



Brussels,

MARE MSEG-SURVEILLANCE 8

**Eight meeting of the Commission's Member State Expert subGroup (MSEsG) on the integration of maritime surveillance of 4<sup>th</sup> September 2012**

**Meeting Report**

This meeting was also attended by TAG members and Commission services as observers.

**Technical pre-study:**

Deloitte presented its draft final results. See PPT on maritime forum at: <https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/maritimeforum/>

The final report will be made available to MS on the Maritime Forum. This report will include the list of open technical points to be investigated as presented during the meeting. Such list will be scrutinized with a view to take the relevant actions.

MS welcomed the sketching of high-level options as useful basis for further reflections. However, PT and NL underlined that this could only be an initial reflections that needs to be deepened and made more accurate.

IT indicated that systems normally carry out 'operational' tasks whereas CISE will simply 'channel' information. The question is how to combine both - which are the data to be channeled between systems via CISE and how to achieve proper transmission?

The 'concrete' technological aspects can be solved relatively easily. It is rather the 'psychological' element still separating user communities that needs to be overcome. (PT, UK)

The Commission recalled the example of 'MARSUNO' and 'Bluemassmed' demonstrating significant progress made both as regards the 'concrete technological' and in particular the 'psychological' aspects when MS work together on concrete tasks. The following Cooperation and FP7 projects are expected to provide similar progress. Furthermore, MSEsG meeting participants have a key role to play as messengers between capitals and the EU level with a view to make progress on both above mentioned aspects.

Most data are not gathered free of cost and may not be channeled free of charge through CISE. The question of cost sharing needs to be addressed. (EMSA)

Portugal recalled that the space and environmental communities need to be involved much more into the CISE initiative as they are closely linked to it. Due to such close link, the environmental part of the EMFF budget may be partially used in the contexts of IMS/CISE.

The Commission recalled that the Marine Knowledge initiative is connected to IMS/CISE and that indeed enforcing the respect of environmental legislation at sea is a matter for maritime authorities. CISE will also help these authorities to be more efficient and cost effective in the future.

#### **Dutch / German discussion paper:**

The Netherlands presented their discussion paper which was sent to MSEsG in advance.

Portugal stressed that the need for an interactive approach between user communities becomes ever more apparent. A cyber oriented approach for CISE is good. It however also needs to be considered that, even though CISE is for the time being restricted to EU/EEA authorities, other parts of the world may not be able to live up to such an approach. This becomes significant if considering that certain safety and security aspects are to be dealt with in cooperation with partners around the global. Further, the Commission should make sure to keep up the political momentum on the IMS/CISE initiative.

Spain indicated that the NL-D proposal would lead to a centralized CISE architecture. This is however not what BluemassMed is likely to conclude. Such early conclusion, as presently proposed by the Netherlands and Germany, would be anyhow premature as the cooperation project first needs to clarify a number of other aspects before a conclusion on the architecture can be drawn.

Italy recalled that the Commission progressed a lot in steering the IMS/CISE initiative since a few years. 'MARSUNO' being finalised and the results of 'BluemassMed' being expected soon it is clear that future work needs to be based on such collaborative projects involving MS and all user communities. The planned cooperation and FP7 projects fulfill just such purpose.

Belgium can agree on most points of the NL-D paper but indicated that it would nevertheless be too early to engage into a detailed definition of the CISE architecture at the present stage.

Poland can align to the NL-D paper.

France pointed towards the interesting content of the NL-D paper.

The Commission thanked the Netherlands and Germany for their input underlining the usefulness of the NL-D discussion paper. The Commission however also recalled that for subsidiarity reasons it can only steer the IMS initiative at EU wide level. MS may nevertheless have an interest to act at national and regional level to prepare for the development of CISE. Further, going too fast on deciding technical options would be counterproductive as long as relevant background still needs to be elaborated amongst

others by building on results from MARSUNO, BluemassMed and TAG. Such background is planned to be elaborated during the forthcoming 'cooperation' and 'FP7' projects where MS will i.a. decide what information the 7 respective user communities should exchange and how the exchange is to be organised. The outcome will help elaborating the technical CISE architecture. As a result of this work, the Commission's 'White Paper' scheduled for end 2013 will take up options for the EU institutions to act upon.

### **Presentation of the Cooperation project:**

The Commission presented the Cooperation project's main features. It stressed that only one offer can be selected. The resulting need for a single offer gathering as many MS and user communities as possible is thus obvious. Ideally the same group of Member States would submit an offer respectively for both the 'cooperation' and the following 'FP7' project calls.

Finland informed that it is preparing to submit an offer as lead partner for the cooperation project. Together with the French SG Mer it is organising a preparatory meeting in Paris on 5 September 2012 inviting all interesting MS to participate.

Italy stressed the importance of having the same partners in both the cooperation and the FP7 projects. It also underlined that after defining use cases the cooperation project will start with the work related to IT semantic standardisation that will however not be finalized during the projects and should be carried out further on thereafter. In this context it will be important to consider that transmitting certain civilian data to law enforcement and military authorities may be delicate.

Portugal underlined that it will be maritime surveillance bodies that will enforce at sea all the various environmental rules derived from the Maritime Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD). It is thus essential that the Environmental user community participates more actively in IMS/CISE preparatory work and that the role of CISE in enforcing the MSFD be fully taken on board when assessing the economic impact of CISE.

