EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR MARITIME AFFAIRS AND FISHERIES

MEDITERRANEAN AND BLACK SEA

Brussels,

MARE MSEG-SURVEILLANCE 10

Tenth meeting of the Commission's Member State Expert subGroup (MSEsG) on the integration of maritime surveillance of 25 April 2013.

Meeting Report

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

Update on FP7- POV: DG MARE recalled that the two Pre Operational Validation 'POV' project proposals submitted to DG ENTR for co-financing under the FP7 research fund are on the reserve list. A decision as regards co-financing of proposals under the FP7 research fund should be taken on 25th May 2013 by the programming committee of Member States. Italy, France and Finland (the latter as leader of the CISE Cooperation Project 'CoopP') stressed the importance of such project for the realisation of CISE and asked other Member States and DG MARE to provide the necessary political support for a positive to co-finance both projects.

Recalling basic CISE principles: A short overview was given to recall the basic principles underlying CISE. These principles have been agreed in the 2009 and 2010 Commission Communications, confirmed in various Council Conclusions up to 2012 and confirmed in practice by both the BluemassMed and the MARSUNO pilot project involving 15 Member States and about 60 public authorities. These fundamental CISE principles essentially provide for the following: i.) CISE should interlink existing and planned systems following a de-centralised, non-hierarchical and cost-efficient approach; ii.) CISE should be constituted by a flexible technical framework for interoperability and future integration while making best use of existing systems and avoiding duplications; iii.) CISE should allow for information exchange between civilian and military authorities and iv.) the necessary specific legal provisions need to be adopted to put CISE in place. On Finland's question whether the evolution of sectorial systems since 2009 has been taken into account, DG MARE recalled that the ongoing Impact assessment work should take the evolution of existing systems into account (evolution of the baseline scenario). DG MARE also recalled that while technical achievements of sectorial systems should constitute CISE building blocks, CISE is foremost a political project that wants to foster cross-sectorial cooperation.

**Member States' comments on the CISE architectural Visions and on whether SafeSeaNet should be the core of CISE:** After DG MARE presented the written comments received by Member States on the CISE Visions, Member States were given the opportunity to re-express and explain their comments:

1. _**Belgium**_ indicated a preference for Vision B and indicated that SafeSeaNet should be chosen as core in the case a backbone system for CISE would be required.
2. _**Germany**_ indicated a preference for Vision B, as Member States should remain the highest coordination instance within CISE. Nevertheless, multiple service providers from all sectors and Member States (i.a. existing systems) would carry on with their own tasks.
3. _**Norway**_ indicated that a definite answer would be premature at that stage but that the Barent's Watch project approach would suggest that Vision C should not be excluded without necessarily aiming for it at this stage. It would not be optimal to use SafeSeaNet as the core of CISE as the latter should not be based on a system but rather interlink systems such as Eurosur and Marsur and as SafeSeaNet would probably not be a best platform to include appropriate information layers as requested within CISE.
4. _**Greece**_ indicated that Vision A should be implemented immediately with a possible future upgrading towards vision C to achieve proper integration of maritime surveillance by 2020. Best use should be made of existing and planned systems, tools and technologies in different user communities, including upcoming ones such as Eurosur, Marsur and the revision of the VTMIS directive. Greece asked whether existing systems will continue to function as today and whether vision C will suppress direct contacts between user communities.
5. _**Spain**_ supported Norway's position while indicating that the results of the FP7-POV would provide interesting results that should be taken into account as well as the Marsur initiative and the cost study results. Spain asked when this cost study would be available. Spain also indicated that legal requirements of existing systems such as defence and transport need to be taken into account.
6. _**France**_ indicated that the core Vision would leave room for flexibility but will probably increase the cost of CISE; it would not oppose Vision A but has a strong need to maintain public power information ('pouvoir régalien') within national borders; it would be favorable to Visions B and C as they may respect national choices of organisation (leaving freedom for Member States' internal organisation should be a baseline); it would not be in favor of Vision C+ as this would hamper the single French view over various sea basins of interest to France. A single sea basin structure only exists in the Baltic which can however not be transposed to other sea basins. France also indicated that CISE should not be limited to EU waters and further indicated that SafeSeaNet does not seem to be adequate for the exchange of law enforcement, security, justice and defence related data. France further indicated that work related to the evolution of transport systems and in particular SafeSeaNet should be shared in full transparency with all relevant user communities in the context of CISE works with a view to ensure the appropriate efficiency across the various surveillance approaches.
7. _**Italy**_ indicated that CISE is very important with a view to increase the efficiency and cost effectiveness of maritime surveillance. This can be explained by the particular geopolitical situation faced by Italy. In the south of the Mediterranean there are crisis situations, only to mention the intervention in Lybia under UN mandate. The Balcans having been a sensitive area, the Adriatic Ionian initiative is a positive tool with a view to establish stabilizing partnerships. On the background of this context Italy recalled the importance of the Council having emphasized the need for further

