EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR MARITIME AFFAIRS AND FISHERIES

MEDITERRANEAN AND BLACK SEA

Brussels,

MARE MSEG-SURVEILLANCE 9

Ninth meeting of the Commission's Member State Expert subGroup (MSEsG) on the integration of maritime surveillance of 26-27 February 2013.

Meeting Report

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

BluemassMed: The BMM lead partner presented the BMM conclusions video and the project conclusions. It was i.a. recalled that the project was carried out by 6 Member States including 37 administrations and constitutes and important step towards creating CISE that will necessitate fine tuning in particular as regards it's future architecture. Both the video as well as the power point presentation are to be found on the Maritime Forum at the following electronic address:

https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/maritimeforum/category/259

Italy pointed towards the importance of BMM in allowing to exchange information *both ways* between civilian and military authorities including the exchange of information containing satellite imagery.

TAG: The JRC presented the Technical Advisory Group's (TAG) six month report highlighting the preparation of about 90 representative Use Cases with a proposed selection for the Cooperation project for the latter to succeed making a swift start. JRC's presentation can be also found on the Maritime Forum under the above mentioned electronic address.

Germany recalled that the 'need to know' concept is now complemented by the 'responsibility to share' and the Netherlands asked for the CISE related FP7 PoV evaluation results and whether the work of the European Network and Information Security Agency 'Enisa' is coordinated with CISE. Mare explained that the results of the FP7 evaluation are to be presented on Thursday by DG Entr to the FP7 Programming Committee but that it appears that the allocated budget is not sufficient to support two projects and therefore both projects - which received the same number of evaluation

points – are only in the reserve list and would currently not be selected. The final selection process depends on Member States.

CoopP: The Finnish lead partner presented the CISE Cooperation project (CoopP). After a Kick off meeting held in January in Malmö, Work Package (WP) leaders have advanced substantially in preparing the partnership and methodology of all five WPs. France asked for special care to be taken in view to avoid meeting overlaps in the future.

Planning 2013-2020: Mare recalled a number of CISE aspects achieved over the past years and explained how the CoopP and the FP7 PoV, if awarded co-financing, will build on each other to have a small portion of CISE tested by 2016 and will allow building a critical mass of information exchange for CISE to be operational by 2020. As next steps, a project on possible governance structures and further technical aspects will have to be defined and started as requested in the Limassol Declaration. The Commission intends tabling the CISE related White Paper by end 2013 with a view not to lose the window of opportunity before the re-election of the European Parliament and the renewal of the European Commission.

CISE principles and requirements: Mare explained the proposed underlying principles for CISE. The Netherlands questioned whether CISE should be *system* or *sector* neutral. It is both. Germany indicated that the principles should not refer to interoperability of *systems* but rather to interoperability of *information flows*. Italy endorsed the DE and NL comments and underlined that the 'responsibility to share' principle is indeed essential. The United Kingdom indicated that both the 'need to know' and the 'responsibility to share' principles need to be in line with security classification as there must be assurance that secret information is not relayed on. Further, the UK indicated that the CISE principles should not be carved in stone if CISE should be a tool evolving 'freely' as it naturally evolves while preserving its agility. Spain indicated that under both principles there must be justified underlying purposes for sharing information.

CISE visions: Mare presented the four visions included in its non-paper:

- **Core vision**: gathering the basic features necessary for CISE to function
- **Vision A**: in which the governance is organized around the concept of User Communities,
- **Vision B**: in which the governance is organized around different national sectorial authorities and
- **Vision C**: under which the governance is organized around a central national (**C+**: regional) node able to analysing information and creating a national (**C+:** regional) maritime awareness picture.

The CISE principles and requirements, as well as the CISE visions are documented in the CISE Architecture Visions Document, which can be found in the maritime forum under https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/maritimeforum/content/3187

Member States have been requested to comment by 29th March (following the procedure described in Annex 6 of the document).

Transport: Move, in this context, presented the IMP project 'Evolution of SafeSeaNet'. While doing so it recalled that the 2009 Communication on CISE provides that: *'The Community system SafeSeaNet should be used by all relevant user communities and be developed further to function as the main platform for information exchange in the EU*

maritime domain with regard to port arrival and departure notifications, notifications on dangerous goods, maritime security notifications, incident and accident information, AIS, LRIT and pollution monitoring.' Considering this and in line with a decision of the SSN High Level Steering Group (COM and MS Governance body), SSN is currently providing services to all 7 user communities, identified by TAG, on a pilot project basis. Move also gave an update on the ongoing work with MS relating to the Reporting Formalities Directive and the Single Windows covering both cross-sector and cross-border. Move further indicated that, in line with the main principles of CISE, that were recalled by Mare and which include the avoidance of duplication and the efficient use of resources, CISE should be based on SafeSeaNet and the Reporting Formalities National Single Windows and on the developments already made respecting the existing legal obligations to share large parts of the identified CISE data with all communities through these systems. In this respect, the 'Evolution of SafeSeaNet' project will also provide input for consideration in the development of CISE. The presentations are uploaded on the Maritime Forum under the above electronic address.