EFCA indicated that exchanging information across sectors and borders through CISE will require a legal basis.

A TAG member representing defence asked if the cooperation project would be dealing with governance aspects of CISE.

The Commission indicated that the cooperation project is meant to solve the question of 'what' information to share and to define the modalities of 'how' to share it. The Technical Advisory Group ('TAG') will start preparing such work during 2012 and will actively follow the work of the cooperation project. TAG will remain of assistance after 2012 during the further process to building up CISE, in particular in the context of further developing information flows and the technical modalities for sharing them. This work will be started during the cooperation project but will certainly have to continue thereafter. Governance questions will have to be addressed in parallel.

### **Presentation of the FP7 project by DG Entr:**

After presenting the FP7 project and being questioned by the Netherlands, DG Entr indicated that the Commission is responsible for the evaluation of the project and will nominate an independent panel of experts that will assess three main criteria: i) the technical level of the project, ii) the level of experts involved and iii) its usefulness/impact. The budget will be of about 9 Mio €.

France expressed its intention to lead the project and reiterated its invitation to the preparatory meeting organised together with Finland to be held in Paris on 5.9.2012.

Italy indicated that it is willing to lead the project as well and to work with all potential participants in the project and is in touch with the French SG Mer on the matter.

The United Kingdom indicated that the interoperability aspects related to CISE should be considered as solved; work should thus focus on the 'psychological' aspects behind IMS/CISE.

The Commission indicated that while the cooperation project mainly focusses on developing EU wide and theoretical aspects of CISE, the FP7 project has a more practical, industrial and national focus. In any case, as 'MARSUNO' and 'BluemassMed' have shown, Member States address best the 'psychological' aspects while working together on concrete projects. The calls for the forthcoming 'cooperation' and 'FP7' projects have been designed in the same spirit.

### **Presentation of Eurosur by DG Home:**

After presenting Eurosur and being questioned by the United Kingdom, DG Home indicated that it is difficult to define the borderline between internal and external security as this is a political issue. Anyhow, at the outer limit of the pre-frontier intelligence picture close cooperation between civilian and military authorities as well as with neighboring non EU countries is a necessity.

Portugal indicated that even if one defines borderlines, the main question is to properly manage those. As regards how to best do this, the necessity of physically merging agencies to improve such management however remains questionable as IT connections may as well suffice to ensure proper cooperation.

DG Home indicated in this respect that there is no obligation to physically merge the National Coordinations Centres (NCC) even though the positive effects of the human factor should not be underestimated as people communicate better when they physically meet on a regular bases in the same premises.

Italy asked which part of Eurosur's operationally processed information may be shared through CISE. DG Home indicated that there is a long list of information mentioned in the Eurosur Regulation that is meant to be shared across sectors and MS via CISE.

The Commission underlined the need in particular for the cooperation project and any CISE related work to take into account those Eurosur requirements.

**Presentation of the 'Bluefin Tuna' (pre-CISE) project by EMSA and EFCA:**

The project gathering EFCA, EMSA and Frontex essentially allowed EFCA to compare AIS and VMS data of fishing vessels on a 'single' IT screen. Where such 'simple' comparison leads to a mismatch there may be illegal fisheries going on. By that means the detection rate could be significantly increased and legal pursuits engaged in a more efficient and cost effective manner. The project may be considered as a 'micro CISE' as it allows integrating data from different sectors on one operational 'screen' while pointing towards economic added value. Indeed, certain investigations so far requiring several hours of work by a single fisheries control inspector could now be done in a second by 'mouse click'. This indeed points towards the potentials of CISE towards significantly enhancing maritime surveillance authorities' efficiency and cost effectiveness when data are properly shared and integrated in the different systems. Thus, with given resources maritime authorities may achieve more results once CISE is in place.

**AOB:**

France informed about the second Mediterranean Coast Guard Forum to be held in Marseille from 17-19 September 2012, which follows a first such meeting in Italy in 2009. The meeting will gather Mediterranean and non-Mediterranean Coastal States to discuss topics such as big ships, navigational security, maritime surveillance and risk management. More information is available on the following website:

[www.medcgff.sgmer.gouv.fr](http://www.medcgff.sgmer.gouv.fr)

Spain pointed towards the third Mediterranean Coast Guard Forum to be held in Spain in 2013.

**Conclusion:**

If another meeting of the MSEsG will be necessary in 2012, it will be towards end of November 2012. Until then MS are invited to stay in touch with each other in view to submit offers for the Cooperation project (deadline on 19 October 2012) and the FP7 project (deadline on 22 November).



Beate GMINDER  
Head of Unit

Cc.: MSEsG members, Mrs. L. Evans, Directors DG Mare, Mrs. V. Lainé, Mrs V. Veits, Mr H. Siemers, Mr M. King, TAG members, ISsG members, Mare D-1 IMS team

PS.: These minutes and other documents related to MSEsG meetings are available on DG Mare's Maritime Forum under the following IT address:  
<https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/maritimeforum/>

All concerned representatives from relevant EU/EEA public authorities are kindly invited to register and consult the maritime forum.