EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region (EUSBSR)
Policy Area on Maritime Safety & Security (PA Safe)

Copenhagen, 6 November 2018

Final minutes

18th international Steering Committee meeting of PA Safe
Tallinn, Estonia, 5-6 June 2018

The Steering Committee meeting was held at the Estonian Maritime Administration. Present at the PA Safe meeting were representatives from relevant authorities of EU Member States bordering the Baltic Sea, the European Commission, the Council of the Baltic Sea States, PA Transport, HA Capacity, PA Ship and ongoing Flagships.

An informal meeting about the upcoming revision of the EUSBSR Action Plan was held on 5 June 2018 at the Park Inn by Radisson Meriton Conference & Spa Hotel.

The documents from the meeting are made available on PA Safe's website: https://www.dma.dk/Vaekst/EU/EUOestersoestrategi/PAsafe/Pages/Meeting-documents-(PA-Safe).aspx

Meeting on 5 June 2018

Mr. Jouni Lappalainen, Policy Area Coordinator (PAC) for PA Safe, welcomed the steering committee members and thanked everyone for coming to this informal meeting.

Afterwards, all the participants introduced themselves (tour de table) and Mr. Lappalainen presented the agenda for this informal meeting. The meeting was meant as a food for thought where three inter-related topics were presented; the new Flagship concept, the upcoming revision of the EUSBSR Action Plan and the United Nation's Sustainable Development Goals.

1. Introduction to the new Flagship concept

Mr. Anders Bergström, Horizontal Action Coordinator (HAC) for HA Capacity and PAC for PA Education, presented the new Flagship concept.

Mr. Bergström started with a short introduction to the European system of macro-regional strategies stating that there are issues that cannot be solved on a national level and therefore cross border cooperation is important. The four macro-regional strategies should be seen as laboratories for a new Europe. Cooperating in these strategies allow national states to work together on solving regional issues but also provide a space for trials and errors to be made. Macro-regional strategies are complex entities as they bring different perspectives together and are based on multilevel governance.

Mr. Bergström stressed that the idea of the strategy is not to organize projects, which is more or less the case today, but to influence policy to benefit the region. This can only be achieved through cooperation. However, by reviewing the EUSBSR it becomes clear that it might have more policy impact if the term 'flagship' is redefined. The proposal is to not just see flagships as projects but to see them as a chain or a system of projects pooled in thematic groups. In this way processes can be built for policy impact instead of only starting projects.

According to Mr. Bergström the project format is going to end in time as the projects are too limited. They often end with a final conference and a report but the results are not always reaching real policy impact. Therefore, if the goal is to influence EU development there is a need for other cooperation formats and *processes* could be one solution for gaining the desired policy impact. Furthermore, the process format allows for knowledge platforms which are built on memberships and not necessarily partners which opens up for a wider stakeholder group as not all stakeholders want to be partners.

Mr. Bergström informed that PA Safe had already had a capacity workshop on the new Flagship concept. This workshop was held together with PA Ship in Copenhagen on 4-5 April 2018. Both Steering Committees including projects were invited to this workshop.

The presentation ended with a discussion about if processes could be a possibility for the future work in PA Safe instead of projects.

Ms. Else Timms, representing DiveSMART Baltic, noted that it was an interesting idea, as she in DiveSMART Baltic have been trying to figure out a way to secure the management of the project after the official project period ends. Moving from fixed project periods to processes would probably make it easier for results from the projects to continue possibly reaching policy level.

Another example came from **Mr. Ulf Siwe**, representing STM Validation, in accordance with traffic monitoring. Today we do not know what happens to results when a project ends. This network and work has to be protected when the project ends, and a process approach would be helpful in this regard.

Mr. Aleksandrs Pavlovics from the Transport Accident Investigation Bureau of Latvia rose the question on how to benchmark processes and noted that it is easier to have exact targets for individual projects than for processes.

Mr. Bergström agreed on this being a challenge and that it would be challenging finding measurable indicators and actions for processes. However, Mr. Bergström explained that with the upcoming revision of the EUSBSR Action Plan there is an opportunity to do this e.g. measure policy impact instead of number of maritime accidents. He added that another benefit with the process approach is that when the added value is discovered, funding in the extend we see to projects today will not be needed.

It was concluded that the new Flagship concept will be an ongoing discussion topic in PA Safe.

2. **Revision of the EUSBSR Action Plan**

Ms. Cilia Sonne Allermann, PAC for PA Safe, presented the upcoming revision of the EUSBSR Action Plan.

