



Using data in practice: From information to impact

Synthesis of a webinar

Event co-organised between
the Governance and Regulation Chair and the OECD

Online



Dauphine
CHAIRE GOUVERNANCE
ET RÉGULATION



**Event co-organised between
the Governance and Regulation Chair
and the OECD**

June 17, 2026



Synthesis n°111
Paris Dauphine-PSL University

Using data in practice: From information to impact

Speakers

Edouard Daband | French Regulatory Authority for Electronic Communications,
Postal Services and Press Distribution (ARCEP)

Annegret Groebel | Member of Germany's Federal Network Agency and current Chair of
the Network of Economic Regulators

Jaunius Krivickas | System Analyst, Construction Sector Development Agency (SSVA)

Giuseppa Ottimofiore | Head of the Effective Regulatory Delivery Programme, OECD of
Regulatory Policy, OECD Public Governance

Susana Rodrigues | Head of the Quality Department, Water and Waste Services Regulation
Authority (ERSAR)

Adam Wilson | Chief Executive Officer, Essential Services Commission of South Australia
(ESCOSA)

Moderator

Eric Brousseau | Scientific Director, Governance and Regulation Chair

Summary

Opening Remarks.....	6
Presentations.....	7-17
Closing Remarks.....	18

This webinar was jointly organised by the Governance & Regulation Chair and the OECD.

Never have regulators had access to such vast amounts of data. Digital technologies now generate a continuous flow of data on the performance of markets, infrastructures and public services. Yet the challenge facing regulatory authorities is not simply one of data collection. It is one of judgement: identifying which information matters, reducing uncertainty sufficiently to support proportionate decisions, and translating evidence into regulatory action.

These questions formed the starting point for the workshop Using Data in Practice: From Information to Impact, jointly organised by the Centre de Recherche Droit Dauphine (CR2D), the Dauphine-PSL Chair in Governance and Regulation, and the OECD. Bringing together regulators, practitioners and researchers from several countries, the workshop explored how data can strengthen licensing, monitoring, benchmarking, enforcement and stakeholder engagement across a range of regulatory settings.

Whether the subject is water services, telecommunications, construction or essential services, the underlying questions remain strikingly similar. Which information is needed to identify emerging risks? How can regulators distinguish meaningful signals from an ever-growing volume of data? How should organisations evolve to ensure that evidence informs decisions consistently and transparently? Throughout these discussions, data emerges not as an objective in itself but as the starting point of a broader regulatory cycle. It acquires value only when it is validated, interpreted within its operational context and transformed into information that supports analysis, action and evaluation. Digital transformation is therefore as much an organisational challenge as a technological one, requiring shared methodologies, robust governance arrangements and analytical capabilities that enable institutions to learn continuously from evidence.

Artificial intelligence naturally occupies an important place within this landscape. Its potential lies not in replacing regulatory judgement, but in reinforcing it: analysing large collections of documents, identifying emerging patterns and extending the analytical capacity of regulatory authorities. The responsibility for interpreting evidence, weighing competing considerations and justifying regulatory decisions, however, remains fundamentally human.

As regulatory systems become increasingly data-rich, the defining challenge is no longer the collection of information but its intelligent use. Building institutions capable of reducing uncertainty, supporting informed judgement and maintaining public trust will be central to the future of evidence-based regulation.

Opening Remarks

Eric Brousseau | Scientific Director, Governance and Regulation Chair

This webinar is part of a long-standing collaboration between the Gouvernance and Regulation Chair of University Paris Dauphine-PSL and the OECD on regulatory issues. This year, we have chosen to examine more closely how regulators can make better use of AI-related data and, more broadly, the tools of the digital revolution to fulfil their mandates.

We have already held one seminar and one in-person conference earlier this year and will organise two additional seminars and a concluding conference next April. Today's webinar focuses on how regulators use data in practice. Topics include enhancing licensing and enforcement, improving monitoring and benchmarking, strengthening citizen engagement, and supporting more outcome-oriented regulation.