Spain thanked the Commission for providing such a comprehensive and complete overview. Indicatively and based on the BMM experience in which Spain built two primary nodes, it appears that CISE vision B may well be a good option. This will however have to be confirmed in any case.

The Netherlands said that the most difficult task is now to put everything together as none of the existing systems is complete or would have the potential to constitute CISE on its own. In response, MOVE indicated that CISE should build on SSN as it is based on existing legal obligations, and in that respect could share its experience, which is the aim of the 'Evolution of SSN' project, as explained. Mare concluded by indicating that finding common IT language/standards while respecting existing ones is the main current challenge.

E-Sense: Connect presented the Electronic Simple European Networked Services (e-SENS), a three year project to create a platform unifying different IT interoperability projects. Certain elements of e-Sense such as digital signatures may be reused by CISE already now and further results from e-Sense will have the potential to become building blocks for CISE in the future. The presentation is uploaded on the Maritime Forum under the above electronic address.

Eurosur: Home presented the latest developments on Eurosur indicating that while CISE should of course respect subsidiarity, the different existing systems should not enter in a beauty contest but enter into a process of cooperation to achieve CISE. As regards Eurosur and CISE, the objective is to work together to get the job done as far as fighting criminal networks is concerned. The relevance of setting up maritime surveillance national nodes was questioned, as a wider approach might be necessary to cope with the larger spectrum of activities covered by the concerned public authorities (e.g. border guards are in charge of land surveillance too and not only maritime surveillance). The presentation is uploaded on the Maritime Forum under the above electronic address.

GMES/Copernicus: Entr presented the GMES initiative now renamed into Copernicus while indicating that it may not only serve the 'Border Control' community but also the maritime surveillance community if it has an interest. The presentation is uploaded on the Maritime Forum under the above electronic address and more information is to be found on DG Entr website under the following address:

http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/space/copernicus/index_en.htm

The Netherlands asked whether the MSEsG should work with Copernicus, what kind of services are on offer and that the Netherlands are interested in near real time services, considering that it takes long time before getting a satellite on a needed spot. Entr replied that no real time services will be provided but that near real time may be possible. It is about gathering intelligence out of in situ and other data.

Mare concluded on the above presentations that no user community should be on top of another one, that a beauty contest would be counter-productive and that instead cooperation between user communities is the Leitmotiv. There are many services on offer by seven sectors and we need to work towards an agreement on how to share them in a single de-centralised environment in order to avoid duplication. The CISE architectural visions allow visualising how information may be shared *without* (Core vision) and *with* different types of organizational governance (Visions A, B, C).

European Coast Guard functions study: Move presented the said study by indicating that it is at its beginnings gathering facts on what should and can be done.

Malta was interested to know what the approach to SAR areas is going to be. Move said that no changes to the SAR areas are planned.

Impact Assessment: The consultant 'COWI' presented its first findings as regards the economic, social, environmental and legal impact assessment of CISE while indicating that the overall approach consists in evaluating the present state of play as being the baseline, to which the various CISE options should be compared. Evaluating the baseline for now and over the next ~10 years involves assessing the evolution of the risk for threats to occur during that period in the EU maritime domain. From the legal side different barriers have been identified. These are e.g. of horizontal nature (personal data protection), sector specific barriers as well as sectorial rules that do not foresee cross-sectorial information exchange.

Germany indicated that indeed the study needs to go beyond the baseline as CISE should allow carrying out maritime surveillance in a different manner than today. The United Kingdom underlined the importance of accurately representing the current state of play also at national level with a view to keeping cost at minimal level taking into account the administrative burden of changing law at national level. It is thus also important to identify the 'break-even point' at which investments into CISE will bring net benefit. Germany added that the duplication of assets such as radars is a fact and that CISE can help saving duplication of such cost. Spain indicated that the national level needs the EU level to push it with a view to making cross-sectorial information exchange a reality.

Mare indicated that cost at national level need to be taken into account and that the need to know / responsibility to share principles need to be identified better with a view to understand whether they need to be a legally binding concepts.

IT cost: The consultant 'Gartner' explained the concept upon which it will assess the IT costs related to each of the four CISE related visions. The presentation is uploaded on the Maritime Forum under the above electronic address.

AOB: The Irish presidency recalled two related events:

- The Security and surveillance conference held in Dublin on 8-9 April 2013 and
- Space, innovation and blue growth conference in Cork on 17-18 April 2013.

Conclusions: Mare concluded the meeting by recalling that the process leading towards the establishment of CISE requires full cooperation of all User Communities as it is a process based foremost on willingness to succeed and will not be a big bang event but rather an organic process building up for CISE over time. Member States have been requested to comment by 29th March as regards the CISE architectural visions document (following the procedure described in Annex 6 of the document).

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.