Firstly, Ms. Allermann informed that it is still unknown when exactly the revision comes but that it is certain that it is coming and therefore the PAC-team – Jouni Lappalainen, Cilia Sonne Allermann and Rikke Holst Søndergård – had deemed it necessary to start now to make sure that it will be a successful revision of the chapter of PA Safe in the Action Plan. Ms. Allermann stressed that the revision is about setting the strategic focus for the future and that it therefore is highly important to anchor the work with revising the PA Safe chapter in the Steering Committee having all members of the Steering Committee contributing to the revision and approving the final revision of the PA Safe chapter. She added that it is better to be ahead than behind and stressed the importance of starting now – even though the European Commission had not set a deadline for the revision yet – because the PAC-team has already had a meeting with the HelpDesk of the EUSBSR Support last week. And the deadline for getting help from the HelpDesk is September 2018.

Secondly, Ms. Allermann presented a tentative timeline starting in May 2017 with the seminar in Brussels. Here two focus areas were chosen as the future focus areas of PA Safe and they were agreed upon at the last Steering Committee meeting in November 2017.

Thirdly, Ms. Allermann informed of the desired outcomes of this process. In a short term perspective, being tonight, the PAC-team hoped to get some initial ideas from the Steering Committee to feed into the work going forward. In the long run the PAC-team hoped for final actions, targets and indicators agreed upon by the Steering Committee to be part of the revision of the PA Safe chapter of the EUSBSR Action Plan.

Fourthly, Ms. Allermann gave a brief introduction to what actions, indicators and targets are. She explained that today PA Safe has seven actions but it is necessary to revisit the actions making sure that the actions are in line with what the Steering Committee would like to be the future strategic focus of PA Safe. Ms. Allermann added that the challenge in this regard is that they cannot be too specific but also not too general.

Hereafter, Ms. Allermann introduced the targets and indicators explaining that the target of PA Safe is not indicative of the work being done by the PAC-team and the Steering Committee including Flagships. Currently the target is to decrease the number of maritime accidents in the Baltic Sea and Ms. Allermann stressed that this target does not correlate to the work being done in PA Safe. Therefore, there is a need for targets and indicators which are measurable and indicative of the work being done in PA Safe. Ms. Allermann added that formulating targets and indicators are difficult for many PAs and HAs which is also why the EUSBSR Support has been introduced to help the PAs and HAs with this task.

Ms. Allermann explained that the future focus areas, actions and targets are all related. The focus areas feed into the actions. Actions then take the focus areas and turn them into targets and indicators to measure the action. Indicators are the mean to achieve the actions.

After the presentation there where a short discussion among the participants. **Ms. Krista Kampus** agreed on HA Climate also struggling with finding suitable targets and indicators. Ms. Kampus, Head of Unit in Council of the Baltic Sea States, suggested that it might be more appropriate that the sub-objectives of the EUSBSR are reflected in the targets and indicators instead of the specific PA/HA level. She added that the sub-objectives under each of the three general objectives (Save the Sea, Connet the Region and Increase Prosperity) have never been revised and most have forgotten about them.

Ms. Allermann promised to send the objectives and sub-objectives of the EUSBSR after the meeting.

Ms. Emmi Huvitus, representing WINMOS II, had the idea to look at the indicators in the Flagship application of the projects to the funds. In these the projects write indicators, which might be inspirational in this process.

3. Introduction to the United Nation 2030 Sustainable Development Goals

Ms. Kampus, Head of Unit in Council of the Baltic Sea States, presented the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and how to implement the 2030 Agenda through the EUSBSR. Ms. Kampus informed that in 2015 the UN agreed upon 17 goals to be adopted by 2030. These 17 goals consist of 169 targets and 244 indicators. It is an agenda for the world meaning that every stakeholder from governments to NGOs to private enterprises should be involved. Ms. Kampus addressed the meaning of sustainability explaining that sustainability basically means “treating the world as you planned to stay”.

Ms. Kampus informed that last year the ministers from the Baltic Sea States endorsed the Baltic 2030 Action Plan implementing the UN SDGs into the regional work. In this Action Plan there is six focus areas which can be seen here:

http://www.cbss.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/Baltic-2030-Action-Plan-leaflet-eng.pdf

She showed that the Baltic Sea Region is in the top 10 in every statistic on UN SDGs and concluded that the region is doing well compared to the global level. However, Ms. Kampus stressed that even though the region is doing good this does not mean that there is no room for improvement, on the contrary. By taking a closer look it becomes obvious that the Baltic Sea states have several SDGs which are not fulfilled and moreover there are significant differences between the Baltic Sea states.

