working Document

Subject: **Implementation of the European emergency number 112 –
Results of the ninth data-gathering round**

This is a Committee working document which does not necessarily reflect the official position of the Commission. No inferences should be drawn from this document as to the precise form or content of future measures to be submitted by the Commission. The Commission accepts no responsibility or liability whatsoever with regard to any information or data referred to in this document.

The data-gathering exercise based on Key Performance Indicators was introduced with a view to implement performance measurements in order to get reliable data which would allow the assessment and optimisation of the access to 112 at national level.

Quality of the data

Member States were invited to follow the definitions of the measurements provided in the KPI reporting table. This year Finland, Ireland, Romania, Spain and Sweden were the countries which could serve as best practice in providing the data according to the methodology described in the reporting table. Several of the responses received were not complete or indicated explicitly that certain data was not available. In case of Italy and Luxembourg the data was not consolidated, but broken down on regions, emergency services or operators, making the harmonised processing of the data impossible. This year Denmark failed to report the required data, hence the 2014 data is taken in consideration when drawing EU level conclusions. The least relevant information was received from Belgium and Germany.

The quality of the reported data did not improve significantly. While some Member States reported relevant data which were not available in the previous exercise others ceased to report some relevant data. Member States, which are not yet in the position to carry out such performance evaluation, are encouraged to follow best practice in this area to progressively introduce the necessary capabilities, thus further increasing the quality of their data.

Main findings

- The data on awareness levels gathered through the E-communications household survey commissioned by the European Commission shows a significant improvement since January 2014 albeit more has to be done to ensure that all citizens know about 112. Most Europeans (61%) would call 112 in the national context (up 3p.p.). Almost half (46%) correctly identified 112 as the single number to call throughout the EU and 48% recalled 112 (either alone, or along with another number). Thus awareness of 112 as the single number to call has increased by six percentage points since 2014, and mentions of 112 along with another number have increased by seven points.

- Access to 112 for disabled end-users did not improve significantly. 23 Member States reported the implementation of an alternative access to emergency service, one up from last year. The take-up of SMS reached 19 Member States (18 Member States last year) while 3 Member States reported the ongoing deployment of such alternative means to contact emergency services.

- 20 Member States reported less than 10 seconds for the answer time needed to get in contact with emergency services. This best practice should be followed by others in terms of performance and also the ability to monitor the indicator.

- No improvement is noticed on the implementation of more accurate caller location in Europe. Cell ID/Sector ID is a standard location requirement in Europe for mobile networks delivering accuracy between 30 meters and tens of kilometres. However United Kingdom proved that a more accurate location solution can be effectively implemented launching the Advanced Mobile Location (SMS). AML ensures a notably more precise location to be sent to PSAPs using SMS. AML locations are obtained using assisted GPS, GPS or WiFi and typically provide a radius smaller than 50 metres.

- In order to make the emergency intervention more efficient caller location should be provided together with the call to the emergency service. Still, excessively long time is needed to receive the caller location in France (several minutes), Malta (5-10 minutes) and Greece (28min 58s). It has to be noted that Austria and Slovak Republic did not report relevant data for this Key Performance Indicator.

These performance indicators were agreed by emergency experts to reflect the efficiency and effectiveness of access to 112 calls. Member States are called on to develop their measuring tools for monitoring these indicators in order to optimise their 112 systems.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

This Report provides an analysis of the replies submitted by Member States on the Key Performance Indicators (KPI) reporting on the Implementation of 112. This is the ninth data gathering exercise following the previous exercises that are published on:

http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/eu-actions-112

This Report is based on the KPI reporting table which was submitted to Member States on 1 September 2015 with a deadline for response on 4 December 2015 (COCOM 15-11). In order to provide the most recent data for the Key Performance Indicators, the reporting period was set for 1 July 2014 till 31 June 2015.

The current KPIs were established on the basis of the cooperation with Member States experts. COCOM delegations were also consulted on these indicators in 2013.

The current Report follows the structure of the KPI reporting table and it is accompanied by the Annex providing a more detailed overview on the information submitted by the responding Member States, in a harmonised manner. The KPIs reflect the provisions of Article 26 of the amended Universal Service Directive concerning the access to 112 for disabled users, provision of caller location and the accuracy and reliability of caller location information. The report covers the information submitted by all Member States. As agreed, the COCOM observer delegations from Candidate and EEA Countries were also invited to submit replies to the questionnaire. Of these countries, relevant replies were received from Iceland.

This Report was published on 11 February 2016, (more information on the Commission's '112' website: www.112.eu). On the '112' website country-specific information is also published.

SEVENTH REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF 112

1. Calls to 112

In total 134 922 340 calls were made to 112 (excluding calls made in Germany and Cyprus which were not reported and taking 2014 data from Belgium, Denmark and Malta).

