



CISE¹ - Technical Advisory Group (TAG), meeting 15 of 25-26.02.2013

Minutes

Participants

- Beate Gminder (chair)
- Alessandra Zampieri (chair)

TAG members:/ substitutes

- Giuseppe Aulicino (Maritime Safety...)
- Cosmo Forte (Maritime Safety...)
- Leon Bouts (Fisheries Control)
- Giovanbattista Raimondi (Defence)
- Pasi Staff (Defence)
- Harri Ahonen (Border Control)
- Robert Light (Customs)
- Manuela Manta (Customs)
- Lukas Vytautas (FRONTEX)
- Sven Tahon (EFCA)
- Leendert Bal (EMSA)
- Yann Briand (EDA)
- Markus Grönblad (MARSUNO)
- Etienne Leray (BMM)
- Elomaa Kimmo (Coop Proj)

Permanent Observers

- Francesco Vitti (EUMS)
- Patricia Romeyro (EUSC)

Cooperation Project

- Fernando Dias Marquez
- Carolina Matarazzi

Commission services

- Thomas Strasser (MARE)
- Isto Mattila (MARE)
- Isabelle Perret (MARE)
- Olivier Fontaine (MARE)
- Staffan Ekwall (MARE)
- David Berger (JRC)
- Michele Avino (MOVE)
- Jukka Savo (MOVE)
- Rui Meneses (ENTR)

Other participants to this TAG

- Emanuele Misiano (GdF)
- Virpi Nieminen (PWC)
- Joao Frade Rodrigues (PWC)
- Sandra Berman (Gartner)
- Karsten Bjerring Olsen (COWI)
- Rasmus Shermer (COWI)
- Peter G. Madsen (COWI)
- Malene Sand Jespersen (COWI)

Franco Oliveri (TAG Permanent Secretary)

Location

European Commission – Brussels - Belgium

Distribution of minutes

For review and approval by TAG Members

Approved meeting minutes are available to the general public.

¹ Common Information Sharing Environment (CISE) for the surveillance of the EU maritime domain.

Welcome by the Chairs.

Welcome from the chairs.

The proposed agenda (Annex 2) was approved.

Agenda Item 1. Update on and FP7 / POV and LinkedData mini pilot

DG MARE informed the TAG that there is still no update on the FP7 POV.

The mini Pilot is starting even if some issues related to the availability of certain data are still to be solved.

Agenda Item 2. Update on Cooperation Project

The TAG was informed that the Cooperation Projects' work is progressing on schedule. Some Work Packages have decided to anticipate their kick off meetings to speed up the work. WP1 (Project management) and WP2 (Use cases and information services identification) have already held their kick off meetings.

WP3 (Cost/benefit analysis) and WP4 (Access Rights) will start next week; the methodology for the work of WP3 is ready to be presented in the kick-off meeting.

WP5 (Data Model/Semantic) has almost finalized the work plan and the guidelines; the kick off meeting will be held towards the end of March.

Agenda Item 3. CISE Impact Assessment: get it together - Discussion on coordination Cooperation Project / TAG / Impact Assessment

DG MARE presented an overview of the progresses of CISE. It was explained how the different on-going studies will contribute to the white paper and which will be the steps leading to CISE 2020.

It was underlined the importance of avoiding the overlap of the Cooperation Project and the FP7 POV in order to allow the latter to take in due consideration the outcome of the first one.

The TAG reflected upon the reasonable timeframe to consider to correctly evaluating the benefits of CISE.

It was mentioned that a Finnish equivalent of CISE (at national level) has proven to generate a cost benefit of 38 M€ over 7 years.

Agenda Item 4. Presentation of final version of architectural options for MSEsG

DG MARE presented the new release of the "Vision document", which has been drafted taking into account the comments of the members of the TAG and the need to limit the total number of visions as well as of having a baseline (CORE) that includes the minimum set of building blocks required to satisfy the most basic requirements of CISE.

Core - Multiple Providers of CISE Services at National level (+ EU initiatives)

The CISE Core is not a vision like the others as it is included to show CISE's minimum viable architecture. Therefore it does not prescribe a governance model. The building blocks in the CISE Core are also present in all other visions, because they are required for CISE to fulfil its most essential requirements.

