TEG-MSP Data
Subgroup 2- Harmonization of Terminology and Nomenclature for MSP Output Data
Workshop – 11th February 2021 @ 14:30
WEBEX Meeting

All presentations given during the meeting will be available on the <u>Maritime Forum</u>.

Presence or Represented:

Please refer to the attached list of participants.

1. Introduction

MSP AM: welcomed everyone to the third meeting of Subgoup-2 and presented the Co-Chairs. Stated that the TEG-2 is now in the position to share the results of the model developed by EMODnet Human Activities. Expressed hope that the group will find the session useful and valuable.

EASME: the outcomes of this discussion will be presented on 25 February 2021 during the MSEG meeting. This will not be a formal MSEG meeting, but rather a dedicated workshop gathering the representatives of Member States. The idea is to present the work of TEG-2 with a clear focus on the results. The model combines the best of what already exists. The work of the experts and a number of recommendations will be shared during the MSEG workshop to highlight the results achieved and to determine the future direction in which the group should proceed.

Andrej Abramic (Co-Chair): the EMODnet Human Activities team will present the final MSP EMODnet model that needs to be discussed and we hope that it will receive consensus amongst the group. After this 'endorsement', the summary recommendations document shared prior to the meeting will be discussed in advance of its presentation at the MSEG Webinar on 25 February.

2. Harmonisation of Output data – Ready to Use Solutions
2.1 BASEMAPS, application and experiences (HELCOM)

Joni Kaitaranta, Co-Chair / HELCOM Secretariat: the aim is to display the ready to use solution that was developed by the HELCOM-VASAB MSP Data Expert Sub-Group (i.e. National MSP authorities and MSP data experts). Data model guidelines were developed to explain how MS can harmonise and process the MSP data to be regionally coherent to ensure availability of the best data for planners, academics and other users. Extensive work was done on the development of the model and associated guidelines. There was a need to develop a platform where the data could be visualized. This is why the BASEMAPS portal was developed (under EU-funded projects BalticLines and PanBalticScope). The technical guidelines contain the process on how to prepare data (interoperability and harmonization of spatial data sets; BASEMAPS platform).

An outcome of the MSP is the plan area (status of MSP plans) and sea use data. The most general is the maritime spatial plan area that provides the general data on the MSP process based on the INSPIRE Land use data model. One of the most important attributes is the status of the MSP process (i.e. in force, elaboration phase, preparation for elaboration or obsolete). MSs should update it as the MSP process advances. There is also a planned sea use area (MSP zoning element) that provides the spatial extent of the existing or planned activities or potential areas of development at sea.

One of the important topics is a list of attributes developed for harmonisation (Code list). In the previous TEG meeting it was concluded that the lists between other data models are similar, especially when the basis for their development has been the MSP directive sea use terms. However, these are quite general terms on sea uses. Sea use type is also important to classify the type of sea use using the code list (Priority, Reserved, Allowed, Restricted, Forbidden). To allow flexibility, some MSs describe only priority use areas, others include also prohibited sea uses.

2.2 MSP INSPIRE Data Model, application and experiences (MarSP)

Andrej Abramic, Co-Chair: The MSP INSPIRE model is an extended INSPIRE data model adapted for MSP. As a first step, a vertical distribution attribute was added, applying the code list (i.e. sea surface, water column, seabed, subsoil). The *land use* classification was extended to cover MSP specific features. The Hierarchy INSPIRE Land Use Classification System (HILUCS) Extended register for maritime use includes original records referenced by original links and the extended record. The code list on maritime uses remains open for extensions, on request of data providers, and can be extended to include new details as necessary. Requests to include new terms for extended HILUCS can be sent via email; the new terms will then be included (if appropriate) within three days. For instance, the fishing and aquaculture classes were extended. Currently, there are over 65 classes and more can be included. The model was tested in 2019. Both GIS and MSP experts were invited to discuss the concept. A hands-on session took place using the draft Madeira MSP that allowed users to work with a real case scenario. There are a lot of activities on the coast and most activities are concentrated within the coastal area with a lot of multi-use and overlaps. This level of detail is relevant for the local stakeholders and useful at the local, reginal and national levels. It uses the code list on maritime uses (extended HILUCS) for GIS symbology. Download and View services were developed using Geo-server, also metadata were included in the data catalogue. The document "Data specification for Maritime Spatial Planning INSPIRE Data Model" was developed as one of the deliverables of MarSP (December 2019). The data specification document represents a guide on how to apply the data model, using simplified flat table INSPIRE templates as a geo-package and INSPIRE like shape file. On the Canaries MSP platform, also available for download, is a Styled Layer Descriptor (SLD)- symbology scheme based on maritime uses code list.