Annegret Groebel | Member of Germany's Federal Network Agency and current Chair of the Network of Economic Regulators

I am delighted to help open this highly relevant workshop on data. Data is only one part of the challenge, but it is the essential starting point for regulators seeking to make evidence-based decisions. The goal is to use the growing volumes of data collected through digital tools more effectively, enabling regulators to become both more efficient and more effective.

Several important questions arise.

- How can digital tools improve licensing and enforcement processes, which are often complex and resource-intensive?
- How can regulators better monitor performance and identify emerging issues before they become significant problems?
- Most importantly, since regulation ultimately serves citizens and consumers, how can data strengthen engagement, transparency, participation, and accountability?

These are the central issues we seek to address today. We want to understand how regulators transform data into useful information and then into sound regulatory decisions. We will also examine practical questions such as how data can be structured to improve benchmarking, support risk-based approaches, and strengthen regulatory effectiveness more broadly.

To explore these topics, we have four speakers representing diverse organisations and sectors, providing a range of use cases and perspectives on data management and evidence-based regulation. I hope today's discussion will offer valuable insights into how data can be collected, analysed, and used strategically to support better regulation. Thank you all for participating. We have an excellent turnout, and I look forward to the discussion.

Presentations

Adam Wilson | Chief Executive Officer, Essential Services Commission of South Australia (ESCOSA)

Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak with you this evening. I would first like to acknowledge that I am presenting from the lands of the Kaurna people, the traditional custodians of the Adelaide Plains. I pay my respects to their Elders past, present, and emerging, and recognise their enduring connection to the land and waters of this region.

This workshop provides an exciting opportunity to explore the role of data in economic regulation. My argument today is simple: **data is necessary, but it is not sufficient**. What ultimately matters in economic regulation is the generation and use of information. Information matters because it reduces uncertainty, and economic regulation is fundamentally a system in which uncertainty directly affects efficiency, effectiveness, and, ultimately, consumer outcomes.

I will develop this argument in five steps.

1. The purpose of regulation

Economic regulation exists to protect the long-term interests of consumers with respect to the price, quality, and reliability of essential services. This objective appears, in one form or another, in the governing legislation of most regulators represented here today.

Protecting consumers has two closely connected dimensions.

- The first concerns long-term service availability, or asset stewardship. Regulators must determine whether service providers are properly planning, financing, building, maintaining, and renewing the infrastructure upon which consumers depend—not only today, but decades into the future.
- The second concerns consumer protection in day-to-day interactions. This includes how providers treat customers when they receive bills, experience financial hardship, contact customer service, lodge complaints, or escalate disputes.

These two dimensions are related but distinct. Strong asset stewardship without consumer protection leaves vulnerable consumers exposed today. Strong consumer protection without sound stewardship creates promises that cannot be sustained tomorrow. Effective regulation must therefore integrate both, and each requires different kinds of information. Regulators who focus on only one dimension are effectively doing only half their job.

2. The regulatory cycle

How, then, do we pursue this objective in practice?

I believe regulators operate through a continuous policy cycle rather than a series of isolated decisions.

- The cycle begins with identifying existing and emerging consumer risks.
- It then moves to policy design, drawing on best practice, regulatory expertise, and meaningful stakeholder engagement.
- Next comes mitigation through instruments such as price controls, licensing conditions, reliability standards, and regulatory codes.
- This is followed by defining what success looks like, because every intervention should be designed with evaluation in mind.

- The cycle then proceeds to monitoring outcomes, analysing results, and asking not merely what the data shows, but what it means. Is a variation normal or significant? Is a trend temporary or persistent? Is a problem localised or systemic? This analysis informs action, which may involve continued observation, targeted engagement, formal investigation, enforcement measures, or even reconsideration of the regulatory framework itself.
- Finally, the regulator evaluates its own performance and the cycle begins again.

At the Essential Services Commission, we describe this process as “set, observe, diagnose, and respond.” The terminology is less important than the discipline. Each stage has distinct requirements and institutional responsibilities. At every point, we are essentially asking the same question: Do we know enough to make a good decision?

