

Draft minutes from the 26th Meeting of the International Steering Committee for the Policy Area on Maritime Safety and Security of the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region – Operational part

June 8 2022 12.30-15.30 CEST

Participant: the meeting was attended by 29 people representing all EUSBSR countries and organisations from academia, public and private sector.

1. Welcome words and Tour de Table

Emelie Tingström (PA Safe PAC, Swedish Maritime Administration) provided welcome words for the first PA Safe Operational meeting, followed by the brief introduction of meeting participants.

2. Approval of the agenda

Ms. Tingström introduced the agenda that was since approved by the meeting participants.

3. PA Safe operational meeting structure

Ulf Siwe (PA Safe PAC, Swedish Maritime Administration) introduced the new meeting structure of PA Safe, including its Formal Steering Group (FG) and Operational Steering Group (OG). This comprised description of its rationality as well as aims and scope of activities within these two interlinked groups. For example, while the FG mainly addresses administrative tasks, the OG focuses on the establishment of new projects. Overall, the aim of this new structure is to support the implementation of PA Safe objectives, including its four action items.

4. Discussion on operational meeting structure

Meeting participants comments on the suggestion:

- Proposed list of tasks is a good starting point for the OG and can be updated at a later stage.
- Flagship status for projects is not relevant for Interreg BSR financing anymore, but could be still granted if needed. It can be useful for other financing institutions for example. However, the main objective is to establish new good projects that contribute to the objectives of PA Safe.
- FG members are always invited and welcome to OG meetings.
- PA Safe can provide financial support for organizing local events in the countries of the Baltic Sea region, where a wider audience can discuss the four PA Safe actions, provide project ideas and partnership thoughts.
- New concept can support matchmaking in the context of PA Safe work.
- The new structure helps the achievement of PA Safe objectives, getting funding for projects and setting common goals.
- Focus should be on brainstorming, matchmaking and tackling of common challenges.

5. Recommendation: PA Safe operational meeting structure

The new meeting structure received support, but should be reviewed on a regular basis.

Ms. Tingström outlined briefly the purpose of following agenda items 6, 7 and 8 to the meeting participants.

6. Flagships

First, Mr. Siwe provided a presentation on the STM BALT SAFE project (closed 2021). In the beginning, he elaborated briefly the aim and scope of the project. Thereafter, he described the outcomes provided, including the new IMO approved data standard for Maritime Special Reporting Areas; to be used in the Gulf of Finland, the Sound, the Great Belt for example. The results also included facilities for route sharing between ships and VTS centres, Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for how the VTS centres should act when receiving routes. These SOPs were developed in cooperation with members of IALA. Next, the aim is to introduce the new SOPs to IALA VTS

committee, establish a new VTS experience exchange forum in the Baltic and explore the applicability of **STM concept for MASS**, Maritime Autonomous Surface Ships.

Second, Stefan Gewies (German Aerospace Centre) introduced the R-Mode Baltic 2 project (closed 2022). To this end, he first described the project background, which was based on the results of the earlier R-Mode Baltic project, as well as its aim and scope. Next, he outlined briefly the results R-Mode Baltic 2 that provided e.g. extension of the concepts test-area further in Germany and Sweden, static evaluation of the system performance and reduction of previous positioning errors. The testbed is still operational after project closure. The project's outputs have also been presented to the IALA to support the associated system standardization. The following steps will include e.g. the extension of the test bed area into new geographical locations, development of its operational systems and continuation with standardization process. The plan is to apply for a **new project "R-mode 3"** with Interreg BSR autumn 2022.

Finally, Maarit Mikkelsen (Finnish Transport and Communications Agency) describe the Speed up re-surveying project (ongoing). First, she outlined the project background, which is based on the Helcom Baltic Sea Action Plan, as well as its aim and scope. The project will follow up on the remaining surveys for commercial shipping (categories I and II) and continue surveys in category III areas, aimed at boating. For category III areas autonomous surveying both surface based and aerial might be solutions and the project will organize a workshop for **autonomous survey** platforms. For commercial shipping surveys, the focus will be on the work in Estonia and Germany. The project continues in line with the IHO standards, while been monitored by the Baltic Sea Hydrographic Organization.

7. Known project applications with PA Safe relevance

Mr. Siwe provided an overview of new project applications in the area of PA Safe. At first, he reminded audience about the four action items of PA Safe that should be supported by new projects.

In the recent Interreg BSR call, there were a total of 11 new projects applications mentioning contribution to PA Safe. Four of these applications could also be considered as new potential Flagship projects (Baltic Sea E-Nav, MaDaMe, OpenRisk-2 and BlueDataService) if they are approved by the Interreg BSR Monitoring Committee. A small project within Interreg BSR: BaltMarGrav also has potential. Additionally, in Interreg Central Baltic there is a project proposal Sustainable Flow with a lot of potential. The leading applicants come from several of the Baltic states and some of the consortiums are covering almost all EUSBSR member states.

8. Financing sources

Ms. Tingström outlined briefly the available funding sources for the PA Safe related projects. This included several options, such as different Interreg, Horizon, national programmes, as well as IMO, SIDA, JPI Oceans funding instruments. Additionally, she provided information about the associated schedules for calls and budgets. The goal is to keep members of the OG informed of upcoming calls on a regular basis. For more information, see <https://keep.eu/programmes/>.