EMODnet MSP Model (EMODnet Human Activities)

Marta Ballesteros and Jose Santiago, EMODnet HA: here is the final version of the European MSP data model to be presented, as well as the ways to integrate the plans into the EMODnet Human Activities Portal. All advances were made based on the contributions received. Official and supplementary information is presented as follows:

- Maritime Spatial Planning is the main spatial element/feature. It establishes the policies, priorities, programs, and land allocations that implement the strategic direction of a given geographic area and influence the distribution of people and activities in spaces at various scales.
- MSP Supplementary Regulation represents documentation, defined mainly in regulations, reporting on existing limitations in the land use in a given area. Consequently, it is a non-mandatory spatial feature.
- MSP Official Documentation represents all documentation, included in the regulation or other official sources, which defines three previous feature types. This is a non-spatial feature and, therefore, will not be represented graphically in the EMODnet geoportal.

Each of these three elements/features extends to a certain level of detail. Within the portal, presentation will be in English and the relevant national language. The most interesting is the MSP Zoning Element. The layers include MSP Zoning Areas, MSP Zoning Lines and MSP Locations. The descriptive information includes the original name, the relationship with the highlights of the directives, etc. All EMODnet themes have to be harmonised.

The key characteristics of the data model are:

- *Simplicity* - usability without giving up relevant information.
- *Harmonization* - a nomenclature compatible with the MSP and Inspire Directives.
- *Integrity* - the original MSP of each Member State and the harmonized MSP are visualized within the platform.
- *Compatibility* - capability to interlink with other MSP models.
- *Versatility* - to visualize and compare across countries, uses and activities.

3. Discussion and Endorsement of EMODnet MSP Model

Joni Kaitaranta, Co-Chair / HELCOM Secretariat: EMODnet model is compatible with HELCOM model. If MSs provide data in a different format, will EMODnet be able to display them?

Jose Santiago (EMODnet HA): Yes, it's compatible, we received plan data from Finland, and we were able to map and harmonise it to EMODnet MSP data model. It was easier to adapt the plan in this case than in the Belgium case because it was developed according to the BASEMAPS model. However, the EMODNET model allows harmonisation of any plan.

Joni Kaitaranta, Co-Chair / HELCOM Secretariat: it would be interesting to hear the views from the MSs. Any views or comments to the chosen approach?

Kees Borst, Senior Advisor for Rijkswaterstaat, NL: Many users are not aware of the data models, as they work with very simple GIS models. For the meeting of 25th February, it would be better to start with a simple introduction, presenting a basis for the MSs representatives who are not aware.

Andrej Abramic, Co-Chair: INSPIRE model is very complex to deliver and to maintain. All three data models that are based on the INSPIRE took different approaches. They simplified INSPIRE as much as possible. As such all three models are very simplified. It's a simple GIS model that was tested with MSP experts. We are following the names of the attributes. This is not a complex task.

MSP AM: Clarified that for the MSEG on 25/02 the target audience is different, and thus the presentation will be simplified.

Marta Ballesteros (EMODnet HA): the models are to make the life of users easier. There is a path to follow to make things faster and in alignment with EC regulations.

Lodewijk Abspoel (Ministry of Infrastructure and Water Management, NL): there are three different ways to digitalise the MSPs. It will be easier if it is possible to provide some advice, as we don't know how they work and how to choose between them. Please provide some advice on the choice between the three and on the course of action to be taken for member states.

