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# Meeting proceedings

ENV presented the action mandate, relevant results from the INSPIRE evaluation and the outcome of a MIG mini-workshop on harmonised and non-harmonised (as-is) data as input and boundary conditions for the work of this subgroup. This was taken as the base for a proposal for an inception subgroup work programme that was also presented to the subgroup for discussion.

**Discussion**

* The subgroup members agreed to a meeting frequency of once a month on the last Monday of the month to take stock and use dedicated half day workshops when needed with the target to close the action begin Q4 2022 with a report of subgroup activities with action proposals to the MIG.
* To get the most out of the exercise it was considered essential to not only capture EU-level priorities but also Member State priorities.
* Maturity levels can be anticipated in different ways. We should avoid raising the implementation complexity even further by introducing additional levels of compliancy.
* We should reflect on how to better support national implementations / infrastructures and avoid harmonisation to models that have no use at national level.
* To stay closer to what is already available we should focus on simplifying what is already on the table, being as pragmatic as possible e.g. consider transformations on as-is data.
* A lot of countries are trying to get better outcomes for the monitoring. Validation criteria are very strict. Two main technology stacks (GeoNetwork and ESRI) are not able to provide 100% INSPIRE compliant metadata or network services. Some reported compliance issues in the validator cannot be fixed with this software. The only way forward is marking these metadata and services as compliant despite the remaining errors that are raised by the validator. We should try to focus with this group on these practical issues that can address the frustration of people trying to implement INSPIRE.
* Maturity levels can go in different directions. From a pan-European perspective the main concern is completeness and connectivity of coverage, bringing in the discussion on data quality and scale. Starting with the essentials: Is the data set available? Is the data set accessible?
* Data availability and accessibility was identified as an important issue to look in to. For the moment no single data set has been made available with EU coverage according INSPIRE requirements (e.g. methane, meteorological … under ac/mf theme).
* It would be good to work on topics topics that can be helpful to provide recommendations on how legal text has to be interpreted and understood in practical life.
* The notion of priority setting / maturity depends on the perspective one has. The group could collect these different criteria, cluster them and identify if we cannot come up with something that will suit us all better than what we currently have.
* In several countries, it is agreed and decided what to declare to the Commission, make metadata and harmonise. The list of priority data sets has provided additional guidance in this process. In national information systems and geoportals there is much more data available that in general is not considered to be relevant for INSPIRE. Work on improving data quality is an ongoing, but costly and slow process.
* In general the political level is less concerned with their INSPIRE performance than with their “Digital Economy and Society Index” (DESI) ranking. The DESI indicators could be a leverage to make INSPIRE prominent.
* It was raised INSPIRE has very weak indicators on the usage of the infrastructure making it very difficult to make the usage of the infrastructure visible. The only relevant information on usage is the text in the country fiches (when supplied) on how INSPIRE infrastructure is being used. This group could reflect on how this could be improved, proposing some ideas to the revision of the Directive.

# Conclusions/actions

* There is certainly a need to further gather information on experiences, approaches and national data priorities to complement EU level priorities to come to a feasible and targeted implementation that we can define as a common ground. **All subgroup members are invited to share their perspectives on data prioritisation, issues to be addressed to make the implementation more feasible and support already existing national infrastructures (see also Annex 1).**
* How to make sure public administrations share their spatial data and do not hide it or refuse to share?
  + Make sure that we support the use of national infrastructures as much as possible to leverage the publication of richer national data sets that are used for national use cases and to increase relevance for national and regional use cases.
  + Minimize compliance issues of too strict validation of non-binding technical rules.
  + …
* ENV to share the initial MIWP Action 2016.1 report as reference material.
* A one-hour meeting is too short, one hour and a half should be a better fit.
* ENV to draft minutes and an updated skeleton for a subgroup work programme.
* Some members were not able to participate in the Teams meeting due to strict access policies imposed by the Commission. For next meetings WebEx or a Teams meeting hosted by EEA should be considered as a better option.
* Setup Action page on GitHub (ENV)

# Next meeting

The 2nd meeting of the subgroup was tentatively scheduled as an online meeting for 31 January 2022 14:00 – 15:30. The meeting will be organised as a WebEx meeting by ENV or a Microsoft Teams meeting by EEA to avoid connection issues.

# Annex – Updated Work Programme for review by subgroup members

Inception Work Programme

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Phase** | **Task** | **Deadline (indicative)** |
| 1 | Task 1: Identifying the flexibilities of the legal framework, building on previous simplification efforts. Gather information on national experiences, approaches and data priorities to complement EU level priorities. List criteria (and their drivers) for prioritisation. | 28 February 2022 |
| 1 | Task 2: Develop recommendations for data priorities and implementation to come to a feasible and targeted implementation that supports the prioritisation and that we can define as common ground. | 28 February 2022 |
| 1 | Task 3: Impact assessment of the proposals/recommendations on existing and future implementation. | 28 March 2022 (report for MIG) |
| 2 | Task 4: Where relevant, promote existing or develop new good practices to support a common understanding of the legal obligations and facilitate a common implementation. Pilot the good practices. | 30 Mai 2022 – 26 September 2022 |
| 3 | Task 5: Draft guidance (legal, political, technical) on application of maturity levels. | 26 September 2022 |
| 1-2-3 | Task 6: Gather recommendations for future improvements to the legal framework | Continuous |

Inception Work Programme – Phase 1

* Phase 1: recommendations for data priorities and implementation to come to a feasible and targeted implementation that we can define as common ground

|  |
| --- |
| Task 1: Identifying the flexibilities of the legal framework, building on previous simplification efforts. Gather information on national experiences, approaches and data priorities to complement EU level priorities. List criteria (and their drivers) for prioritisation. |
| Task 2: Develop recommendations for data priorities and implementation to come to a feasible and targeted implementation that supports the prioritisation and that we can define as common ground. |
| Task 3: Impact assessment of the proposals/recommendations on existing and future implementation. |