112 is the single emergency number in Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Malta, the Netherlands, Portugal, Romania, Sweden and Iceland. It has to be noted that Estonia moved to the single European emergency number on 11 February 2015. In Member States where 112 is not the single emergency number (such as Bulgaria, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Poland and Spain) more than 50% of the calls were directed to 112.

There were only 21 Member States that provided information on false calls[1]. The ratio of false calls to the total number of calls still appears to vary considerably among the Member States: whereas in Cyprus the number of such calls is approximated at 8%, Greece reported 98,41%. The following Member States are between these two extremes: Belgium (20%), Bulgaria (41,4%), Croatia (48,4%), Cyprus (8%), Denmark (60%), Finland (22%), France (18%), Greece (98,41%), Hungary (80,6%), Ireland (51,7%), Italy (55%), Lithuania (60-70%), Luxembourg (37,83%), Malta (22.22%), the Netherlands (45%), Portugal (59%), Poland (36,8%), Romania (63,63%), Spain (28,31%), Sweden (38,3%) and the United Kingdom (41%).

2. Access to 112 for disabled end-users

The question on access to 112 by other means than voice communication reflects the requirements of the regulatory framework, which provides for the obligations of Member States to ensure that disabled end-users enjoy equivalent access to 112. Member States were invited to provide information on their measures, which ensure that disabled end-users enjoy tailored solutions for equal access to 112 taking into account aspects such as speed, mobility, reliability, coverage or language handling.

Out of the 29 replies received, 24 (with Iceland) mentioned the existence of alternative means[2] to voice as measures to provide access to emergency services:

SMS as an alternative means of access to emergency services is available in 19 Member states and Iceland. The Member States concerned are: Austria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and United Kingdom. Lithuania and

---

[1] False calls are calls which are not followed up with intervention or assistance from the PSAP or the emergency services. Calls that report an emergency event which has already triggered intervention or assistance from the part of the PSAP, therefore not triggering separate intervention or assistance, will not be considered false calls. Abandoned calls, as defined in KPI no. 4 are excluded from the category of false calls.

[2] Alternative means of access is a non-voice access, or voice access assisted by other type of non-voice service in order to permit the effective conveyance of a request for emergency relief. Examples: real-time text, sms, video streaming, relay services.

Romania introduced the SMS facility since the last report. Croatia and Poland reported plans to introduce 112 SMS. Hungary is planning the development of a dedicated portal.

Lithuania introduced a 112 App since 2014.Text relay services are available in the Czech Republic, the Netherlands, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom. Fax is used in Belgium, Cyprus, France, Italy, Luxembourg. Minicom is deployed in Ireland in addition to 112SMS.

Twelve Member States, can monitor the uptake of access to emergency services through alternative means. Member States that reported the number of communications through these means to 112 or other dedicated numbers are: Austria, Estonia, France, Greece, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom. It is to be noted that Slovenia reported the number of eCalls received.

3. Answering time[3]

People in distress are often in desperate need to get in contact with the emergency services operator. 20 Member States reported less than 10 seconds for the average answering time needed to get in contact with the emergency services. The best performing Member States where more than 90% of the calls are answered in 10 seconds are: Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Finland, Ireland, Latvia, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, United Kingdom. Iceland reported that 96% of the calls are answered within 8 seconds.

A pre-recorded message is played before getting in contact with an operator in Cyprus, France, Greece and Spain.

4. Call abandon rate

The respondents were also invited to report on the calls that are presented to the PSAP switches but terminate prior to an answer by a human operator. 22 Member States and Iceland could report on this data. Call abandons may be caused by network problems, call congestion, etc.

A call abandon rate of more than 20% was reported by the Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Netherlands, Poland and Portugal.

5. Lack of availability of caller location

The provision of caller location by undertakings concerned is an obligation under Article 26(5) of the Universal Service Directive. However, there are cases, where due to technical problems in the networks or on the PSAP side, the caller location information cannot be determined automatically or on request in both "push" and "pull" systems.

Only 17 Member States reported this data. In most Member States the lack of availability of caller location occurs in less than 10% of the calls. Higher rates of failure to provide caller location were reported for Italy (13%), Poland (22%), Slovak Republic (16,33%). In

---

[3] The time period between the moment the emergency call is presented to the stage 1 PSAP switch and the moment the call is being answered by a PSAP human operator.

the Slovak Republic the request for caller location is repeated, usually with a positive result while in Poland short/false calls are included.

6. Caller location accuracy and reliability

Member States were asked to provide the level of accuracy and reliability provided by network operators to the PSAP.

In 23 Member States the accuracy for the location of the caller from fixed networks is given by the installation address, street/mailing/billing address of the calling party, STD Code match or county match. This location technology is deemed reliable by the respondents.

