



## CISE<sup>1</sup> - Technical Advisory Group (TAG), meeting 14 of 16-17.01.2013

### Minutes

#### Participants

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

#### TAG members:/ substitutes

- Cosmo Forte (Maritime Safety...)
- Anders Bogelius (Fisheries Control)
- Giovanbattista Raimondi (Defence)
- Harri Ahonen (Border Control)
- Robert Light (Customs) <sup>(1)</sup>
- Manuela Manta (Customs)
- Erik Berglund (FRONTEX) <sup>(2)</sup>
- Sven Tahon (EFCA)
- Lawrence Sciberras (EMSA)
- Jari Hartikainen (EDA) <sup>(1)</sup>
- Markus Grönblad (MARSUNO)
- Bo Andersen (EUROPOL)
- Conor Shields (MAOC-N) <sup>(2)</sup>

#### Permanent Observers

- Francesco Vitti (EUMS)

#### Commission services

- Thomas Strasser (MARE)
- Isto Mattila (MARE)
- Isabelle Perret (MARE)
- Olivier Fontaine (MARE)
- Michele Avino (MOVE)
- Chrysanthi Giortsou (DIGIT)

#### Other participants to this TAG

- Virpi Nieminen (PWC)
- Joao Frade Rodrigues (PWC)
- Niels Van Hee (PWC)
- Kristian Billeskov Boving (Gartner)
- Rasmus Shermer (COWI)
- Peter G. Madsen (COWI)
- Malene Sand Jespersen (COWI)

Franco Oliveri (TAG Permanent Secretary)

<sup>(1)</sup> Attended the second day

<sup>(2)</sup> Attended the first day

#### Location

European Commission – Brussels - Belgium

#### Distribution of minutes

For review and approval by TAG Members

Approved meeting minutes are available to the general public.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 Cooperation Project and FP7 / POV**

DG MARE updated the TAG on the Cooperation Project underlining that the kick off meeting was very positive and the different WPs will soon convene for WP kick off meetings to which DG MARE and JRC will participate to provide support (WP2 – “Use cases and information services identification” - kick off will be on 30<sup>th</sup> – 31<sup>st</sup> January in Malmo).

DG MARE also informed the TAG that the proposals for the FP7 POV are currently under evaluation by a panel of external experts which is expected to finish the evaluation within a couple of weeks. The results will be communicated to the awarding committee in March. The decisions on how to proceed will be based on the outcome of the evaluation.

### **Agenda Item 2. Update LinkedData mini pilot**

DG MARE informed the TAG about the latest development regarding the start of the **mini pilot project** on linked data that is going to be carried out in the western Mediterranean area, involving Spanish armada and four EU agencies (EDA, EFCA, EMSA, FRONTEX); the replies from the potential participants are still on the way and the project is expected to start in February. The project aims at providing some preliminary information to the Cooperation Project regarding the use of the linked data technology to handle similar, but slightly different data, stored in different databases, in the maritime field.

### **Agenda Item 3. Presentation of architectural Vision**

DG MARE appreciated the effort of the members of the TAG to provide, in such a short time frame, their comments on the Visions for CISE (presented during the 13<sup>th</sup> TAG meeting) and underlined that it will also be necessary to refine the section of the document regarding the Requirements for CISE and invited everybody to provide comments and suggestions also on this part.

DG MARE clarified that the selection of the Visions will not be done by the TAG, but by the Member States. The TAG should verify the feasibility of each Vision; the work carried out by the TAG aims at providing the right tools to MSs to decide among the different Visions. For this reason, the SWOT analysis will be preliminarily discussed within the TAG.

The comments provided, over the past weeks, by the TAG have been categorized, ranking them for their “importance”, i.e. impact on the Visions. The comments have been organized in a table reporting also the name of the author and the proposed action. Only the “more important” comments have been presented and discussed during the TAG, although every comment will be addressed and managed.

To provide a qualitative feeling on the opinions expressed by TAG members with their feedback, the comments expressing a preference or a “dislike” regarding a specific Vision have been shown in a sort of “heat table” showing the “comfort zone” with reference to the different Visions, showing at this preliminary stage a certain level of appreciation for the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Visions (Vision 7 was not in the heat matrix because it has been presented at this TAG meeting for the first time, thus TAG members couldn't comment on it).

The TAG discussed the possibility that some Visions may not respect the “subsidiarity principle”, but it was clarified that all the Visions respect such principle, while it may be evaluated to which level they are in line with the “proportionality principle”, thus it was decided to introduce this criteria in the “SWOT analysis”.