Ms. Kampus explained that many of the challenges faced in the Baltic Sea region are related to the UN SDGs e.g. consumption, climate actions, life below water, life on land and institutions and security and stated that the UN SDGs are going to be implemented into EU legislation and therefore it would be timely to start thinking them into the EUSBSR and the upcoming revision of the EUSBSR Action Plan.

The informal meeting closed with thoughts and comments to the three presentations.

Ms. Timms stated that is was a lot to take in. But regarding the new Flagship concept and more specifically the process approach this might be helpful in continuing projects after the typical 3-year period. Furthermore, she added that the illustration Ms. Kampus used of the UN SDGs was good and might be easier to copy.

Mr. Siwe agreed with Ms. Timms on the process approach, and he also liked the idea of a membership approach in the processes explaining that stakeholders could then participate on the level they wish and have the resources for which might be a way forwards.

Ms. Allermann explained that all three presentations are interconnected and agreed that it is a lot to take in and added that should these presentations at some point in time give reason for questions or ideas the participants werw more than welcome to contact the PAC-team.

Meeting on 6 June 2018

1) **Welcome remarks**

Mr. Lappalainen and Ms. Allermann welcomed the participants and thanked for a productive meeting yesterday.

Mr. Tarmo Ots, from the Estonian Maritime Administration (EMA), welcomed the participants to the EMA. He was happy to host this meeting as the EMA participates in multiple projects under PA Safe e.g. WINMOS II and EfficienSea II.

Mr. Ots then moved on to a presentation of the EMA and how modern technology affecting maritime safety is a focus area for the EMA.

Mr. Lappalainen thanked for the presentation and for being able to use the EMA for this meeting.

2) **Approval of the agenda and confirmation of approved final minutes**

The agenda of the meeting and minutes from the latest Steering Committee meeting (held in Gdynia 9 November 2017) were approved.

3) **Activities of the Policy Area Coordinators**

Mr. Lappalainen presented the recent activities of PA Safe.

The 9th EUSBSR Annual Forum had just taken place on 4-5 June 2018 in Tallinn, Estonia. Here PA Safe had a joint seminar with PA Secure called 'Exercises as tools for building a resilient BSR post 2020 – from the roundtable to the field'. This event both contained a traditional seminar with a panel debate but also a life demonstration. Here four projects – ChemSAR and DiveSMART Baltic from PA Safe and HAZARD and Balex Delta from PA Secure – worked together to illustrate how joint actions work in reality.

The joint capacity workshop in April with PA Ship and PA Safe co-organised with HA Capacity was highlighted but was dealt with in more details under agenda item 9.

Ms. Allermann also mentioned that PA Safe was in Oslo in December 2017 to meet with the Norwegian ship owners' association trying to engage this segment more in Flagships.

Lastly, Mr. Lappalainen informed that the PACs had been contacted by Oddgeir Danielsen from the Northern Dimension Partnership on Transport and Logistics (NDPTL) on the possibility of co-organising – also with PA Ship – an event on autonomous transport in the fall. He also informed of the Transport Research Arena (TRA) in Helsinki on 26-30 April 2020 and asked the Steering Committee to save the date. Mr. Lappalainen suggested that PA Safe would organise a seminar during TRA and possibly also have a stand.

Mr. Osiris A. Valdez Banda, representing STORMWINDS, mentioned that Aalto University has organized seminars on autonomous shipping and would be helpful in sharing experiences with the PACs if needed. He added that Aalto University just had a seminar in the Netherlands and was planning an international seminar also on autonomous shipping with focus on safety and security in May 2019 and were planning for one more next year.

4) **News from the European Commission**

Ms. Dora Barreira Ramos, representing DG MARE, started by informing that lately the European Commission had focused a lot on security, where PA Safe have focused mostly on safety.

The Commission will send out an EU Maritime Security Action Plan, which is a political paper, on 26 June 2018. In here there will be references to the EUSBSR and it also include commitments from the Baltic Sea States. This will show that cooperation in exercises and risk assessments add value and it will benefit PA Safe by making EUSBSR visible.

Ms. Ramos lastly informed about the conference DG MARE just hosted about investment in blue initiatives. It was a very successful conference where businesses, ideas and investors where matched. On behalf of this conference DG MARE is trying to set up a blue investment platform. In connection to this DG MARE is planning on having a general blue call at the end of the year. The focus will probably be on digital technology and research.