civilian-military cooperation as the EU needs all legal, technical and other capacities including from competent agencies to make the seas a safe area. Italy confirmed that IMS and in particular CISE can thus not be based on the systems of one particular sector.

8. *Latvia* indicated to support CISE in general and would in particular favor Vision B. While Latvia already uses the transport related Single Window, most maritime surveillance systems in the country are owned by the ministry of defence.

9. *Lithuania* indicated to be in favor of Vision C as a result of ongoing discussions involving all sectors.

10. *Malta* indicated to support Visions C and C+. Malta further called for CISE to be directly based upon Vision C as it would be too expensive to aim for Visions A or B as intermediary steps towards Vision C.

11. *The Netherlands* indicated to be fully in support of CISE but would prefer availing of cost indications before giving a preference on a Vision. Nevertheless, The Netherlands would be favorable to Vision A as a starting point.

12. *Poland* indicated that it would need cost indications before giving a preference. The Vision with the lowest cost would be envisaged. Poland further indicated that SafeSeaNet may constitute the core of CISE.

13. *Romania* indicated to support vision C as it supports an intergovernmental structure.

14. *Finland* indicated to support Norway's and Malta's approach towards Vision C as this allows integrating all sectors, including defence, in a decentralised and sector neutral manner via a single national node. Finland also reiterated its support to the basic CISE principles as recalled at the beginning of the meeting (see above). Finland further indicated that as visions B and C anyhow include the principles of Vision A, Finland can support a mix of Visions A, B and C. Finland further recalled that existing systems such as the transport related Single Window should serve as useful building blocks for CISE. Finland further asked whether CISE constitutes a system.

15. *The United Kingdom* indicated that it needs more information, such as the results of the impact assessment, to choose between Visions and would therefore signal a preference towards the Core Vision for the time being. The UK further indicated that CISE should not be constituted by one system but shall interlink existing ones.

16. *Bulgaria* indicated to fully support CISE. As Bulgaria would need further indications as regards cost, it may not commit to any particular Vision but may still indicate that Visions B and C are being considered for potential preference.

DG MARE thanked Member States for their comments, commitment and work involved in preparing the above positions that re-confirm strong support for CISE and its fundamental principles. It also indicated that there is no need to make a firm choice on the CISE architectural Vision at this stage, in particular as the results of the impact assessment need to be awaited with a view to substantiate the business value of CISE. The ongoing Cooperation project shall bring essential indications as regards CISE related cost figures. Nevertheless, Member States opinions show that there is no objection to the Core Vision and that Visions A, B and C may *a priori* co-exist. Independently, a centralised alternative should also be examined. DG MARE further clarified that existing systems should continue functioning as today and that CISE shall not suppress direct contacts between user communities but on the contrary it is meant to foster such exchange. The cost study results will of course be available when finalised.

While it is too early to make organisational choices, DG MARE also recalled that CISE is foremost a political initiative bringing together seven user communities throughout 27 Member States that carry out over 70 distinct maritime surveillance initiatives alone at EU

level. CISE will need to be given more ownership at political level to envisage its implementation with a view to take advantage of the expected medium term benefits over cost. On the question whether CISE would be a new system MARE clarified that this is <u>not</u> the case as CISE aims at interlinking existing and planned systems but not at doing their job. As its name says, CISE is thus a legal, technical and organisational 'environment' as well as a political process towards giving European Member States the means to ensure safe, secure and clean seas as a fundamental pre-requisite to sustainable blue growth.

DG Mare further recalled that CISE is meant to reach out way beyond territorial waters as it is for instance meant to cover sea areas such as the Golf of Aden at the Horn of Africa where the civilian-military operation ATALANTA is currently being carried out.