24 Member States reported that for the location of the caller from mobile networks the accuracy is given by the Cell/sector ID providing a high reliability of the data transmitted to the PSAP operator. However, there is no information on the usefulness of the data transmitted, the accuracy reported being from 30 to 5000 meters.

Portugal provided a very useful breakdown of the accuracy of Cell ID technology:

Radius (m)	%
100	1,08%
250	0,60%
500	0,91%
750	4,25%
1000	9,92%
2000	22,29%
4000	34,03%
10000	21,28%
20000	5,30%
40000	0,34%

Denmark reported on the use of a 112 App which could provide an accuracy of 10 to 60 meters.

Notably, in July 2014, the Advanced Mobile Location service was launched in the UK, allowing a more precise location to be sent using SMS to PSAPs. AML locations are obtained using assisted GPS, GPS or WiFi and typically provide a radius smaller than 50 metres. The number of calls per week supported with AML reached about 2000.

7. Average time needed for receiving the caller location by the 112 operator

The timely provision of caller location data is highlighted in Article 26(5) of the Universal Service Directive as amended by the "Citizens' Rights" Directive requiring Member States to ensure that undertakings concerned make caller location information available free of charge to the authority handling emergency calls as soon as the call reaches that authority.

Due to the implementation of the "push" system or the automatic "pull" system, near instant times (up to 10 seconds) were reported by Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany (PSAPs where "pull" is introduced), Hungary,

Ireland, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and United Kingdom. Longer times were reported by Cyprus (20 s) and Croatia (10-50 s). Excessively long time is needed to receive the caller location in France (several minutes), Malta (5-10 minutes reported in 2014) and Greece (28 min. 58 s). Austria and the Slovak Republic did not report relevant data for this Key Performance Indicator.

8. Availability of EU roaming call to 112 and caller location by mobile network operators

According to the replies to the previous questionnaire, caller location was not available in all Member States for users of intra-EU and/or national 112 roaming. The current replies show that these categories of mobile users still cannot be located when calling 112 in several Member States. However, the fact that this facility is now available in the majority of countries shows that it is technically feasible within the meaning of the EU regulatory framework.

Out of the 28 Member States Denmark did not provide relevant information. All other Member States, except France, reported that an EU roaming call to 112 is possible on their territory. France and the United Kingdom (for some networks) reported that for intra EU roaming calls caller location is not available.

9. Awareness levels on 112

In the Annex to this document the new awareness data of December 2015 on 112 is presented in point 9. The January 2014 data are presented in brackets. The data on awareness levels was gathered through the E-communications household survey commissioned by the European Commission.

The following questions related to 112 awareness were asked in the survey:

1) Can you tell me what telephone number you would call in the event of an emergency in (OUR COUNTRY); for example, if someone needs urgent medical assistance or if you need to contact the police or the fire brigade?

Finding (December 2015): Most (61%) would call 112, while 26% would call the national emergency number. Just over one in ten (13%) would call another number, while 6% do not know what number they would call.

The proportion that would call 112 has increased slightly since 2014 (+3 percentage points), as has the proportion that would call the national number (+2 pp). The proportion mentioning other numbers has decreased by three points.

2) Can you tell me what telephone number enables you to call emergency services anywhere in the EU?

Finding (December 2015): Almost half (46%) correctly identified 112 as the single number to call throughout the EU.

Overall (48%) mentioned 112 (either alone, or along with another number), while 13% mentioned other numbers. Four in ten (40%) could not say what number to call.

Awareness of 112 as the single number to call has increased by six percentage points since 2014, and mentions of 112 along with another number have increased by seven points.

ANNEX – KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

(2014 data in brackets)