Ms. Ramos informed that she would send the EU Maritime Security Action Plan as well as information on the blue call when published.

Mr. Odd Godal, representing DG REGIO, informed about the latest news. The 9th EUSBSR Annual Forum had taken up a lot of time but also the new regulation for cohesion policy being adopted last week. Here the focus will be: Smart Europe, Green Europe, Connected Europe, Social Europe, Europe close to citizens and capacity and cooperation with non-EU countries. Mr. Godal also informed that DG REGIO also focuses on transnational corporation and sea basin programs, where the EUSBSR will be one.

He added that one of the priorities is to strengthen the governance in the EUSBSR and prioritise in line with the strategy.

Mr. Lappalainen thanked for the presentations and stressed the fact that PA Safe is about maritime safety <u>and</u> security. However, there are no Flagships dealing with security at the moment but security does also belong in PA Safe.

Mr. Siwe supported this by saying that security is integrated into infrastructure of sea traffic management as information security and cyber security.

Mr. Magnus Wallhagen, representing FAMOS, agreed with Mr. Siwe that cyber security matters. It is very easy to disturb satellite systems used for positioning of the ships. Mr. Wallhagen said that there have been incidents where the positioning system of ships have been disturbed in the Black Sea and in the Baltic Sea. The Swedish Maritime Administration is now looking at using the seabed and echo sound as a back-up system for satellite positioning. It is a research area the Swedish Maritime Administration is thinking about.

5) **Status of other Policy Areas of relevance to PA Safe**

Mr. Thomas Erlandson, PAC for PA Transport, explained that the overall goal for PA Transport is to facilitate a sustainable transport system. However, Mr. Erlandson saw that there are a lot of synergies between shipping, maritime issues and transport. He informed about the transport project EMMA dealing with shipping on inland waterways and the TENTacle project, which looks at making land transport more adaptive to sea transport.

Mr. Erlandson thanked for the invitation to the meeting and for the close cooperation between PA Transport and PA Safe.

Ms. Allermann gave a brief update on PA Ship, which DMA is also PAC for. Ms. Allermann informed that PA Ship and PA Safe have done many things together which is also evident from the activity list presented earlier. She informed that at the 9th EUSBSR Annual Forum PA Ship hosted a joint seminar with PA Transport and HA Climate called 'Transport sector responses to emerging climate risks'. Ms. Allermann also informed that the new Flagship concept had also been introduced to the Steering Committee of PA Ship and that PA Ship would be having a similar process regarding the upcoming revision of the EUSBSR Action Plan.

6) **Update on EU Funds and Seed Money**

Ms. Rikke Holst Søndergård, Assistant Policy Area Coordinator for PA Safe, gave a brief update on the funding programs which was also sent by e-mail before the meeting. An important point from this update was that the end of the current funding period is approaching and therefore there are not that many calls left.

7) **Flagships**

1. *Speed up re-surveying of major shipping routes and ports*

Mr. Seppo Mäkinen, from the Finish Transport Agency, informed that the Flagship is on the right track according to covered areas. The goal is that 99% of areas are covered by 2020. The project is looking at both category 1 routes (CAT I): main routes and category 2 routes (CAT II): used based on available AIS information. The procedure of speeding up is agreed in HELCOM (Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission), in order to ensure that the safety of navigation is not put at risk through outdated or inadequate source information. At the HELCOM Ministerial Meeting in 2013 estimated time schedules for CAT I and II areas were approved. The progress review will be done yearly.

Mr. Mäkinen informed that the project lately has raised awareness in HELCOM about the situation in the south east Baltic. As Poland and Russia have not reported on category 1 and 2 routes. They have the data but have not shared it. There are many tankers and cargo ships in this area and therefore the need for surveying this area is big.

Mr. Mäkinen was not sure whether the project would continue as a Flagship in the EUSBSR and HELCOM but informed that this will be decided upon in two years' time.

2. *Final Surveys for the Baltic Motorways of the Sea (FAMOS)*

Mr. Wallhagen, from the Swedish Maritime Administration, presented the Flagship and informed that the project that Seppo Mäkinen presented was the political platform while FAMOS was in charge of the actual research program. Mr. Wallhagen explained that FAMOS is used as a cooperation project to achieve the goal and added that the speed up re-surveying of major shipping routes and ports, FAMOS, WINMOSS II and STM Validation are all connected.