This leads to my central proposition: **economic regulation, viewed as a cyclical system, depends on certainty—not absolute certainty**, which is unattainable, but practical certainty, i.e., having a sufficient understanding to act confidently and proportionately.

If we do not understand emerging risks, we cannot design effective interventions. If we do not understand available remedies, we cannot calibrate our responses appropriately. If we do not understand market outcomes, we cannot judge whether our interventions are succeeding.

Every knowledge gap creates uncertainty, and every uncertainty introduces inefficiency or ineffectiveness. Prices may be set incorrectly, regulatory codes may fail to address actual harms, or enforcement actions may be delayed or disproportionate.

3. The distinction between data and information

This is why data is valuable. Yet **data is not valuable simply because it exists. Its value lies in its ability to be transformed into information through careful collection, validation, definition, contextualisation, and analysis.**

Information serves a precise purpose: it reduces uncertainty. Data is the raw material; information is the finished product. Regulatory systems do not operate on data—they operate on information. A regulator rich in data but poor in information is in a weaker position than a regulator with less data but a clear understanding of what it knows and where its knowledge gaps remain. The objective is not volume; it is the ability to answer important questions with sufficient confidence to support sound decisions.

Consequently, the design of any regulatory data system must begin with questions.

- What do we need to know?
- Why do we need to know it?
- With what level of precision?
- Compared to what benchmark?
- And how would our decisions change if we knew the answer?

In practice, this means gathering information that allows us to assess asset stewardship: asset condition, replacement cycles, operating costs relative to benchmarks, the relationship between forecast and actual capital expenditure, and cash-flow patterns that reveal whether a utility is investing appropriately or extracting value.

On the consumer protection side, it means understanding complaint volumes and characteristics, hardship-program participation and outcomes, disconnection patterns—including among households dependent on life-support equipment—the effectiveness of family violence protections, and the experiences of consumers in regional and remote communities.

In both dimensions, meaningful information rarely consists of a single metric. Rather, it emerges from the analysis and triangulation of multiple quantitative and qualitative data sources. Each resulting insight reduces a specific uncertainty about how the system is performing for the people we are charged with protecting.

4. The organisational capabilities required to make effective use of information

Building this capability within an organisation is more difficult than it may appear.

When I assumed my current role, there was a common assumption that regulatory judgement could rely primarily on accumulated experience, intuition, and observations from the field. Such judgement remains valuable, but it is insufficient on its own.

Without rigorous testing of whether a problem is current, emerging, or merely a legacy concern; without understanding its scope, impact, and affected groups; regulators risk directing resources toward ineffective interventions or overlooking issues that careful analysis of available data could have revealed much earlier.

The transformation we initiated at the Commission was not primarily about technology. It was about understanding regulation as a system and embedding the regulatory cycle into both our organisational structure and our daily work. Once we understood the cycle, we could identify the information required at each stage.

Technology and IT systems followed from that understanding and were largely developed and maintained in-house. Our greatest investment, however, was not technological. It was the effort required to establish common data definitions, validation procedures, time-series methodologies, and analytical standards through which raw data could be converted into actionable information. This process also initiated a broader cultural shift.

Alongside new tools, we introduced structural reforms. We organised regulatory functions into collaborative teams aligned with the different stages of the regulatory cycle, while maintaining deliberate institutional separation between them. These separations are not bureaucratic obstacles; they are safeguards.

Separating rule-setting from monitoring prevents regulators from changing the rules after implementation. Separating observation from judgement preserves confidence in the evidence base. Separating analysis from enforcement ensures that identifying a problem does not automatically trigger punishment. Building these capabilities has taken considerable time and remains an ongoing effort.

Changing how an organisation regulates is far more difficult than changing what it regulates. New rules can be drafted within months; new ways of working often take years.

When the cycle functions effectively, specialists focus on their respective responsibilities, generating information and passing it systematically to the next stage. Skills are deployed more efficiently, resources are targeted more deliberately, and consumer outcomes improve because the organisation becomes better at identifying risks, designing interventions, monitoring effectiveness, and responding proportionately.