Country	1.1 Number of calls to 112 1.2 % of total emergency calls 1.3 False calls	2.1 Alternative means of access for disabled ed-users 2.2 No. of communications to 112 2.3 No. of communications to other numbers	3.1 Average answer time in seconds 3.2 % of calls answered within 10 seconds	4. Call abandon rate
Austria	1.1: 1.161.996 (1.333.145) 1.2: 18% (20,7 %) 1.3: N/A	2.1: SMS-to-Fax transmission via non-emergency number (0800-133-133) 2.2: none 2.3: (208) 34	3.1: 11,8s (11,1s) 3.2: 71,8% (73,6%)	4.1: N/A
Belgium	1.1: (1.376.652) (112+100: 2.839.983; 101: 2.889.314) 1.2: (24%) 1.3: (> 20 % false calls of the total number of emergency calls 100/112 About 16% of calls to 101 are false calls)	2.1: (Fax[4]) 2.2: N/A 2.3: N/A	3.1: (6,8s) 3.2: (78%)	4.1: N/A
Bulgaria	1.1: 6 458 593 (6 387 922) 1.2: 77.36% (64.10%) 1.3: 41.4% (42.73%)	2.1: No alternative access	3.1: 5.14 s (4.32s) 3.2: 91.04 % (99.14%)	4.1: 17.87% (14.37%)
Croatia	1.1: 2.101.232 (2,664,176) 1.2: N/A 1.3: 48.4% (51,9%)	Plans to provide non voice access to 112.	3.1: 5,4 s (5,1 s) 3.2: 90 % (92 %)	4.1: 4,5 % (4,4%)
Cyprus	1.1: 613.000 for both 112 and 199 1.2: N/A 1.3: approx 8%	2.1: Tefelax machine to 1408, SMS to 99510408 (this is a universal service obligations for disabled end-user accessibility delivered by Cyta) 2.2: N/A 2.3: N/A	3.1: 15-16 s 3.2: 100 after the pre-recorded message% There is a pre-recorded message notifying that the call is recorded which lasts 10 sec.	4.1: N/A
Czech Republic	1.1: 2 870 096 (3 230 765) 1.2: N/A (44% of all calls in 2012) 1.3: N/A (75% of false calls to 112 in 2012)	2.1: SMS services 2.2: N/A 2.3: N/A	3.1: 4,6 % (4,6 s) 3.2: 100% (100 %)	4.1: 20,61% (32,06 %)
Denmark (2014 data)	1.1: 1,584,261 (513.450) 1.2: no other emergency numbers are in use. 1.3: Danish National Police:	2.1: SMS 2.2: N/A 2.3: N/A	3.1: 12,56 s (13 s) 3.2: 81.70 % (43,89 %)	4.1: Danish Fire Department: 6.4% Danish Police:

---

[4] SMS to 112 and 101 (only for people with hearing and/or speech impairment) in development, trials starting Q4 2014

Country	1.1 Number of calls to 112 1.2 % of total emergency calls 1.3 False calls	2.1 Alternative means of access for disabled ed-users 2.2 No. of communications to 112 2.3 No. of communications to other numbers	3.1 Average answer time in seconds 3.2 % of calls answered within 10 seconds	4. Call abandon rate
	60%			33%
Estonia	1.1: 1 278 596 (916 431) 1.2: **on 11th February 2015 Estonia moved to the single emergency number 112** 1.3: N/A	2.1: SMS to 112 2.2: 73 (27) 2.3: (N/A)	3.1: 6 s (6 s) 3.2: 89% (88 %)	4.1: 0,03% (0,03%)
Finland	1.1: 3 172 000 (2 797 000) 1.2 :112 is the single emergency number 1.3: 22% (29 %)	2.1: SMS to local numbers of ERCs 2.2: N/A 2.3: N/A	3.1: 6% (4 s) 3.2: 95% (93 %)	4.1: 13,2 % (14 %)
France	1.1: 12 810 397 (8 535 278) out of 59 922 258 1.2: 21% (13%) 1.3: 18% (24%)	2.1: "114" for the deaf people 2.2: N/A 2.3: 357 754 (127 854) sms corresponding to 15 435 (7103) cases (each case requires an average of 23 SMS or 11 faxes)	3.1: 9 s (8 s), including 6s compulsory automated message 3.2: 50% (49%) after the message	4.1: 39% (43%)
Germany	The responsibility for the collection of these data by the local governments. A nationwide national statistics according to the KPIs is not available.	The responsibility for the collection of these data by the local governments. A nationwide national statistics according to the KPIs is not available.	The responsibility for the collection of these data by the local governments. A nationwide national statistics according to the KPIs is not available.	The responsibility for the collection of these data by the local governments. A nationwide national statistics according to the KPIs is not available.
Greece	1.1: 2.605.978 (2.771.066) 1.2: N/A 1.3: 98,41%	2.1: SMS (currently not available for 112 calls/only to Police) 2.2: N/A 2.3: 53.792 (17.754) to Police	3.1: 9 s (9 s) 3.2: N/A	4.1: < 2 % (< 2 %) (data refer to 112 only)
Hungary	1.1: 5 102 673 1.2: N/A 1.3: 80, 6 (80,56%)	2.1: N/A – a dedicated portal is under development. 2.2: N/A 2.3: N/A	3.1: 5,9s (5.28s) 3.2: 84,41% (92,7%)	4.1: 19 % (16,05%)
Ireland	1.1: 1,963,220 (2,455,985) 1.2: N/A 1.3: 51,7 (60.5 %)	2.1: SMS and Minicom 2.2: 4,048 (9,089) 2.3: None	3.1: 0,63s (0,66s) 3.2: 99,19% (99.13%) within 5 seconds (within 10 s N/A)	4.1: 5,7% (7.1%)
Italy	1.1: approx. 10 000 000 1.2: 62% for the Lombardia Region 1.3: 55% for the 112 NUE	2.1: SMS 2.2: N/A 2.3: statistically insignificant	3.1: approx. 6 s (6-10 s) 3.2: 86% (85%)	4.1: approx. 3%