Mr. Wallhagen informed that the FAMOS project aims at improving safety of navigation in the Baltic Sea by increasing hydrographic survey efficiency. This will enable the participating countries to map the remaining areas of interest for commercial shipping in the Baltic Sea according to the BSHC/HELCOM harmonized re-survey plan. Resurveying of the Baltic Sea with modern technology is expected to bring about a number of advantages for safer and more efficient shipping. In addition, the collected data will also be useful for other maritime applications, such as planning of wind energy or environmental protection. The FAMOS project would help to carry out in practice resurveying of a large share of the remaining areas where resurveying ought to be conducted.

Mr. Wallhagen explained that FAMOS have helped many – especially Baltic – countries in surveying their waters and told that FAMOS work with three keywords. Firstly, Safety. There is a need to survey the Baltic Sea, which is also reflected in the HELCOM declarations. E.g. FAMOS found a big rock near the major route in Kattegat. The area with the rock was surveyed in the 1970s but back then they had not found this rock. Just to illustrate that there is still found crucial things in the Baltic Sea. Secondly, Accuracy. Mr. Wallhagen informed that there today are full see-through models and that these are used for safety but also for under the keel clearance management, as it is tricky to know what is under the ship. To get this image and a better understanding of what is under the keel FAMOS uses vertical positioning through satellite together with horizontal positioning on the seabed. With a better understanding of under keel clearance it will be possible to load the ships more efficient. Thirdly, efficiency. Mr. Wallhagen explained that FAMOS work with actual AIS tracks and optimized routes because the more water you have under the keel the less fuel you use. This is opposite to the keel management mentioned before in relation to loading ships more. The more water under the ship, the less fuel the ship will use, which in the end is better for the environment.

Mr. Wallhagen also informed that the current FAMOS Odin runs until the end of 2018 but that they are thinking about prolonging the project. FAMOS wants to use the data e.g. in cooperation with STM Validation and are actually planning on making a joint FAMOS-STM project in 2019.

3. *Efficient, Safe and Sustainable Traffic at Sea II (EfficienSea 2.0)*

Mr. Siwe, from the Swedish Maritime Administration, presented EfficienSea II, which has been finalized. He informed that the platform will live on for three more years as a Korean project use the platform for their services so the Koreans have ensured the survival of the platform. Arctic web has been taking over by the Norwegian authorities while the Baltic Web will not live on but the idea has been exported to Asia for a Pacific Web. And finally five of the fifteen infrastructure services will live on in STM Validation.

Mr. Siwe added that EfficienSea II hopes that the PAC-team will support sea traffic management as an area/process and that this is supported by FAMOS and STM Validation.

4. *Sea Traffic Management Validation Project (STM Validation)*

Mr. Siwe also presented this Flagship.

He informed that the Sea Traffic Management (STM) aims to form a common standardized information sharing environment for actors in the maritime domain. Built on these standards, the concepts of Voyage Management, Flow Management, Port Collaborative Decision Making (CDM) and SeaSWIM have been identified and Mr. Siwe explained the four. Under Voyage Management, a multitude of services are envisaged improving support to individual ships in both the planning and the executional phases of a voyage. Flow Management concerns services supporting both land organizations and ships in optimizing the overall traffic flow through areas of dense traffic or particular navigational challenges. Port CDM aims at increasing the ability to determine the accuracy of port approaches by and for involved actors by improved sharing of information and collaborative decision making in the process of port calls and departures. Lastly, SeaSWIM ensures an efficient exchange of information between the actors in the maritime domain. Mr. Siwe explained that STM services have a great potential in overcoming many of the challenges of communication and information sharing between actors at sea and on land. Test beds in Northern Europe (Baltic Sea) and in the Mediterranean will engage 300 vessels, 10 ports of different sizes and 3 shore centers.

Mr. Siwe stressed that the STM Validation wishes for the PAC-team to push for IMO-regulation on STM, as it will be global by 2030. The Flagship also wishes the other Steering Committee members to push for policies in EU, IMP and IALA and added that a workshop for the Steering Committee on how to push policy recommendations might be effective and relevant for all Flagships as they are facing the same challenges when it comes to reaching policy level.

5. *WINMOS II*

Ms. Huvitus from the Finnish Transport Agency presented the Flagship.

Ms. Huvitus informed that the Flagship aims to improve the efficiency, safety and environmental performance of winter navigation in the Baltic Sea. The main objectives are to further develop and enhance the maritime winter navigation system and its safety. This shall be done through enhanced cooperation among Baltic Sea states and safeguarding required icebreaking resources for the future, by developing new options as well as improving the old capacity to modern environmental

standards. Ms. Huvitus explained that WINMOS II is linked to the objective "Save the Sea" and the sub-objective "Clean and safe shipping". The project addresses the policy area "Maritime Safety and Security" and the actions "Winter navigation" and "Ensure that crews serving on board vessels are well trained".