5. The potential role of artificial intelligence

A brief word on artificial intelligence; no discussion of this topic would be complete without it.

The OECD has already done substantial work on AI governance, but I see AI not as a separate topic but as the next chapter in the same story. The fundamental question remains unchanged: how can we use information to reduce uncertainty in regulatory decision-making for the benefit of consumers?

Within that framework, I see at least four highly promising applications.

- First, large-scale document analysis and data extraction. Regulatory reviews often involve thousands of pages of submissions, price proposals, and expert reports. AI can help summarise and cross-reference these materials against regulatory tests, greatly increasing efficiency.
- Second, pattern detection in performance data. Machine learning models can identify anomalies and emerging trends that traditional rules-based monitoring may overlook.
- Third, analysis of unstructured consumer information, including complaint narratives, ombudsman records, and call-centre transcripts. The most significant systemic issues often lie beneath aggregated statistics and become visible only through deeper analysis of text.
- Fourth, and perhaps most significant for smaller jurisdictions, capability augmentation. AI can provide analytical capabilities that previously required entire teams, opening possibilities that regulators are only beginning to explore.

However, there is an important caveat.

AI must be treated as an analytical assistant, not as an author. The reasoning behind regulatory decisions represents institutional accountability. Those decisions, and the explanations that accompany them, must remain our own.

Judgement, the weighing of evidence, the choice of intervention, and the accountability owed to consumers and regulated entities are fundamentally human responsibilities. They are what confer legitimacy upon the regulatory state.

AI can enhance information, sharpen analysis, extend our capabilities, and accelerate our work. It cannot relieve us of the responsibility to think independently and to stand behind our decisions.

6. In conclusion

Data is indispensable. Without it, none of what I have described would be possible. Building a culture that treats data as an institutional asset, developing systems that identify and collect the right data, validating it rigorously, and analysing it effectively—none of this is trivial.

Yet data alone is not enough.

Our true task is to generate information: information that reduces uncertainty within a regulatory system that itself operates within broader economic, social, and political systems. Information that regulated entities can rely upon. Information that supports investment decisions. Information that ultimately benefits consumers, even though they will rarely be aware of the work behind it.

Indeed, successful economic regulation is often invisible. When water flows reliably, lights remain on, and the public trusts that costs and conduct are being appropriately monitored, the system is functioning as intended.

But that invisibility is not effortless. It results from disciplined institutions, collaborative structures, and people committed to making sound decisions. Ultimately, the challenge is not whether regulators can collect and validate data. It is whether they can accomplish the more difficult task of transforming data into information, information into judgement, and judgement into actions that protect the long-term interests of the people who depend on them—most of whom will never know our names.

Thank you, Adam. That was an excellent introduction to the subject. Incidentally, our seminar in October will focus specifically on artificial intelligence and how regulatory authorities can use AI to improve regulation.

Susana Rodrigues | Head of the Quality Department, Water and Waste Services Regulation Authority (ERSAR)

I would like to begin by thanking the OECD and Paris Dauphine University for the invitation and the opportunity to share the Portuguese experience. It is a pleasure to participate alongside such distinguished speakers.

Adam has already provided an excellent explanation of how data can be transformed into information for effective regulation. I will therefore focus on a practical example from Portugal.

1. Overview of the Quality-of-Service Regulatory Cycle

The use of data is becoming increasingly challenging as data volumes continue to grow, while meaningful impact is far from guaranteed.

Any quality-of-service assessment system must begin with two fundamental questions:

- **What do we want to evaluate?**
- **Where do we want improvement?**

When establishing a quality-of-service assessment system, the first task is therefore to define clear objectives. These objectives should be aligned with the legal framework and national strategic plans. Appropriate KPIs must then be selected to evaluate progress toward each objective and target.

In Portugal, the most recent revision of our framework reflected emerging challenges related to energy markets, climate change, resilience, water safety, and cybersecurity. Understanding the broader context in which the sector operates is essential.