Country	1.1 Number of calls to 112 1.2 % of total emergency calls 1.3 False calls	2.1 Alternative means of access for disabled ed-users 2.2 No. of communications to 112 2.3 No. of communications to other numbers	3.1 Average answer time in seconds 3.2 % of calls answered within 10 seconds	4. Call abandon rate
	service in the Lombardia Region N/A for the National Territory except the Lombardia Region			
Latvia	1.1: 1 648 720 (1 924 707) 1.2: N/A 1.3: N/A	2.1: SMS to 112. 2.2: 102 (15 with people with disabilities) 2.3: None	3.1: 6 s (6 s) 3.2: 97% (71 %)	4.1: 21 % (21%)
Lithuania	1.1: 2 956 549 (3 817 583) (to all numbers) 1.2: 79,37% (70,66%) 1.3: 60-70% % of false calls of the total number of emergency calls	2.1: 112 SMS and 112 APP since 2014 2.2: less than 100 2.3: N/A	3.1:7s (6,75s) 3.2: 75% within 8s	4.1: 15-20 % (same as last year)
Luxembourg	1.1: Administration des services de secours (112) : 351.437 (406.196) Police (113) : 152.450 (153.485) 1.2: 69,75% (72,58%) 1.3: Administration des services de secours: N/A Police : 37,83%	2.1: Administration des services de secours : SMS and Fax Police : SMS 2.2: Administration des services de secours : 217 (94) SMS 2.3: None	3.1: Administration des services de secours : 2,9s (2,8 s) Police : N/A 3.2: Administration des services de secours : 92,47 (92.84) Police : N/A	4.1: N/A
Malta	1.1: 479320 (501827) 1.2: 112 is the single emergency number 1.3: 25,14% (22.22%)	2.1: Currently there is in place an SMS facility through number: (+356) 79777119, which is used for instant reporting. 2.2: None 2.3: N/A	3.1: 8s (6s) 3.2: 40,59% (43.66%)	4.1: 42,38% (33,74 %)
Netherlands	1.1: 2.929.351 (3.475.118) 1.2: 112 is the single emergency number 1.3: 45%	2.1: Relay services 2.2: N/A 2.3: N/A	Mobile calls: 3.1: N/A 3.2: 93% fixed 97% mobile (as in 2014)	4.1: 26,2% (fixed) 4.9% (mobile)
Poland	1.1: 21.104.865 (18,722,572) 1.2: 52,9% (44,8%) 1.3: 47,2% (36.8%)	2.1: 112 SMS is under development 2.2: N/A 2.3: N/A	3.1: 5s (12s) 3.2: 93% (68%)	4.1: 35,7% (34%)
Portugal	1.1: 10.200.000 (10.600.000) 1.2: 112 is the single emergency number 1.3: 59% (66.3%)	2.1: SMS (96 10 10 200) for the deaf citizens operated by the National Guard 2.2: N/A 2.3: N/A	3.1: 5s (4,45s) 3.2: 97% (90%)	4.1: 35,9% (38,5%)
Romania	1.1: 15.959.511 (17.038.459) 1.2: 112 is the single emergency number 1.3: 63,63% (69,46%)	2.1: SMS 113 introduced in 2015 2.3: 1 SMS	3.1: 3,86s (3.68s) 3.2: 94% (94.63%)	4.1: 5,36% (4.95%)
Slovakia	1.1: 1.428.574 (1.478.653) 1.2: N/A 1.3: N/A	N/A	3.1: 9s (9 s) 3.2: 85,12% (87,94%)	4.1: 17,76% (18,67%)