9. Areas for new project ideas

Ms. Tingström set up the basis for discussions addressed to the new project ideas in the context of PA Safe. For this purpose, she provided an overview of the previous projects and gaps to be explored in the future studies for the administrative perspective.

10. Discussion – project ideas

[In the below notes, the PACs have tried to mark every mention of an idea **bold** in order to identify common issues and possible partners.]

Valtteri Laine (PA Safe PAC, Finnish Transport and Communications Agency) led the discussion and kicked it off by three areas of interest: **Windfarms** at sea – in relation to winter navigation. IMO MASS (Maritime Autonomous Surface Ships) new regulations **Chemical spills** – we have a lot of preparedness for oil spills, but less for chemical spills.

Krystof Wrobel (Maritime University of Gdynia) agreed that **MASS** is at the edge of implementation and that it needs common solutions

Else Timms (Swedish Coast Guard, SCG) mentioned that they participate in an ongoing project “AI Arc” where SCG is interested in **anomaly detection**. Regarding **windfarms**, we have common challenges in the construction phase, the maintenance and replacement phases. Windmills contain a lot of lubrication oil, so there is a spill risk added to the maritime safety risk. Any **detection technology** over, on or under water is of interest. **Drones** is an area where many could profit.

Christopher Saarnak (Danish Maritime Authority) suggested the area **drone** inspection of Aids to Navigation (**AtoNs**). This is also of interest in Finland and Sweden stated Mr Laine and Mr Siwe.

Ms Tingström suggested that all participants should be given the opportunity to comment on project ideas as a tour de table. Mr Laine proceeded leading the discussion accordingly.

Aleksandrs Pavlovics (Latvian Transport Accident and Incident Investigation Bureau), please make all solution as accessible and user friendly as possible.

Annikka Lehtikoinen (Kotka Maritime Research Centre), ongoing: **port safety** in extreme weather and pandemics. Ideas: **oil spill** in open sea in winter conditions, risk assessment & response preparedness for **new fuel type spills**, **human factors** – personnel still behind many accidents/incidents, Multifunctional **drones** – use research drones also for surveillance, etc.

Benedikt Dafner (German Federal Ministry for Digital and Transport), **Windfarms** seem to be a cross-country issue

Mr Saarnak: no ongoing projects, building blocks enabling **MASS**, future **smart AtoNs**, **VDES**, **standards**

Dan Heering (Estonian Maritime Academy, TalTech) **Cyber**-resilience for all digital solutions, **Windfarms** also relevant in Estonia. Mr. Laine confirmed Finnish interest in **Cybersecurity**.

Mr Gewies R-mode 3: *looking for administrations and authorities around the Baltic to join the partnership*. Anything increasing the reliability of **positioning** – needed for **MASS**, need to be **cyber secure**.

Juha Korsi (Finnish Transport and Communications Agency) All digitalisation projects, especially **MASS**. **Windfarms**.

Raitis Murnieks, (Maritime Administration of Latvia) **Windfarms** also relevant in Latvia, during the pandemic the need for **hybrid inspection** has arisen

Mindaugas Zakarauskas & Jurijus Gleikinas (Lithuanian Transport Safety Administration) e-nav project using S-100 standards [*application already in*], issues **remote surveying**

Marek Rauk (Estonian Transport Administration) **Windfarms**, **MASS** and machine-to-machine **cybersecurity**

Mikael Hägg (Research Institutes of Sweden, RISE) RISE has capacity to work in all Actions. Currently projects in **digitalization** and **new fuels**. Has a centre for **cybersecurity**.

Ms Mikkelsson (Traficom) Importance of sharing information and results between projects

Nicole Costa (SSPA/RISE) Ongoing designing leisure boats and icebreakers, **anomaly detection**, has route optimization tool. Agree with Ms Lehtikoinen – **Human factors** important in every action and project. Working on **remote pilotage** with RISE.

Philipp Schwedas (German Federal Maritime and Hydrographic Agency) Cooperation between projects – data sharing. Use IHO common real data.

Rima Mickiene /Elena Valioniene (Lithuanian Maritime Academy) Support the **human factors** importance – add training in all projects. **Windfarms** also of interest in Lithuania.

Tarmo Ots (Estonian Ministry of Economic Affairs and Communication)

Continuation of **FAMOS** project [*application already in*], Aids to navigation and waterway project ,

AtoNs (with similar structure (sub-topics) as was FAMOS, Use of AIS systems on **recreational crafts** to analyse the impact on safety, SAR and collecting statistics to define routes used by recreational crafts, **Winter navigation** (with several subtopics). We are thinking that preparing design concept of new vessel, **MASS** (pilot project on international sailing). We would like to see how it works in reality, Use of **drones** in the field of pollution monitoring, securing and checking aids to navigation, **windfarms** (safety of navigation in these areas, also impact of ice) looks very interesting.

Vytautas Paulauskas (Klaipeda University) **Navigational safety conditions** regarding pilotage tugs etc. **Remote pilotage** – great for pandemic.

[Mr Siwe wants to add implementing **SAR best practices** in the region to the project ideas]

11. Meeting closure

Ms Tingström was happy that so many people joined and brought so much energy and so many ideas to the table. She then closed the meeting.