The second phase involves designing the evaluation system. This requires clear reporting rules and precise definitions. In our case, all requirements are documented in a technical guide that establishes reporting standards, metrics, data definitions, indicators, and minimum reliability requirements. The guide applies uniformly to all operators regardless of ownership model, management structure, or size. Portugal has more than 250 water operators, and the framework must work consistently across all of them.

As sector challenges evolve, the framework is regularly updated through the introduction of new indicators or revised targets. The guide is available in English, and I have included the link in my presentation materials.

Our assessment framework, supported by an online platform, consists of four main components:

- Profile data, providing a general characterisation of each operator.
- Input data, with clearly defined codes, definitions, and information sources used to calculate KPIs.
- Key Performance Indicators, carefully selected and defined through transparent formulas.
- Reference values, which establish performance targets and can be progressively tightened over time to encourage continuous improvement.

Results are presented using a simple traffic-light system: green, yellow, or red. For example, for economic accessibility—a measure of affordability—a utility receives a positive evaluation when its result falls within the established target range.

The third phase is data collection.

Data validation and auditing are critical and highly time-consuming. All raw data submitted by utilities undergoes verification by ERSAR. The entire reporting process is managed through a national online information platform that links the regulator with all water utilities.

Although reporting remains based on uploaded Excel files, these files contain built-in validation rules and automatic error detection. If a mathematically impossible value is entered, the system immediately flags it. The platform records both the original data submitted by utilities and the regulator's validated data. The two values often differ, reflecting the regulator's review and verification process.

The fourth phase is indicator calculation.

While KPI calculations are largely automated, additional analysis and interpretation remain necessary. The resulting information supports systematic evaluations published in our annual reports. We produce national maps that visually display performance levels. For example, municipalities may be shown in green, yellow, or red depending on the quality of service they provide.

We also publish benchmarking graphs that rank operators and compare them with peers within similar geographic areas and service clusters. This allows us to identify top performers, operators above or below the national average, and those meeting or missing established targets. Each operator receives an individual performance report containing contextual information, current-year results, and a five-year performance history. This allows operators and stakeholders to see clearly whether performance is improving or deteriorating over time.

Naturally, no operator wants to appear in red.

The publication of these results generates considerable attention from both the media and the public, creating strong incentives for improvement. All information is publicly available through multiple channels, including our annual reports, our website, and a dedicated smartphone application. We also provide open-data files so that researchers, universities, and other stakeholders can conduct their own analyses.

ERSAR is currently undergoing a broader digital transformation. We are enhancing our IT platform and developing interactive dashboards and AI-based tools to support analysis and decision-making. These dashboards allow users to apply filters, explore specific metrics, and customise visualisations. Rather than relying on IT specialists or data analysts, users can access real-time information directly, adjust parameters, and retrieve the insights they need.

Users can interact with the dashboards in different ways. They may view high-level summary figures, examine the evolution of a specific KPI for an individual operator—such as non-revenue water—or compare the performance of multiple operators against a particular indicator.

Before discussing the KPIs themselves, let me briefly outline our annual regulatory timeline. The process follows clearly defined stages, rules, and deadlines.

The cycle begins in January with the publication of the updated technical guide. During March and April, utilities submit their data. From May to June, the regulator conducts validation and auditing. Between June and August, the data is processed and performance indicators are calculated.

In September, operators receive their individual performance reports and are given the opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. Finally, at the end of the year, the official results are published.

2. Key Performance Indicators for Utility Performance

The definition of KPIs is perhaps the most important challenge in implementing this type of regulatory framework. Although many objectives and dimensions may warrant attention, the system must remain as simple and focused as possible. KPIs should therefore be carefully prioritised and, above all, they must be useful to operators themselves. They need to become integrated into the utilities' own operational monitoring and management processes.

ERSAR's indicators are organised around three overarching objectives, divided into eight assessment criteria.

- The first group concerns service adequacy, focusing on the protection of users' interests.
- The second addresses service sustainability, focusing on the operator's long-term performance.
- The third evaluates environmental sustainability, taking into account the wider external impacts of service provision.

For water supply services, indicators are grouped according to these objectives. For example, service adequacy is measured through indicators such as coverage and affordability, while service quality is assessed through measures such as service interruptions and reliability.

