



INSPIRE

Infrastructure for Spatial Information in Europe

Outcome of written procedures following the 12th INSPIRE Committee and 6th INSPIRE MIG meetings

Type	Information document
Creator	DG ENV
Date/status/version	22/11/2017 / FINAL
Addressee	MIG
Identifier	MIG/7/2017/DOC12
Description	Outcome of written procedures regarding the review of the implementing rules following the 12th INSPIRE Committee and the revised mandate of MIWP action 2016.3 following the 6th INSPIRE MIG.

Requested actions: The members of the MIG are invited to:

- Take note of the document.

Written Procedures

Contents

Written Procedures.....	2
1. 12th INSPIRE Committee - written procedure on the review of implementing rules.....	2
1.1 Result of the written procedure regarding the review of the implementing rules following the 12th INSPIRE Committee	4
2. 6th meeting of the MIG - written procedure on revised mandate for MIWP 2016.3	9
2.1 Result of the written procedure regarding the revised mandate of MIWP action 2016.3 following the 6th INSPIRE MIG.	9

1. 12th INSPIRE Committee - written procedure on the review of implementing rules

As an outcome of the discussion on the possible review of some of the implementing rules in the INSPIRE Committee it was agreed to consult the MIG in a written procedure.

Extract from the 12th Committee meeting draft Summary Record: *"The Chair asked Member States that had not yet developed a coordinated opinion on the presented document to continue their internal consultations and inform the Commission (via the Chair) in writing of any opposition to the proposed revisions of Commission Decision 2009/442/EC and Commission Regulation (EU) No 1089/2010 by 15 September 2017. This written procedure will give all Member States, including the ones that were not represented in the meeting, the opportunity to prepare and share their coordinated views on the presented proposal. If Member States do not reply by the deadline, the Chair will assume their overall consent on the direction of the future work as indicated in the document (DOC3).*

In addition, this document will be shared with the INSPIRE Maintenance and Implementation expert Group (MIG) to receive expert input from this working group. Committee Members are expected to coordinate with their MIG experts and provide their coordinated views to COM by 15 September 2017."

MIG members were kindly invited to coordinate with their Committee counterpart and by 15 September 2017 express their support for:

- changes to the selected implementing rules in general (Commission Decision 2009/442/EC, Commission Regulation (EU) No 1089/ 2010),
- the more detailed change proposals as presented at the Committee and documented in the attached document.

1.1 Result of the written procedure regarding the review of the implementing rules following the 12th INSPIRE Committee

Possible revision of Commission Regulation (EU) No 1089/2010 and its amendments on interoperability					Revision of Commission Decision 2009/442/EC implementing Directive 2007/2/EC (INSPIRE) as regards monitoring and reporting					
MS	For	Against	Abst	Silent Consent	Comments	For	Against	Abst	Silent Consent	Comments
Votes	11	2		15	<p>26 MS support the COM proposal. BE does not support any change to the Interop IR, FR first want to see the evidence presented of any expected benefit resulting from reviewing the IR.</p> <p>Conclusion: A large majority of 26 MS supports changes to the Interop IR with limited impact.</p>	13			15	<p>The proposed changes to the Reporting Decision are unanimously supported by the MS.</p>

AT	X				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Austria welcomes the efforts done in action 2016.1 and especially the effective project management for this activity and keeping the timeframe. 2. Austria supports simplifications and becoming more pragmatic in the INSPIRE implementation. 3. Action 1: Austria supports the “Master Guidelines” as a non legally binding information framework. We are actually preparing “Austrian Master Guidelines” for the stakeholders within the “Assistenzstelle Österreich”: https://assistenzstelle.inspire.gv.at/ 4. Action 2: Austria supports alternative simplified schemas and looks forward to the outcome of this activity. Actually we are observing discrepancies, for example in Annex III.12 natural risk zones among others. 5. Action 3: Austria supports action 3, open source client software is urgently needed for complex gml. We are evaluating Geopackage (OGC standard) and Spatial Lite for complex schemas. These databases are for exchange and archiving of geoinformation. 6. Doc.4: Austria welcomes a more automatic monitoring and reporting on the basis of existing INSPIRE infrastructure components. 	X				
BE		X			It seems to us that the problem is mainly at a technical level. Consequently, we do not support a revision of the interoperability IRs at this stage of the implementation of the Directive to maintain stability in the current implementation and the 2020 targets.	X				
BG				X					X	
CY				X					X	
CZ				X					X	