The Flagship ends in October 2019 and Ms. Huvitus hoped that the PAC-team would stress the importance of icebreaking at the policy level. There are several challenges with icebreaking e.g. the aging icebreaker fleet, environmental regulations and vessels getting larger. This means that the icebreakers are not big enough to make the routes for e.g. large cargo ships.

Mr. Lappalainen noticed that the PAC-team has to think more about how to influence policy level in the future and concluded that maybe there is no need to think about new projects as much but more on how to influence policy level.

6. *Diving with State Maritime Resources Together in the Baltic (DiveSMART Baltic)*

Ms. Timms from the Swedish Coast Guard presented the Flagship.

She explained that the DiveSMART Baltic is an enlargement and extension of a current national Swedish project entitled DiveSMART. The national project has, following the lessons learned of the Costa Concordia accident, successfully raised the national emergency preparedness within the diving sector. This has been done by mapping and listing competences and technical resources in a database, developing mobilization strategies for competences and resources, developing standard operational procedures for operations and modules for quick transport and rescue and designing table tops and exercises with accelerating complexity.

Ms. Timms informed that the Flagship is ending in 2018 and they are looking at a way to continue. The Flagship would like the PACs to write a letter of support saying that the project is good and worth investing in.

7. *Operational plans and procedures for maritime search and rescue in hazardous and noxious substances (HNS) incidents (ChemSAR)*

Ms, Kirsi Laitio from the University of Turku presented ChemSAR.

Ms. Laitio informed about the latest activities for ChemSAR. In February 2018 they have had their midterm conference, which was a success, and they have also come up with the draft on Standard Operational Procedures (SOP) based on their tests and results. Ms. Laitio also informed about the seminar and exercise ChemSAR was part of, with DiveSMART Baltic, at the 9th EUSBSR Annual Forum on 5 June 2018.

The conclusion from the seminar was, that exercises is important as they help test the products the Flagships produce. In this regard it is valued to have different exercises ranging from table top exercises, bilateral exercises and full scale exercises. Ms. Laitio explained that this has proven to be a good and smooth way to work which Ms. Timms from DiveSMART Baltic agreed on.

Ms. Laitio informed that the live demonstration in Seaplane Harbour in Tallinn was arranged to be audience friendly to show of what the Flagships are doing in reality. The scenario was two ships colliding in a European port causing a barrel with dangerous chemicals to splash into the sea. A Border Guard Patrol vessel arrives to investigate the situation. Experts from the neighboring countries are needed to recover the barrel safely. The neighboring country's authorities are contacted for assistance, and specially trained divers arrive with the neighboring country's coast guard.

Ms. Laitio explained that the demonstration was a practical illustration of the theoretical panel discussion, which had taken place earlier at the Annual Forum's venue. The panel focused on the life-cycle of exercises, from the identification of the problems, to the logistics and evaluation, as well as on how the results of joint exercises can be used efficiently to improve practice.

Furthermore, Ms. Laitio explained that the future for ChemSAR is to start the project platform ResQU2 if the application was to be approved. The platform intends to work at enhancing the durability of learning experiences gained in ChemSAR, HAZARD, DiveSMART Baltic and Mirg-Ex projects on guidelines, operational plans and procedures and exercises related to incidents at sea and in ports. The platform's aim is to disseminate the learning experiences to other rescue operators in different areas, and to professional and decision makers on local, regional, transnational and EU level.

Ms. Laitio also informed about a possible extension stage project for ChemSAR which would increase the impact of the main ChemSAR outcomes and strengthen their utilization and transferability in the Baltic Sea region.

Ms. Laitio also explained why it is important that ChemSAR continuous. Standard procedures take time to develop as there is always something new to learn. On top of this there are different national procedures and equipment so developing standards is not a one size fits all. They have to be flexible.

8. *Strategic and Operational Risk Management for Wintertime Maritime Transportation System (STORMWINDS)*

Mr. Valdez, from Aalto University, presented the Flagship which deals with management of winter transport especially in the northern Baltic Sea, and particularly in regards to oil spills.