Many wastewater indicators mirror those used for water supply, so I will not discuss them in detail today. What is important is that every KPI is rigorously defined within our technical guide. Each indicator includes a unique reference code, measurement units, objectives, formulas, data sources, performance thresholds, and explanatory notes.

Data reliability is equally important. Accurate KPI results depend entirely on reliable input data. Accordingly, we classify submitted information into three categories: highly reliable, reasonably reliable, and unreliable, according to criteria established in our technical guide. Poor-quality or incomplete data can compromise decision-making and weaken risk management. Robust data systems and transparent reliability standards are therefore indispensable for effective regulation.

3. Benchmarking Results and Their Impact on Water Service Performance

Turning to outcomes, the evidence demonstrates that this regulatory approach has had a positive impact on utility performance. The graphs presented show a clear improvement in overall service quality assessments, a higher rate of participation by operators, and significant improvements in data quality over time.

Looking at several critical indicators over a ten-year period, Portugal has achieved notable progress. Physical access to services increased by fifteen percentage points. Safe water provision improved substantially. Service connection rates rose, and water losses declined by twenty-one percentage points.

National benchmarking provides numerous advantages. It supports the establishment of strategic targets and policy objectives, enables monitoring of national progress, and facilitates reporting to the European Commission.

KPIs are also increasingly used as criteria for allocating European Union funding, creating a strong incentive for utilities to improve performance.

Benchmarking is therefore an exceptionally powerful regulatory tool. By creating a form of artificial competition in a naturally monopolistic sector, it encourages operators to improve their own performance and match or exceed that of their peers.

The Portuguese experience demonstrates how reliable and timely information can strengthen regulatory planning, monitoring, and enforcement while promoting transparency and public trust. Comparisons foster healthy competition. Consumers respond to information about prices and service quality, creating incentives for efficiency and better performance. This approach also improves environmental monitoring, supports consumer protection, enhances transparency throughout the sector, and enables the continuous oversight of public service obligations.

To conclude, **having data is very different from generating positive impact.** Effective regulation must be evidence-based, and data reliability is fundamental to improving transparency and service quality.

Such regulatory systems require digital tools and online platforms that connect regulators and utilities. Regulatory benchmarking is a continuous process with continuous opportunities for improvement. In sectors characterised by natural monopolies, it remains one of the most powerful tools available to water-service regulators.

Thank you for your attention.

Eric Brousseau | Scientific Director, Governance and Regulation Chair

Thank you very much, Susana. You are absolutely right that one of the regulator's essential functions is to create transparency within markets. This dimension was often overlooked in the past, when regulators were viewed primarily as enforcement bodies.

One of the pioneers of this transparency-oriented approach has undoubtedly been the French authority responsible for electronic communications, postal services, and press distribution, ARCEP. Nearly a decade ago, ARCEP began developing what it termed data-driven regulation. We are therefore delighted to welcome Édouard Daband, who will share some insights from this experience.

Edouard Daband | French Regulatory Authority for Electronic Communications, Postal Services and Press Distribution (ARCEP)

Thank you very much for the introduction and the invitation. I would like to discuss how information derived from data can empower users and indirectly transform markets, using the telecommunications sector as an example.

1. The framework behind our approach

To begin with a brief theoretical perspective, I would recommend two influential works for anyone interested in exploring the topic further: the White Paper “Regulation, the Internet Way: A Data-First Model for Establishing Trust, Safety and Security” by Nick Grossman, and Richard Thaler's work on Nudge Theory.

The central idea is straightforward: **by providing users with reliable, relevant, and accessible information, regulators can indirectly influence markets, encourage investment, and shape behaviour without relying exclusively on traditional regulatory intervention.**

This approach emerged because regulators now have access to unprecedented volumes of reliable data, making it possible to identify weak signals, detect systemic issues, and accelerate regulatory responses.

Data-driven regulation reflects what I would describe as a platform philosophy. It adopts a user-centred perspective, leverages network effects, and seeks to facilitate decision-making and action rather than directly controlling industry behaviour.