DK				X	We do not consider Part 3a of the DOC 3 as a concrete proposal for revision of the Commission Regulation (EU) No 1089/ 2010. We find it more as a collection of issues to consider in regards to bringing INSPIRE closer to “fit for purpose” as some of the items have nothing to do with the above mentioned IR. Since there is no concrete proposal for changes to the IR it is difficult to give a view for or against.				X	
DE	X				Condition: There are no basic concerns changing the Commission Regulation (EU) 1089/2010 as proposed as long as the proposals do not have any negative impacts on the implementing efforts and resulting costs, i.e. increase the efforts and associated costs of member states for implementing INSPIRE regulations.	X				
EE				X					X	
FI	X				In summary, Finland prefers that existing flexibilities in legislation and technical guidance level development are considered as the primary method for streamlining INSPIRE implementation. Amending IR 1089/2010 related to Annex III data themes is supported if no other feasible option can be discovered with reasonable effort.	X				
IE				X					X	
EL				X					X	
ES	X					X				
FR		X			The French position is that the working groups must first provide evidence to the Committee, as a first step, of the benefits for the public authorities of the Member States of a revision of the Regulation 1089/2010 . The Committee would then be in a position to give a opinion on the need to launch the revision of the Regulation n°1089/2010.	X				
HR				X					X	
IT				X					X	
LV	X					X				

LT				X					X	
LU				X					X	
HU				X					X	
MT	X				We would like to highlight that any changes to the Implementing Rules should have minimal impact on already conformant datasets and services as not to incur additional cost to align to new regulations.	X				
NL	X					X				
PL	X					X				
PT	X					X				
RO	X				<p>Romania supports the revision, as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To produce effects at the level of the Member States in order to adopt as relaxed data policies as possible; 2. Simplification of spatial data services by considering principles that make them easier to use, adoption of standards with a demonstrated maturity level and development of a set of appropriate technical guidelines; 3. Simplification of data schemes in order to avoid delays in ensuring the compliance of data sets, under the circumstances that they are due in some cases to the lack of pan-European coding systems or conventions. <p>In conclusion, Romania considers that in order to support the amendment of Commission Regulation (EU) no. 1089/2010, the draft amendment of Regulation should be submitted in order to see what the expected effects are.</p>	X				

SE	X				Sweden would also like to stress the issue of reusing specifications and encodings from other, already existing initiatives, which already have well developed standards and specifications within their respective domain. Examples are for instance OneGeology, TN-ITS, EFFIS, etc. The importance of reusing the results from the work already carried out within these initiatives are not well indicated in the document.	X				
SI				X					X	
SK				X					X	
UK				X					X	

2. 6th meeting of the MIG - written procedure on revised mandate for MIWP 2016.3

As an outcome of the discussion on MIWP action 2016.3 "Validation & conformity" in the 6th meeting of the MIG it was agreed to consult the MIG in a written procedure after a final round of comments.

Extract from the 6th MIG meeting draft Summary: *"The MIG is invited to send written comments on DOC5 by end of July 2017. In August the Commission will provide an updated document to the MIG for written procedure with deadline in September. The scope of the written procedure will be to endorse the new mandate and close MIWP action 2016.3."*

2.1 Result of the written procedure regarding the revised mandate of MIWP action 2016.3 following the 6th INSPIRE MIG.

MS	For	Against	Abstention	Silent Consent	Comments
Votes	3	0	0	25	The MIG approved the closure of action 2016.3 and the revised mandate unanimously.
AT				X	
BE				X	
BG				X	
CY				X	
CZ				X	
DK				X	
DE	X				
EE				X	
FI				X	
IE				X	
EL				X	

ES	X				We would only like to stress the relevance of using a unique validator in the INSPIRE Geoportal, ATS Validator and the dashboard for reporting.
FR				X	
HR				X	
IT				X	
LV				X	
LT				X	
LU				X	
HU				X	
MT				X	
NL				X	
PL	X				
PT				X	
RO				X	
SE				X	
SI				X	
SK				X	
UK				X	