Update on CoopP: The Finnish lead partner of the CISE Cooperation Project 'CoopP' recalled the timing of the project's deliverables while indicating that i.) good progress has been made in identifying representative use cases for CISE ii.) the work on identifying the cost of CISE, iii.) appropriate access right policies and iv.) common IT semantics has started. While some intermediary results are expected by summer 2013, the project's final results are to be ready by January 2014.

1. *France* indicated that the CoopP Work Package 2 (WP2) has some difficulties to deliver as there are different ideas of what CISE services may be.
2. *Italy* indicated to be confident that the CoopP will deliver a good product overall.
3. *Germany* indicated that CISE needs to have 'interfaces' interlinking various sectorial systems and needs governance structures or at least coordination elements for CISE users to know where to find information across the EU in the various sectorial systems. CISE is thus <u>*not*</u> about replacing existing systems as the latter produce the different sectorial layers of maritime situational awareness. By interconnecting these systems CISE will allow them to exchange missing information thereby enhancing each awareness layer.
4. *Romania* indicated to understand CISE as a form of 'IT cloud' application in which form it can be implemented at national level.
5. *DG DIGIT* recalled that the 'BluemassMed' pilot project constituted a test CISE allowing legacy systems to remain unmodified and continue their own lives while still being connected amongst each other.
6. *The European Maritime Security Agency (EMSA)* indicated that the transport related Automatic Identification System (AIS) is already mastered by seven different types of access rights and asked whether under CISE access rights are to be decided at information sender or receiver level.
7. *DG MARE* explained that access rights need to be pre-defined with a view to satisfy the principles of *need to know* and *responsibility to share*. Access rights should be managed by the data owner of an information service.
8. *Spain* indicated that the responsibility to share also needs to be cleared when information received from authority A is forwarded by authority B to authority C.
9. *Germany* complemented by recalling that the CoopP is looking into these aspects.

Update on MARSUR: The military representative from the Defence User Community updated on the recent development plan of the EDA MARSUR initiative. According to the report given, MARSUR will support better cross sectorial information exchange and therefore it should be fully compatible for the CISE environment.

Update on impact assessment studies: The consultant 'Gartner' presented progress made on assessing CISE cost. The methodology used consists in theoretically establishing the

number of IT building blocks necessary for establishing CISE, cost those and deduct the cost of existing systems. That is why the survey distributed to MS contains a number of cost related questions.

1. *Italy* asked how the total cost of ownership are defined in particular in respect of legacy systems. *Gartner* indicated that it considers the cost of providing e.g. a gateway, of maintaining it and using it.
2. *Greece* asked whether the cost will depend on the architectural vision, the IT semantics or other factors. *Gartner* answered that the study will provide an estimate of total cost for all building blocks of CISE.

The consultant COWI presented an overview of the data sources that are going to be used for the impact assessment. These consist mainly in desk research on existing studies, sectorial and horizontal legislation, sectorial initiatives at EU level, statistics, output from TAG, results from the pilot projects, figures produced by the CoopP and Member States' answers to the survey.

DG MARE presented the above mentioned survey to Member States. Member States are kindly requested to provide one answer per Member State by 3 June 2013 to the following e-mail box:

MARE-INTEGRATED-MARITIME-SURVEILLANCE@ec.europa.eu;

France asked whether the CISE initiative is currently still limited to the EU / European Economic Area (EEA).
DG MARE clarified that this is still the case.
Italy suggested that the MS survey should incorporate the Gartner approach focusing on investment and operational cost. Italy further explained that the cost analysis under the CoopP WP3 is complex and getting hold of relevant cost figures is not an easy task. CoopP WP3 will thus develop a macro overview of cost before assessing cost of individual use cases. WP3 is gathering statistical data on maritime surveillance and works together with WP2 on the development of use cases.

Conclusions: DG MARE concluded by thanking Member States and all actors for progress made not least in converging on a *in itinere* mutual understanding of CISE. The White Paper on CISE is foreseen by next spring. It should constitute a political reflection with concrete steps to take with a view to achieve a critical mass for CISE to be operational by 2020.

p.o.
V. Schacht

Beate Gminder

Cc.: MSEsG members, Mrs. L. Evans, Mrs M. Pariat, Mrs C. Montesi, Mr B. Friess, Mr S. Depypere, Mr E. Penas Lado, Mrs. V. Lainé, Mrs V. Veits, Mr H. Siemers, Mr M. King, TAG members, ISsG members

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.