A user-centred approach means addressing the information needs of all stakeholders—consumers, local authorities, journalists, businesses, and others—even when some of those needs extend beyond the regulator's traditional remit.

Leveraging network effects means engaging a broad range of stakeholders, expanding data sources through partnerships, and creating a positive feedback loop. Data publication stimulates interest, encourages investment, generates demand for further information, and ultimately leads to the publication of even more useful data.

In this model, end users become active participants in regulation. The regulator's role is to facilitate informed decisions and actions.

This can be visualised as a data funnel. We begin with data collection from operators, field measurements, and crowdsourced sources. The data is then processed and published through observatories, interactive maps, and other public tools. Ultimately, this information influences the market indirectly by encouraging investment, stimulating public debate, and supporting data reuse.

2. Principal products and data solutions

Let me now turn to some concrete examples. We group our solutions into three categories:

- platforms for the general public,
- tools designed specifically for local authorities,
- and alerting platforms.

For the general public, one of our flagship products focuses on mobile connectivity. Through a single platform—essentially “My Mobile Network”—we provide mobile coverage maps based on operators’ simulations, supplemented by quality-assurance measurements, local testing campaigns, and crowdsourced data.

The platform also includes information on mobile antennas and comparative benchmarks for specific locations or regions. Since last year, it has also incorporated information from our alerting platform, allowing users to see the volume of connectivity-related complaints and reports directly on the map.

We have developed a similar platform for fixed internet connectivity. Through “My Internet Connection,” users can access address-level information on available technologies, connection speeds, county-level coverage rates, and fibre-to-the-home deployment status.

The platform currently receives approximately 10,000 visits per day.

For local authorities, we provide tailored versions of these tools that address their specific needs. These include semi-annual county-level mobile connectivity maps and interactive tools monitoring fibre deployment progress.

Our third category consists of alerting platforms. Unlike our other services, which communicate information from the regulator to the public, these platforms operate in the opposite direction. Consumers, associations, businesses, and other stakeholders can report issues directly to ARCEP.

Reports are submitted through multiple channels, including email, telephone, web forms, and postal correspondence. These submissions are analysed by dedicated teams and consolidated into a central platform. The data is processed using geographic information systems and AI-supported tools, although a human always remains involved in the process.

The objective is to strengthen regulation by identifying local problems, detecting emerging issues, and uncovering situations of potential non-compliance.

3. Key lessons from nearly a decade of data-driven regulation at ARCEP

Let me conclude with some lessons from our experience. The most important lesson is that **sharing data multiplies its value and impact**.

Most of our datasets are available as open data for researchers, journalists, public authorities, and citizens. To date, these resources have generated approximately 800,000 views and nearly 500,000 downloads.

As I mentioned earlier, we have also increasingly interconnected our alerting platforms with our other information services, creating additional opportunities to amplify the impact of the data we collect and publish.

Data sharing also allows us to enrich our datasets through partnerships. We integrate mobile network measurements collected by local authorities, crowdsourced speed-test data, and insights from other public administrations that operate similar alerting platforms, such as the DGCCRF. We regularly compare findings across these systems and use publicly available data wherever possible so that we can focus our efforts on our core mission within the telecommunications sector.

Internally, we have adapted our organisation through a horizontal workflow inspired by agile methodologies and supported by a federated governance model. This brings together infrastructure teams, a central data team, consumer protection units, and other operational departments.

Within this framework, the role of the central data team is to facilitate data-driven regulation across the authority. It establishes and coordinates workflows, promotes a data-oriented culture, and ensures consistency in the use of information. Most importantly, it safeguards our ability to collect and publish data. Without those powers, none of these initiatives would have been possible.

Eric Brousseau | Scientific Director, Governance and Regulation Chair

Thank you, Édouard. Your presentation provided a fascinating insight into how a regulatory authority can organise itself to collect, process, and distribute information to stakeholders, enabling them to challenge operators, influence policy discussions, and contribute to more effective regulation.

Regulators are not only institutions that promote transparency; they are also enforcement authorities. Our next speaker comes from the Lithuanian Construction Sector Development Agency. His work focuses on monitoring and enforcing compliance throughout the construction process.