Country	1.1 Number of calls to 112 1.2 % of total emergency calls 1.3 False calls	2.1 Alternative means of access for disabled ed-users 2.2 No. of communications to 112 2.3 No. of communications to other numbers	3.1 Average answer time in seconds 3.2 % of calls answered within 10 seconds	4. Call abandon rate
Slovenia	1.1: 898.268 (992.264) 1.2: 49,26% (51.22%) 1.3: 0%	2.1: WAP112, SMS112 2.2: WAP112 – 71 (12); SMS112 – 940 (857) **eCall - 124** 2.3: N/A	3.1: 4,59s (4.51s) 3.2: 93,92% (100%)	4.1: 15 calls (0,0029%)
Spain	1.1: 26.082.672 (29.741.512) 1.2: 69,04% (62.45%) 1.3: 28,31% (30.40%)	2.1: SMS, Assisted calls (Chat), Fax 2.2: 2023 (604) 2.3: Less than 100	3.1: 5s (4.76s) Some PSAPs use automated messages (5s – 10s) to filter false calls. 3.2: 92,11% (91.52%)	4.1: 9,3% (9.79 %)
Sweden	1.1: 3 673 964 (3 275 995) 1.2: 112 is the single emergency number 1.3: 38,3% (40,8%)	2.1: SMS112 - PSTN text telephone calls received by PSAP - Videophone and Total conversation through 112 SIP address – through relay services for sign language users - IP textphone access indirectly via text relay service 2.2:. - SMS112: 285 (104) - Text telephone to 112: 78 (163) - Calls through relay services: 153 (100) 2.3: N/A	3.1: 15,3s (11,57s) 3.2: 61,3% (67.6%)	4.1: 11,9% (21,6%)
United Kingdom	1.1: 28,965,956 (35,868,363) to 999 and 112 1.2: N/A (4.47%) 1.3: 41% (51.85%)	2.1: via 112 or 999 SMS and text relay service – requires simple pre-registration of handset. 2.2: Aprox. 2950 (3500) emergency SMS conversations made in the year/ average of 7 SMS in each direction 2.3: A real time text service using ITUv21 protocol is available for deaf users with special terminals to call 18000. There were an estimated 4250 calls to 18000 from such terminals.	3.1: N/A 3.2: 98,62% (98.44%) were answered within 5 s	4.1: N/A
Iceland	1.1: 201 522 (202 517) 1.2: 112 is the single emergency number 1.3: 26% (32,4%)	2.1: SMS is available for all users, although primarily implemented for the hearing impaired 2.2: N/A (1310) 2.3: 0	3.1: 3,6s (4,5s) 3.2: 96% (96%) of all calls answered within 8 seconds	4.1: 1,29% (1,2%)

Country	1.1 Number of calls to 112 1.2 % of total emergency calls 1.3 False calls	2.1 Alternative means of access for disabled ed-users 2.2 No. of communications to 112 2.3 No. of communications to other numbers	3.1 Average answer time in seconds 3.2 % of calls answered within 10 seconds	4. Call abandon rate
Norway (2014 data)	1.1: 737.882 1.2: N/A 1.3: in the 112 PSAP in Oslo: 95,93%	2.1: 1412 emergency text telephone number reserved for people with hearing disabilities 2.2: N/A 2.3: N/A	3.1: 7 s 3.2: 93,8% in 20 seconds	4.1: 18,8%

Country	5. % of total calls when automatic or non-automatic request of caller location is unsuccessful	6 Caller location accuracy and reliability 6.1 Fixed networks 6.2 Mobile networks	7. Average time needed for receiving the caller location by the 112 operator	8.1 Availability of EU roaming call to 112 8.2 Availability of caller location of EU roaming calls	9. Awareness level (%) 9.1: national 9.2: EU (2013 data in brackets)
Austria	5.1: N/A	6.1: residential address, see http://www.rtr.at/en/tk/TKG 2003 6.2: Cell/ID (base station number) or location of base station (geographic data). If technically available some mobile operators offer sector information additionally	7.1: N/A	8.1: Yes 8.2: Yes	9.1: 35 (35) 9.2: 50 (52)
Belgium	5.1: N/A Exact location information is only provided for fixed calls. (installation address) For mobile : Cell-ID (avail-able to four call-centres 112/100 that operate with CAD/ASTRID-technology, in development for the other (remaining 6) call-centres 112/100).	6.1: registered installation address by the operator reliability fluctuates due to irregular update of changed data by operators. 6.2: Cell ID together with installation address of antenna of operator; reliability is high. Nomadic services remain problematic location data are rarely provided and reliability is highly questionable.	7.1: Fixed: real time if emergency services have access to installation database ; mobile: near real time. (automated pull system)	8.1: Yes 8.2: On request to the PSAP through non-automated procedure	9.1: 71 (65) 9.2: 65 (61)
Bulgaria	5.1: 3.46% (0.805%) Period of measurement: 18.10.14-	6.1: address of the calling party, based on calling party number 6.2: Cell ID	7.1: Push method (instant)	8.1: Yes 8.2: Yes	9.1: 89 (88) 9.2: 61 (70)