Mr. Valdez informed that the Flagship focus on science and policy and works with a policy and operational part. The policy part involved risk analysis, preparedness and response for oil spills in ice, and the operation part involved decision support tools for oil spill combating in ice. In this was STORMWINDS contribute to implement EU maritime policy.

He explained that STORMWINDS had already impacted policy and practice e.g. through several contributions to the HELCOM-coordinated OpenRisk project. STORMWINDS had also had an impact on science through e.g. journals, articles, doctoral theses and contributions to the ICES Working Group on Risks of Maritime Activities in the Baltic Sea.

Mr. Valdez informed that the next steps for STORMWINDS were to ensure research uptake in e.g. HELCOM and IMO, further application and testing of selected risk analysis tools in the OpenRisk workshop in Malmö in October 2018, and operational use of improved SeaTrack Web in complete Baltic Sea.

9. *R-Mode Baltic*

Mr. Stefan Gewies from the German Aerospace Center presented the Flagship, which is the newest to the PA Safe project portfolio. The project works with safe navigation in creating a backup system to the navigation used today. The goal is to have a testbed in 2020 between Sweden, Poland, Germany and Denmark (Bornholm).

The project is 6 months old but especially Finland have shown great interest in the project. At the moment R-Mode is working on raising awareness about the project and the possibilities as many states are thinking about closing their radio frequencies. This will not be food for R-Mode who tries to develop a backup system based on radio frequencies used in a different way. In this regard IALA is important and the organization have shown interest in the technology the Flagship is working with.

Mr. Gewies also mentioned that R-Mode need assistance and support from the PACs and the Steering Committee in order to find platforms for the projects (presentations, workshops, exhibitions), help to raise awareness about the project through communication and to come into contact with maritime stakeholders etc.

Hereafter Mr. Lappalainen thanked for all the presentations and concluded the agenda item on Flagships. The conclusion was that the Flagships are doing well and providing good results. The challenge is to reach policy level and for this the PACs are needed. Ms. Allermann mentioned that the new Flagship process and project platforms might have it easier in reaching and influencing policy level.

8) Maritime activities in the Baltic Sea assessed in new report

Mr. Lappalainen explained that the HELCOM released an assessment of maritime activities in the Baltic Sea region covering distribution of activities at sea, developments over time, related environmental issues as well as future perspectives and scenarios and that a large part of the report was dedicated to maritime traffic.

The Steering Committee was invited to discuss the document and the further process.

Mr. Lappalainen started the discussion with some comments to the report. Firstly, he stressed that the report had shown an increase in the number of maritime accidents as also mentioned by Cilia Sonne Allermann the previous evening. Mr. Lappalainen explained that this was due to a new way of measuring accidents and not a real increase. Nonetheless, this had been used to say that e.g. PA Safe was not fulfilling the target of reducing maritime accidents. Ms. Allermann added that this was the kind of link that the PACs would like to avoid because such a target was not indicative of the work being done by the PACs and the Steering Committee.

Mr. Lappalainen informed that the report also mentioned some of the Flagships under PA Safe e.g. STM and speed-up re surveys, which was positive.

Mr. Pavlovics informed of the database, EMCIP, which has a very holistic approach and might be a good source when measuring among others maritime accidents. EMCIP belongs to the European Commission and is run by EMSA and the authorities should have access to this database.

9) The joint capacity building workshop 4 and 5 April 2018

Ms. Allermann shortly explained what the workshop had been about. PA Safe and PA Ship had organized a joint capacity building workshop – "The Baltic Sea Region – an interconnected system". The workshop was held in Copenhagen on 4 and 5 April 2018 and facilitated by HA Capacity.

Both Steering Committees from PA Safe and PA Ship had been invited to the workshop but unfortunately only one Steering Committee country member had participated. Thankfully, many of the Flagships from both Policy Areas had been present and participated actively. The importance of attendance from both countries and Flagships to meetings and workshops throughout the year was stressed.

Ms. Allermann explained that the PACs are looking into the new Flagship concept moving from being only projects to being processes, as an attempt to be more pro-active and not only reactive as today. However, for this to happen Ms. Allermann stressed the need for support from the Steering Committee. Also, there is a need for a common understanding which calls for everyone to participate and support the further work. As a result of a low number of participants from country members in the Steering Committee the overall concept and the main outcomes from the workshop would have to be re-presented to the rest of the Steering Committee in some way.

10) Any other business

Ms. Allermann informed that the next Steering Committee meeting will be held in week 45 (5-9 November). The Steering Committee country members will receive a Doodle where they will be asked to choose the day(s) that they will be able to participate during that week. Based on this poll the exact day(s) will be chosen.