MSP AM: the next step is the finalisation of recommendations from the TEG to the Member States. Perhaps, within these we could propose to the MSs which model to use.

Joni Kaitaranta, Co-Chair / HELCOM Secretariat: the discussion will have to be led at a very general level. It could make sense to suggest this. Basemaps was developed for the Baltic. Process-wise, it would make sense to recommend this in the Baltic region. The question is whether we should make regional recommendations and whether they would be too binding.

Lodewijk Abspoel (Ministry of Infrastructure and Water Management, NL): will anything go wrong if different MSs, sharing the same sea basin, choose different models?

Stefano Menegon, Italian National Research Council: we are finalising the model and our institute is involved in the process. In Italy, we have to choose the model to export the final result of the plan. It is not a technical issue for us because we can convert our plan in any model we decide, but it is important

to propose and decide what is the preferable model. All models are reversible. Maybe EMODnet could produce a tool to transform the model to maintain the compatibility with the other models. This could be an approach for MSs.

Dominique Carval (SHOM): Where MSs share a sea basin, they need to be able to access the information from neighbouring countries. The unique model would be an ideal situation - the design of a standard. Maybe converting the model is a good step. When published on the EMODnet Human Activities Portal, the plan indicates the zoning areas that are linked to uses and regulations. Could EMODnet confirm that strategic areas will also be published on the EMODnet Human Activities Portal?

Jose Santiago (EMODnet HA): the model is designed to include the following use of the sea: priority, reserved, allowed, restricted, forbidden or potential.

Ellen Vos (NL Hydrographic Service): if the model is presented for the European overview, it is necessary to make sure that the data translation is in place. Outside the Baltic, not every state has the necessary data in place. We need to see what data is available to translate it to the EMODnet model and then make an agreement on a particular sea basin.

Kamil Rybka (PL MSP Contact Point): the difference between the three models is the level of difficulty the model can achieve. The Baltic model is rather general. The attributes such as aquaculture or transport have no details. In relation to the Baltic model, there is not much work to do; other models are suitable for the incorporation of more detail.

Marta Bollesteros (EMODnet HA): the question is how to avoid creating confusion between the MSs as some are already well advanced in their MSPs and others are not. We tried to build on the differences of other models. In terms of harmonisation, this could be a way forward. The idea was to build on other tools, to integrate them and to make things easier.

Joni Kaitaranta, Co-Chair / HELCOM Secretariat: the classes applied in the Baltic model are not very detailed. The difference is in the level of detail. If more details are needed, then preference should be given to the INSPIRE data model. It would be good to give the flexibility to MSs but giving the freedom might mean creating confusion.

Lodewijk Abspoel (Ministry of Infrastructure and Water Management, NL): the directive only requires that the MSPs public, there are no provisions that it should be made digitally available. The directive is specific on the level of detail. It would be good to have a coherent picture in all European sea basins: present the plan, its content, and show the coherence. There is a lot of background information, but not so many details

Andrej Abramic, Co-Chair: EMODnet model makes this bridge. It merges both models, includes all aspects, and is fit for the purpose.

Joni Kaitaranta, Co-Chair / HELCOM Secretariat: the INSPIRE model has a vertical component that the Baltic model does not have. This is a factor that MSs should consider. We cannot be too technical during the MSEG meeting on 25/02/2021, but we have to explain the reason behind these three options.

Marta Bollesteros (EMODnet HA): the option could be to create the comparison table as one model might be more suitable for regional cooperation, while another model for delivering what is requested etc. Each model can be suitable for different purposes.

Triin Lepland (EE MSP Contact Point): posed a question about legally binding plans. Do we have an agreement that EMODnet will be the official platform for legally binding data? We have to translate the data into the Basemaps model. It was agreed that the user should always have to revert to the MSs for the data and documents that are legally binding.

Jose Santiago (EMODnet HA): you can send your data to EMODnet where it can be published or if necessary, it will first be harmonised and then published.