Vision A - Multiple Providers of CISE Services Coordinated by User Communities (+ EU initiatives)

This vision proposes a governance model centred on User Communities. Ideally each User Community should have a single service provider at national level and one or more EU led initiatives. Consequently, the integrated maritime awareness pictures are User Community oriented.

Vision B - Multiple Providers of CISE Services Coordinated by Member States (+ EU initiatives)

This vision proposes a governance model where each Member State appoints an authority to

manage which CISE services are delivered. Unlike vision C, each Member State has one or more service providers of CISE services. CISE services are also to be provided by EU led initiatives. As in the Vision A, several integrated maritime awareness pictures coexist, but they are no longer divided in User Communities.

Vision C - Single National Providers of CISE Services (+ EU initiatives)

This vision proposes a governance model where each Member State appoints an authority to manage which CISE services are delivered. Unlike vision B, each Member State has a single service provider of CISE services. CISE services can also be provided by EU led initiatives. Unlike visions A and B, a single integrated maritime awareness picture can be offered per Member State. Sea basin authorities can also be set up to provide sea basin level services (variant of vision C).

With reference to “Vision A”, it was underlined that not all the sectors have the same level of “cooperation” as it appears needed for the correct implementation of such vision.

With reference to the integrated maritime awareness picture, it was again stated that it is different from community to community, thus to have different pictures should not be considered a weakness.

Some parties underlined the importance of having a cross-sector cooperation at national to filter the information at national level thus avoiding the delivery of contradicting data.

It has also been explained the need of delivering benefits both at national level and at sectoral level.

With reference to the definition of common fusion rules it has been pointed out that the fusion process cannot be completely automated and that the architecture should allow the possibility of having different pictures.

It was also requested, in the definition of the architectural vision to avoid solution that could cause conflicts between user communities and MSs.

EDA representative requested to correct a wrong reference to EDA in the Visions document.

DG MOVE thanked DG MARE and DIGIT for the effort made in drafting the new Vision document which is a completely new document compared with the previous version. MOVE reminded the need to take into account the existing systems and initiatives like the implementation of the single window under the Reporting Formalities Directive as a baseline to build CISE in order to avoid duplication. DG MOVE also reminded about the importance to take into consideration, when approaching the vision of CISE, the legal obstacles and implications, particularly as concern to the multiple legal basis.

Co-chairs reminded that it has always been the intention to design CISE taking into account existing systems.

DG MARE described the next steps in the process of refining the Visions document: after the presentation to MSEsG, 4 weeks will be allocated to allow MSEsG to provide comments, then the comments will be consolidated within 2 weeks and on April 12th the revised document will be sent to MSEsG and TAG members and the major comments will be discussed in the following TAG/MSEsG meeting.

Agenda Item 5. Presentation of Single Window – (DG MOVE)

DG MOVE presented the on-going initiative on the Single Window for reporting formalities explaining that data related to reporting formalities are very well defined.

It was stated that the raw data provided by the “ship” represent just the starting point, the value added part of the work starts afterwards by further sharing and using such data and there CISE can play a role, because what goes beyond the single window directive, in term of cross community data exchange, will have to be managed by the CISE, but it should not be forgotten the importance of having the “right” to share the data which are needed.

It is clear that the spirit of CISE is to foster cross sectoral exchange; Single Window is a large building block for CISE, but CISE will go beyond this. CISE aims at achieving interoperability

through open standards, rather than through applications.

The TAG underlined that in the definition of CISE it shall be paid due attention to take into account the existing systems and to avoid duplication.

The TAG also underlined that the existing system are good and they can be a good starting point, but they're mostly "self-reporting systems" (sectorial focus) and there are many situation where this not sufficient.

DG MOVE explained that the implementation of the single window directive requires harmonizing the collection and exchange of information; which in turn requires the standardization of the interface towards the data providers, as well as the exchange of messages between the users and the systems. It was clarified that the applications currently under development are not within the directive and are meant to support the work.

It was requested to convey to DG MOVE the request of cooperation put forward by the Cooperation Project and the TAG.

Agenda Item 6. GMES Presentation – Discussion

DG ENTR delivered a presentation on GMES (Copernicus)

The Copernicus team is interested on how they could extend the cooperation, in the definition of GMES related services, which they already have in other areas (e.g. Border Surveillance) to the Maritime Surveillance.