Country	5. % of total calls when automatic or non-automatic request of caller location is unsuccessful	6 Caller location accuracy and reliability 6.1 Fixed networks 6.2 Mobile networks	7. Average time needed for receiving the caller location by the 112 operator	8.1 Availability of EU roaming call to 112 8.2 Availability of caller location of EU roaming calls	9. Awareness level (%) 9.1: national 9.2: EU (2013 data in brackets)
	30.06.15				
Croatia	5.1: N/A	6.1: public address book. 6.2: Cell Id and angle of coverage	7.1: 10-50 s on a GIS map – not statistically measured.	8.1: Yes 8.2: Yes	9.1: 74 (80) 9.2: 64 (65)
Cyprus	5.1: 0	6.1: address 6.2: Cell ID	7.1 : 20 sec.	8.1: Yes 8.2: Yes	9.1: 57 (37) 9.2: 58 (37)
Czech Republic	5.1: N/A	6.1: Address 6.2: approx. 800m / 70%	7.1: 1 s for fixed/ instant for mobile (push)	8.1: Yes 8.2: Yes	9.1: 53 (59) 9.2: 60 (61)
Denmark (2014 data)	5.1: 1,5%	6.1: N/A 6.2: Cell ID: 75% within a range depending on the mobile network infrastructure from 500 m to 5000 m. 112 app is accuracy: 10-60m.	7.1: Instantly. 112 App – 12 s	8: N/A	9.1: 94 (93) 9.2: 49 (41)
Estonia	5.1: N/A	6.1: Accuracy of installation address 6.2: 2G urban: 120-200m; 3G urban 70-150m; 2/3G rural: 500m-2km	7.1: 2s (2 s)	8.1: Yes 8.2: Yes	9.1: 96 (94) 9.2: 65 (49)
Finland	5.1: N/A	6.1: street address information from the commercial directory services database 6.2: Cell ID/Sector ID and more accurate information based on the best available calculation method (depends on the operator)	7.1: 10 s (6 s)	8.1: Yes 8.2: Yes (provided upon request from MNO)	9.1: 99 (97) 9.2: 64 (61)
France	5.1: N/A Manual process at the request of PSAP is being automated.	6.1: Mailing Address 6.2:Cell ID	7.1: several minutes (estimated)	8: No	9.1: 19 (16) 9.2: 40 (33)

Country	5. % of total calls when automatic or non-automatic request of caller location is unsuccessful	6 Caller location accuracy and reliability 6.1 Fixed networks 6.2 Mobile networks	7. Average time needed for receiving the caller location by the 112 operator	8.1 Availability of EU roaming call to 112 8.2 Availability of caller location of EU roaming calls	9. Awareness level (%) 9.1: national 9.2: EU (2013 data in brackets)
Germany	The responsibility for the collection of these data by the local governments. A nationwide national statistics according to the KPIs is not available.	6.1: For calls from fixed networks, the technical specifications state that an exact address must be given as the location. The only exemptions from the implementation requirement are: a) telephone connections to exchanges using ISDN technology (in view of the foreseeable end of the service life of that technology) and b) mixed types of nomadic uses for which solutions at EU level are to be standardised. 6.2: Cell ID	7.1: a) mobile networks: 0s (push system) b) fixed networks: 0s (push system)	8.1: Yes 8.2: Yes	9.1: 89 (84) 9.2: 61 (42)
Greece	5.1: 2,17% (1,46 %)* *Refers only to calls placed to 112	6.1: physical address for fixed telephone connection 6.2: Cell ID	7.1: 28min 58s (34 min 56 s) For 112 calls.	8.1: Yes 8.2: Yes	9.1: 6 (5) 9.2: 13 (10)
Hungary	5.1: 0%	6.1: Address of installation with 100% reliability 6.2: Cell ID; 100% reliability	7.1: 3 s	8.1: Yes 8.2: Yes	9.1: 56 (49) 9.2: 63 (45)
Ireland	5.1: 0,99% (3.18%)	6.1: 99.1% of fixed lines have location information. This is broken down as follows: Installation Address Co-ordinates –25.6% STD Code match – 11.2 County only match – 22.3% Townland & County match – 40.0% 6.2: Cell ID – 99% (96.63%)	7.1: Instant	8.1: Yes 8.2: Yes	9.1: 32 (31) 9.2: 44 (33)
Italy	5.1: 13%	6.1: N/A 6.2: N/A	7.1: 3-5 s (same as in 2014, 2013)	8.1: Yes 8.2: Yes	9.1: 63 (58) 9.2: 36 (33)
Latvia	5.1: >1%	6.1: address provided by network operator. 6.2: Cell ID	7.1: 7s (12s)	8.1: Yes 8.2: Yes	9.1: 80 (82 9.2: 44 (47)
Lithuania	5.1: Up to 5 % (same as last year)	6.1: Subscriber's billing address, database renewal – every two months 6.2: Cell ID, 95% of mobile location data must be provided within 20 seconds	7.1: 1-2 s (same as in 2014)	8.1: Yes 8.2: Yes	9.1: 90 (85) 9.2: 38 (41)