Marta Bollesteros (EMODnet HA): EMODnet allows that all legally binding documents are available for the consultation.

Triin Lepland (EE MSP Contact Point): However, if the plans are translated, they will not be legally binding, but informative.

Joni Kaitaranta, Co-Chair / HELCOM Secretariat: In Basemaps, there is no download functionality, but it provides a link to the national source due to the reason that legally binding data is accessed from the national sources. In case of displaying harmonized product, there should be a disclaimer in the portal such as: "Note that this information is for visual purposes only".

Lodewijk Abspoel (Ministry of Infrastructure and Water Management, NL): the MSEG never made a decision on whether the plans will be available in one portal. My advice is prior to the 25/02 meeting to get such information. If users around Europe could have a coherent plan established, then the group would have helped a lot. You can say that you are able to help by providing advice to the Member States. The MSEG has never made a decision to present the information in a coherent way. However, a joined up and coherent view for all Europe would be of real interest and I think they could say yes to that.

EASME: yes, there was no such a decision. So, we will now take it to the dedicated MSEG and put this point on the table to see whether MSs can come to such a decision. There will be a reflection regarding the formal MSEG in April or May 2021.

DG MARE: there is no obligation to provide plans in a particular format or via a particular tool. Perhaps, this could be discussed on 25/02/2021. If MSs agree that they should provide the data in these formats, this would be great. But the consensus would be that it is strongly recommended. Perhaps, there should be some sort of mechanism to provide MSs with the tools or guidelines to achieve these objectives. Perhaps, some MSs have tools in place already and others not.

Andrej Abramic, Co-Chair: it brings us to the point of publication of the plans. We could recommend why MSs could actually publish their plans. There are many reasons for this, such as increasing transparency of the development of the plans. It is important for stakeholders to see how the plan evolves rather than when it just appears. I think this point should also be included in the meeting on 25/02/2021.

Lodewijk Abspoel (Ministry of Infrastructure and Water Management, NL): A possible approach to the Member States is 'don't worry about getting it in a digital form, the TEG can help you to choose one of the three models and then you can meet the commitment easily'.

4. **MSEG Webinar (25ᵗʰ February 2021)**
   Recommendations for the MESG group and preparation of the event (DG MARE, EASME & AM)

Andrej Abramic, Co-Chair: some clarifications should be made regarding the recommendations document that was sent to the group. The deadline is tight as the document must to be shared with the MSEG participants before 25/02/2021. TEG participants are requested to provide comments as their inputs are necessary. The document will be under the authorship of the group. Participants are requested to provide comments by 17/02 as the document will be shared on 22/02.

Another question is how to develop the data flow from MSs to EMODnet. Where and how can EMODnet upload data, starting with national Spatial Data Infrastructure (SDI), Regional Sea Convention SDI, maybe even getting details within the national web page of the MSP platform? Perhaps, the plans can be placed there. Requested to include the points on this matter as well. Assistance on harvesting data.

Marta Bollesteros (EMODneet HA): we have been cooperating with MSs so we have several mechanisms to make the provisions easier, we will include them in the document.

5. Conclusions and Wrap-up

EASME: when sending the ideas on the document, participants are requested to share the thoughts on what the group should continue doing (i.e. offering guidance and assistance) to understand whether this discussion can be taken further and whether there is an interest in continuing the exercise.

Joni Kaitaranta, Co-Chair / HELCOM Secretariat: there were a lot of good inputs so this is something that should be worked on in the recommendations document. Expressed an opinion that the group is now aligned and can propose something concrete. Thanked everyone for the inputs.

MSP AM: thanked the group for the valuable comments. The document will be shared for recommendations shortly.

6. Ways forward (next steps)

- Participants are requested to provide feedback to the recommendations document by 17th February 2021
- The TEG Co-Chairs will present to the MSEG Webinar on 25th February 2021
- Outcomes of the meeting will be shared with the TEG once they are available
- Proposals of the future of the TEG and how the activities of Sub-Group 2 can evolve beyond this point will be opened for discussion in coming months.