*With reference to this point, DG MARE informed the TAG that the EU has already planned to allocate a large proportion of funding, related to CISE, at national level and MSs will be relatively free on the use of these funds. Approx. 75% of funding for CISE will be given to MS under so called 'Shared Management', while only 25% will remain with the EC for the design*

*and implementation of common services.*

With reference to the discussion on Vision 4 and its possible variants the TAG agreed to foresee only one “national” node for each MS, although some parties pointed out that the possibility to have more than one national node may ease the acceptance by some MS.

TAG also agreed to remove the notion of gateway in Vision 3 and to introduce the national “coordinator” to facilitate the service discovery/location in the nation; in this way, each Member State can have multiple sectorial nodes (reasonably, no more than 7). Member State should also have an authority in charge of that coordinator, and of the catalogue of services offered by the Member State.

Regarding the services provided in the CISE environment it has been agreed that “common services”, are not “central services”, they’re just services commonly agreed at EU level, it doesn’t matter where they will be located; it is also agreed that there should be a core set of services common to the entire EU maritime domain.

It has been pointed out that a refined and agreed definition of what services are, derived from the Users’ needs, is necessary and the different Visions should be verified against the possibility of satisfying the different services.

The TAG agreed on the importance that the selected Visions will be flexible enough to cater for the different services that can be envisaged, also in the future, because once CISE will be in place it should be evolving over an indefinite future.

The TAG discussed the need for a “national recognized maritime picture” and came to the conclusion that it may be useful to have it, but it is also important to consider that the situational awareness picture depends on the needs of each authority/community and such picture will be different for different types of users.

The new 7<sup>th</sup> Visions introducing interconnection at sector/user community level, requested during 13<sup>th</sup> TAG, was presented.

The TAG commented on the benefits and on the critical points of this Vision and such comments will be duly included in the SWOT analysis.

The TAG also discussed whether it is necessary to store data at the level of the national node and agreed that it will depend on the type of services provided by the national nodes and by their implementation. This point will be clearly indicated in the final document acknowledging that there may be the need to impose a limitation to the storage time of certain data in the national node to take into account legal issues.

#### **Agenda Item 4. Next steps on the Architecture Vision between mid Jan and the next MSEsG mid/end Feb**

DG MARE informed the TAG on the next steps for the Visions document:

- DG MARE will distribute a consolidated version of the excel spreadsheet with the comments and the new version of the Visions document by January, 18<sup>th</sup>
- TAG members are required to provide feedback within January, 25<sup>th</sup> on:
  - the slides related to Vision 7
  - the author’s position proposed in all comments received on the Architecture Vision document
  - the CISE requirements (section 4 of the Architecture Vision)
- The revised version of the Visions document, taking into account TAG’s comment will be finalized and sent to MSEsG representatives by February, 11<sup>th</sup>

These documents will be presented to MSEsG in February and it is expected that the real discussion will take place in the following MSEsG in April.

#### **Agenda Item 5. Presentation by COWI on the methodology to assess as-is, cost/risk levels/quantify effects of problem – way of using the use cases**

COWI is the contractor in charge of carrying out the Impact Assessment study who has already delivered a preliminary report.

COWI presented to the TAG its activity and its approach to discuss the methodology to be used also in view of the joint work with Cooperation Project WP3 (Cost-benefit analysis).

The presentation described the preliminary findings stressing the possible use of use cases to identify risk/opportunities, cost/benefits of the CISE.

COWI explained that the key question to be answered is: “can CISE allow making better surveillance?” To answer this question it is important to define what better surveillance is.

COWI clarified that in order to assess the benefit of CISE it is necessary to have a baseline and move from there to assess the added value; taking into account that although the cost impact assessment should take into account also social and environmental issues, the financial aspects are crucial because of the attention paid to them by MSs.

COWI presented the examples of risk/threats they are currently considering, and TAG members provided feedback explained the importance of considering the final impact of such risks

Some TAG members offered to supply statistical data on some of these aspects; COWI will follow up with bi-lateral interviews and urged each community to provide indicators to assess the improvements with the introduction of CISE.

The TAG underlined that the risks analysis should cover all the tasks of the seven different communities and that the “language” used to define the different risks should be in line with the commonly used terminology. COWI pledged to revise the wording within one week.

COWI presented a table to be used to associate, to each “risk”, a cost based on the impact, on the probability and on the actual cost, they will, now, do a preliminary completion of the fields with the contribution of the DG MARE and JRC experts and then the table will be further discussed with TAG members.

COWI clarified that, for the scope of the impact assessment, the contribution of TAG is vital because evidence is also the “motivated opinion of qualified experts”, not only hard statistics.

COWI explained that they will also need a further clarification of some aspects of the Use Cases that will then jointly used by COWI itself and by the WP3 of the Cooperation Project.