TAG members are requested to help the GMES team to liaise with the experts in the different communities to get to work together to prepare a document justifying the development of services within GMES for maritime surveillance.

Agenda Item 7. Presentation by COWI – Joint methodology for WP3

The consultant (COWI) in charge of the Impact Assessment study presented the status of the study as well as the draft methodology that will also be used by the WP3 of the Cooperation Project.

With reference to the Impact Assessment study it was again underlined the importance of establishing a reliable baseline as well as the difficulties to get reliable data; furthermore it is also important to consider that the Impact assessment board usually analyses carefully the process followed in assessing the impact, which therefore must be duly specified and followed. It is crucial to correctly define the problem and the baseline, which is used to measure the benefits provided by CISE. It is important that there are no mistakes in the baseline because this will destroy everything that has been built on it.

It has been agreed to focus the analysis of benefits directly referring to the objectives of the initiatives and to avoid taking into account secondary benefits

The consultant requested comments, on the methodology, from the TAG possibly before the kick-off meeting of WP3 (next week in Roma).

Agenda Item 7. AOB

The next TAG /MSEG meetings will be as follows:

	TAG	MSEG
April	23 th - 24 th tbc	24 th – 25 th tbc
July	2 nd - 3 rd	3 rd - 4 th

The TAG was informed that the JRC will use a new procedure for recruiting non-permanent staff through CAST.

Next TAG meetings:

- **16th TAG meeting: April, 23th - 24th** (to be confirmed)
- **17th TAG meeting: July, 2nd - 3rd**

**Actions
summary**

Actions:

TAG members are requested to help the GMES team to liaise with the experts in the different communities.

ANNEX 1 TAG Composition 01-01-2013

Technical Advisory Group (TAG) members		
	Members	Substitutes
Co-Chairs		
GMINDER Beate		
ZAMPIERI Alessandra		
Secretary		
OLIVERI Franco		
User Communities		
Maritime safety, security and prevention of pollution caused by ships	AULICINO Giuseppe	FORTE Cosmo
Fisheries control	BOGELIUS Anders	BOUTS Leon
Marine pollution preparedness and response, Marine environment	GAGO PINEIRO José Manuel	DONNAY Eric
Customs		LIGHT Robert
Border Control	LOBO Eduardo	AHONEN Harri
General law enforcement	SHIELDS Conor	
Defence	STAFF Pasi	RAIMONDI Giovanbattista
Agencies		
EFCA	COMBY Béatrice	TAHON Sven
EDA	GIRARD Eric	HARTIKAINEN Jari
EEA	SCHUREN Eugenija	
EMSA	BAL Leendert	SCIBERRAS Lawrence
EUROPOL	ANDERSEN Bo	REITSMA Gjalt
FRONTEX	BERGLUND Erik	LUKAS Vytautas
Pilot projects		
BLUEMASSMED	LERAY Etienne	Ad hoc WG Leader
MARSUNO	GRONBLAD Markus	
COOPERATION PROJECT	ELOMAA Kimmo	Deputy Project Manager
Other TAG participants (observers)		
EU Military Staff – VITTI Francesco EUSC – ROMEYRO Patricia EC InterService Group on IMS – maximum 2 people per DG/Service		



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE

Institute for the Protection and Security of the Citizen (Ispra)
Maritime affairs

TECHNICAL ADVISORY GROUP - TAG

TAG MEETING 15 - AGENDA

25 - 26 FEBRUARY 2013

Venue: Brussels, Belgium (DG MARE)

25 February 2013 (DG Mare ground floor room J99 00/53)

14:00 Welcome

Agenda approval

Update on FP7 / POV - LinkedData mini pilot - (DG MARE)

Update on Cooperation Project

CISE Impact Assessment: get it together - (DG MARE)

Discussion on coordination Cooperation Project / TAG / Impact Assessment

Presentation of final version of architectural options for MSEsG

26 February 2013 (Albert Borschette – Salle AB -2D)

09:00 Start of the meeting

Presentation of Single Window – (DG MOVE)

GMES Presentation – Discussion

Presentation by Cowi – Joint methodology for WP3

AOB

13:00 End of meeting