Country	5. % of total calls when automatic or non-automatic request of caller location is unsuccessful	6 Caller location accuracy and reliability 6.1 Fixed networks 6.2 Mobile networks	7. Average time needed for receiving the caller location by the 112 operator	8.1 Availability of EU roaming call to 112 8.2 Availability of caller location of EU roaming calls	9. Awareness level (%) 9.1: national 9.2: EU (2013 data in brackets)
		from call set-up moment.			
Luxembourg	5.1 : Administration des services de secours : < 1% for fixed caller < 1% for mobile caller (cell ID)	6.1 Administration des services de secours : High accuracy; High reliability No data for VoIP caller 6.2 Administration des services de secours : Cell ID; High reliability	7.1 Administration des services de secours : < 1 seconds for fixed and mobile caller Police : N/A	8.1 : Yes 8.2 : Yes	9.1 : 96 (93) 9.2 : 80 (80)
Malta	5.1: N/A	6.1: Address of Registered Line as available in the Service Provider database 6.2: Cell ID	7.1: N/A (5-10 min)	8.1: Yes 8.2: Yes	9.1: 72 (63) 9.2: 43 (34)
Netherlands	5.1: 4,3% (12,9%)	6.1: Near 100% for fixed calls (Name, ddress, Zipcode, CLI) 6.2: Cell ID	7.1: <2 s	8.1: Yes 8.2: Yes	9.1: 98 (97) 9.2: 61 (57)
Poland	5.1: 22% (short/false calls included)	6.1: detailed address of a network termination point installation 6.2: Cell Id/Sector ID/timing Advance: 100m – 1 km.	7.1: 7s	8.1: Yes 8.2: Yes	9.1: 81 (74) 9.2: 83 (70)
Portugal	5.1: <1%	6.1: N/A 6.2: 	Radius (m)	%
---	---
100	1,08%
250	0,60%
500	0,91%
750	4,25%
1000	9,92%
2000	22,29%
4000	34,03%
10000	21,28%
20000	5,30%
40000	0,34%		7.1 <2 s	8.1: Yes 8.2: Yes	9.1: 97 (92) 9.2: 51 (34)
Romania	5.1: 6.3% (2%)	6.1: 98.03% (97.20%) from fixed networks receive address information with accuracy (updating databases monthly) 6.2: 99.57% (99.27%) from	7.1: 3s (3s)	8.1: Yes 8.2: Yes	9.1: 93 (95) 9.2: 61 (71)

Country	5. % of total calls when automatic or non-automatic request of caller location is unsuccessful	6 Caller location accuracy and reliability 6.1 Fixed networks 6.2 Mobile networks	7. Average time needed for receiving the caller location by the 112 operator	8.1 Availability of EU roaming call to 112 8.2 Availability of caller location of EU roaming calls	9. Awareness level (%) 9.1: national 9.2: EU (2013 data in brackets)
		calls have a valid network cell ID and sector ID			
Slovakia	5.1: 16,33% (18%) (but the request is usually repeated with positive result)	6.1: N/A 6.2: N/A	7.1: N/A	8.1: Yes 8.2: Yes	9.1: 80 (81) 9.2: 72 (69)
Slovenia	5.1: 0% using pull method 28% using push method	6.1. Address 6.2. Cell ID	7.1: 4 s (4 s)	8.1: Yes 8.2: Yes	9.1: 87 (86) 9.2: 50 (46)
Spain	5.1: 8.27% (17.68%) – Includes cases where location information is available but cannot be processed by the PSAP)	6.1: Subscriber's address. 6.2: Cell ID, Sector ID	7.1: 1s	8.1: Yes 8.2: Yes, 17 out of 19 PSAPs	9.1: 72 (70) 9.2: 29 (23)
Sweden	5.1: 8,7% (8,2%)	6.1: N/A 6.2: N/A	7.1: 0,9s (<2 s)	8.1: Yes 8.2: Yes	9.1: 97 (97) 9.2: 57 (48)
United Kingdom	5.1: 7% (5%)	6.1: street address, post code 6.2: Cell ID In July 2014, the Advanced Mobile Location service was launched in the UK, allowing a more precise location to be sent using SMS to PSAPs. AML locations are obtained using Assisted GPS, GPS or WiFi and typically provide a radius smaller than 50 metres. The number of calls per week supported with AML reached about 2000.	7.1: <2 s	8.1: Yes 8.2: Automatic approximate caller location is available only for 15% of the calls.	9.1: 9(7%) 9.2: 22(18%)
Iceland	5.1: N/A	6.1: 100% Correct location IP based phone calls 50% correct 6.2: Cell ID provided reliably in 99,9% of all mobile calls	7.1: 21s	8.1: Yes 8.2: Yes	9.1: N/A 9.2: 53,8 (54,4)
Norway (2014 data)	5.1: 45,3 % of the manual requests	6.1: Installation address and registered names 6.2: Cell ID, timing advance, sector ID	7.1: 3.44 s	8.1: Yes 8.2: Yes	9: N/A