With reference to this subject, it has been recalled that it is the task of WP2 to refine and select the Use Cases to ensure a coherent overall outcome of the Cooperation Project.

It has been agreed that COWI will share with to the WP3 of the Cooperation Project the methodology for the cost-benefit analysis presented in the interim report, within January.

COWI delivered also a brief presentation on the preliminary findings related to legal issues and obstacles to information sharing within the sectors; TAG underlined that the key point is to carry out such analysis to the aspects related to the information sharing across sectors.

TAG members are invited to provide examples of difficult cross-sector information sharing to COWI to help the contractor both to focus on these specific aspects and to have a baseline to evaluate the value added potentially provided by CISE.

#### **Agenda Item 6. Presentation of final list of UC to be submitted to the cooperation project**

The TAG secretariat presented the final list of the Use Cases to be handed over to the Cooperation Project which includes the comments provided by the TAG members after the 13th TAG meeting.

13b	Inquiry on a specific suspicious vessel (cargo related)
13c	Inquiry on a specific suspicious vessel (crew and ownership related)
25b	Antipollution tasks: investigation (law enforcement)
37	Monitoring of all events happening at sea for intervention readiness
44	Request for any information confirming the identification, position and activity of a vessel of interest

57	Request for all available assets in a zone to plan an operation
70	Suspect Fishing vessel is cooperating with other type of vessels (m/v, Container vessel etc.)
85	Merchant vessel at sea (out of territorial water) report MAYDAY, unit is under piracy attack
93	Detection and behaviour monitoring of IUU listed vessels

TAG approved the list.

### Agenda Item 7. AOB

The next TAG /MSEG meetings will be as follows:

	<b>TAG</b>	<b>MSEG</b>
February	25 <sup>th</sup> - 26 <sup>th</sup>	26 <sup>th</sup> - 27 <sup>th</sup>
April	23 <sup>th</sup> - 24 <sup>th</sup>	24 <sup>th</sup> - 25 <sup>th</sup>
July	2 <sup>nd</sup> - 3 <sup>rd</sup>	3 <sup>rd</sup> - 4 <sup>th</sup>

### Next TAG meetings:

- **15<sup>th</sup> TAG meeting: February, 25<sup>th</sup> - 26<sup>th</sup>**
- **16<sup>th</sup> TAG meeting: April, 23<sup>th</sup> - 24<sup>th</sup>**
- **17<sup>th</sup> TAG meeting: July, 2<sup>nd</sup> - 3<sup>rd</sup>**

### **Actions summary**

#### *Actions:*

*TAG members to provide comments on the present release of the Vision document within January, 25<sup>th</sup> [TAG members can share the present document with experts in the MSs, but it is important that MS are aware that this is a working document and there will be future releases].*

*DG MARE to incorporate the comments in a new release of the Vision document by February, 11<sup>th</sup> and send it to TAG and MSEG*

*While the Cooperation project WP2 is in charge of selecting and refining relevant Use cases for all WPs, DG MARE, JRC and COWI may assist wherever needed.*

*COWI to share the methodology for cost-benefit analysis with Cooperation Project WP3 within the end of January.*

ANNEX 1 TAG Composition 01-01-2013

Technical Advisory Group (TAG) members		
	Members	Substitutes
<b>Co-Chairs</b>		
GMINDER Beate		
ZAMPIERI Alessandra		
<b>Secretary</b>		
OLIVERI Franco		
<b>User Communities</b>		
Maritime safety, security and prevention of pollution caused by ships	CARLONE Nicola	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
<b>Agencies</b>		
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
<b>Pilot projects</b>		
BLUEMASSMED	LERAY Etienne	Ad hoc WG Leader
MARSUNO	GRONBLAD Markus	
COOPERATION PROJECT	SIKALUOMA Ismo	
<b>Other TAG participants (observers)</b>		
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 14 - AGENDA**

**16 - 17 JANUARY 2013**

Venue: Brussels, Belgium (DG MARE)

**16 January 2013** (DG Mare ground floor room J99 00/53)

14:00 Welcome

*Agenda approval*

*Update on Cooperation Project and FP7 / POV - (DG MARE)*

*Update LinkedData mini pilot*

*Presentation of architectural Vision*

*Review of comments on architecture visions + elaboration of visions*

18:00 End

**17 January 2013** (DG Mare ground floor room J99 00/53)

09:00 Start of the meeting

*Continuation of the discussion on the visions*

*Next steps on the Architecture Vision between mid Jan and the next MSEsG mid/end Feb*

*Presentation by Cowi on methodology to assess as-is cost/risk levels/quantify effects of problem – way of using the use cases*

*Presentation of final list of UC to be submitted to the cooperation project (JRC)*

*AOB*

15:00 End of meeting