Hereafter, Mr. Lappalainen then asked the Steering Committee members to share their thoughts on the three presentations from yesterday's informal meeting regarding the new Flagship concept and the revision of the EUSBSR Action Plan through a tour de table.

Ms. Timms mentioned that a focus area could be "To improve emergency and crisis preparedness and response" encompassing the Flagships working with this area as it had not been on the list of future focus areas showed last night. This list of focus areas was developed with the Steering Committee in Brussels in May 2017 and agreed upon at the following Steering Committee meeting in November 2017 in Gdynia. Ms. Allermann ensured that the list was not final and more areas could be added if the Steering Committee approved.

Ms. Ramos fully agreed on the future focus areas and on adding the preparedness and response that Else Timms had mentioned. Ms. Ramos believed that PA Safe is on the right path but highlighted

that enhancing collaboration between PAs and HAs should not be forgotten e.g. in relation to education, digital shipping, cybersecurity and navigation. PACs should look for synergies with other PAs and HAs and take these into account.

Mr. Wallhagen suggested that autonomy is part of digitalization in his opinion and therefore might not need its own heading in the future focus areas.

Mr. Siwe supported Magnus Wallhagen and added that he, furthermore, supported the idea of working closer with other PAs and found it strange that Flagships had to choose only one PA when applying for Flagship status. Moreover, Mr. Siwe encouraged the PACs to talk to each national maritime authority – a tour de Baltic Sea – in order to explain about the EUSBSR (including the upcoming revision), the Policy Area as such and the Flagship. In this way authorities might be more eager to participate and even become Flagship leaders.

Mr. Pavlovics, from the Transport Accident Investigation Bureau, Latvia, stressed that there was a need for emphasizing emergency preparedness and response and that the focus should be on reality and the goal of preventing maritime accidents and not on high tech solutions. He also highlighted the importance of keeping in mind that the majority of accidents happens on ships from non-Baltic countries. And additional to this the increase in cruise ships from non-Baltic countries should also be kept in mind. Some of these ships are not even covered by IMO legislation e.g. in connection to cork conditions which was why these things were the ones PA Safe should focus on. Mr. Pavlovics added that he agreed that crisis management, as Else Timms had brought up, also had to be included.

Mr. Ivars Gaveika, from the Transport Accident Investigation Bureau, Latvia, thanked for the Flagship presentations which he had found interesting and also highlighted the good exchange of experience that had been the previous day with the presentations and at today's meeting.

Mr. David Niinepuu from the Estonian Maritime Administration supported the idea of moving towards a process approach. He also mentioned in connection to digitalization and paperless shipping, that the industry would be supportive if PA Safe could show them that this development would save them money. Furthermore, he added that the informal meeting yesterday was important and had given food for thought regarding indicators and that he supported working further on this.

Ms. Huvitus also supported the idea of Flagships being processes as projects often fit under more than just one PA. A process might include an overall PA and related PAs.

Mr. Mäkinen supported the focus on digitalization and standards, however, he stressed that they take a long time to develop. In connection to the process approach he would like to see the added value of the process as the project produce concrete results to fulfill a concreate goal. But if the processes easier influence policy it might be a good development.

Mr. Valdez found it interesting to focus on digitalization. However, he also agreed with Aleksandrs Pavlovics that accidents cannot be forgotten as one accident is enough to wipe out years of research and progress. Furthermore, he found it interesting if one Flagship under the new concept could focus on maritime competences (identified as a future focus area in Brussels) including further education of already educated seafarers to keep them up to date on the development within digitalization and the like. This was also due to a recent study showing that 50 % on the maritime

educations were “new” students while the other 50 % was already educated personel looking to maintain their skills.

Ms. Laitio agreed with Ms. Timms’ point in including crisis management into the future focus areas and she agreed with Mr. Mäkinen regarding the new processes having to produce actual results. Ms. Laitio also stressed that it is important not to forget the human factor in the digital world adding that the need for better education, safety instructions etc. will still be present as humans are part of the process, also when it comes to digitalization.

Mr. Gewies was somewhat sceptic regarding the new Flagship concept as the innovation in the projects might disappear with the process approach as only a few organizations have the capacity to lead these processes in the future. However, he saw it as a good idea to bring projects together to create added value.

Mr. Ots thanked for the Steering Committee having the meeting at the facilities of the Estonian Maritime Administration.

Mr. Lappalainen concluded the meeting by thanking everyone for the active participation and for their valuable input.