Jaunius Krivickas | System Analyst, Construction Sector Development Agency (SSVA)

I would like to present Infostatyba, Lithuania's digital platform for construction permitting and enforcement. It is designed around a lifecycle approach to service delivery and the strategic use of data.

Traditionally, construction permitting has involved complex and highly bureaucratic procedures, requiring numerous approvals and interactions with multiple organisations. Our objective was to simplify and streamline these processes while making them more transparent.

The result is an integrated digital ecosystem through which users can obtain all required documentation in a single place. The platform covers the entire lifecycle of a building project—from planning to demolition. Users can obtain requirements and conditions from various authorities, including cultural heritage bodies and infrastructure owners. The same platform enables public consultation on project proposals, allowing stakeholders to submit comments and review the outcomes of public discussions.

All documentation is connected sequentially throughout the process, allowing previously submitted information to be reused at later stages. After consultation and review, officials assess projects and issue permits where appropriate. The platform also supports notifications of construction commencement, inspections during construction, and the issuance of completion certificates.

All sixty municipalities in Lithuania operate through this single system. There is no separate permitting platform elsewhere in the country. The figures displayed in my presentation illustrate the volume of permits issued this year across the various municipalities.

The platform is highly interoperable. It exchanges information in real time with the national land cadastre and other public registries, automatically notifying them when permits or other official documents are issued. Most data is publicly accessible, either directly or through APIs available to businesses and citizens. This enables companies to make more informed investment decisions and to better understand local development activity.

From a public perspective, users can view projects at different stages of completion through an interactive map. The map is continuously updated, allowing users to see what developments are taking place around a particular location. Businesses can use this information when evaluating opportunities and selecting sites for investment.

We also provide interactive dashboards that support both public transparency and evidence-based policymaking. These dashboards offer statistics on permit volumes, processing times, delays in permit issuance, construction activity by building type, and the number of application submissions typically required before a permit is granted. This information helps applicants plan more effectively.

The platform serves all major stakeholders: builders, businesses, individual citizens, architects, municipalities, inspectors, and certification authorities. Looking ahead, we aim to expand interoperability further and simplify applications by automatically importing data from public registries. This would reduce the burden on users and improve efficiency.

We are also developing automated compliance checks that compare application data against current safety regulations and zoning requirements. In addition, we are implementing three-dimensional verification tools that assess building models against spatial and landscape data.

Thank you for your attention.

Closing Remarks

18

Giuseppa Ottimofiore | Head of the Effective Regulatory Delivery Programme, OECD of Regulatory Policy, OECD Public Governance

Thank you, Eric. I will be brief, as we are already running slightly over time. First, I would like to thank all the speakers and participants. The discussion has been extremely valuable.

One of the most important themes emerging from today's presentations is that **data should be understood as part of a continuous regulatory cycle**. This point was emphasised repeatedly by Adam, Susana, and Jaunius.

Another key lesson is **the importance of starting with the right questions**. Why do we need data? What data do we require? Where will we obtain it? These may seem basic questions, but they are fundamental. The answers discussed today included improving understanding of risks, supporting better decision-making, evaluating service effectiveness and efficiency, and fostering continuous improvement.

Another recurring theme was **reducing information asymmetries and, ultimately, increasing trust**.

The survey results were also revealing. When asked what future workshop participants would most like us to organise, the overwhelming answer was the use of artificial intelligence by regulators to improve regulatory delivery. Conveniently, that is exactly the subject of our next webinar after the summer.

Thank you all for reminding us that data are tools. They are indispensable, but they are not sufficient on their own. Many additional elements are required to transform data into meaningful outcomes. On behalf of the OECD, thank you to Eric, Adam, Susana, Jaunius, and Édouard. We look forward to seeing you again soon.



Chaire Gouvernance et Régulation
Fondation Paris-Dauphine
Place du Maréchal de Lattre de Tassigny - 75016 Paris (France)
<https://chairgovreg.fondation-dauphine.fr/>