



INSPIRE

Infrastructure for Spatial Information in Europe

MIWP Action 2.2 “Roadmap for priority-driven implementation”

MIG mini-Workshop

Type	Workshop background document
Creator	DG ENV
Date/status/version	27-03-2022 /DRAFT/ version 0.1
Addressee	MIG
Identifier	[DOC4]
Description	Context-setter for the MIG mini-workshop on a “Roadmap for priority-driven implementation”.

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

- Take note of the document;
- Participate in the workshop survey;

Note: This document does not necessarily represent the official, formal position of any of the partners. To the extent that the European Commission's services provided input to this technical document, such input does not necessarily reflect the views of the European Commission and its services or the European Environment Agency. This document is, in parts, intended to facilitate the implementation of Directive 2007/2/EC and is not legally binding. Any authoritative reading of the law should only be derived from Directive 2007/2/EC itself and other applicable legal texts or principles such as the related Implementing Rules. Only the Court of Justice of the European Union is competent to authoritatively interpret Union legislation.

1 Context

The action 2.2 “Roadmap for priority-driven implementation” subgroup has decided in his last meeting that it would be appropriate to seek the full MIG’s view, support and validation on the priority issues that have been identified, the views that have been formulated and the possible actions that the subgroup might further pursue. An interactive workshop was proposed as the best instrument to get a more holistic view from all countries in view of the current implementation issues and the upcoming revision of the INSPIRE Directive. A shared view/consensus on should allow us to steer our current implementation effort to a more streamlined and feasible implementation of the INSPIRE Directive across Europe and provide valuable input for a possible review of the Directive.

In its first and second meeting the subgroup abandoned the principle of maturity levels in favour of working on identified priority issues. The following four major priority issues were identified and agreed:

1. **National priorities**, experiences and approaches to make INSPIRE implementation more user-driven and better fit for common needs.
2. **Compliance & Check** e.g. strengthen the compliance promotion effort and quality check on a common agreed set of priority data to be harmonised
3. **Improve the Indicator framework** e.g. make benefits/use of INSPIRE more visible and integrate in politically more important indicator frameworks (e.g. DESI).
4. **Master guidance** e.g. provide legal clarity on data priorities and the flexibility in the legal framework regarding data harmonisation priorities.

Objective for the subgroup is to deliver a report after summer, to be presented at the MIG for approval and to be used to define concrete actions and as input for the INSPIRE impact assessment.

2 Problem statement

Certain aspects of the implementation of the INSPIRE Directive (e.g. harmonization of all data in its scope, technical over-specification) are still considered as cumbersome or even disproportionate. The broad spatial data scope of the Directive and the high level definition of the data scope through its 34 themes has resulted in a diversified and non-comparable offering across Member States. The overall implementation would benefit from clear common data priorities that would allow developing a common set of high value spatial data serving shared information needs. Furthermore, implementers are seeking more clarity on the compliance of their solutions both with the technical guidelines as the legal framework and would welcome more visibility of the added value and benefits of the Directive and the tangible results at EU level (e.g. existing pan-European coverages).

The envisaged common landing zone should address these issues whilst being realised in compliance with the existing legal provisions documented in the INSPIRE Directive and its implementing regulations. Under Action 2.1 a commonly agreed usage-driven prioritisation of the data scope will be pursued. This action will build on this clear data prioritisation to develop specific actions to remediate the main concerns under the current legal framework or inform the impact assessment for the revision of the INSPIRE Directive.

3 Objectives of the workshop

This MIG mini-workshop is organized to have an exchange of views with all countries on the possible

priority issues to be addressed for the further implementation of the INSPIRE Directive that have been identified by the subgroup of action 2.2. The input gathered from the MIG will contribute to validating and complementing the already identified issues to steer the subgroup activities and inform the impact assessment for the revision of the INSPIRE Directive.

4 Workshop survey

1. The action 2.2 subgroup has already identified the below priority issues. Could you indicate how important these priority issues are for you? (1 star = no importance – 5 stars = high importance)
 - a. **National priorities**, experiences and approaches to make INSPIRE implementation more user-driven and better fit for common needs.
 - b. **Compliance & Check** e.g. strengthen the compliance promotion effort and quality check on a common agreed set of priority data to be harmonised
 - c. **Improve the Indicator framework** e.g. make benefits/use of INSPIRE more visible and integrate in politically more important indicator frameworks (e.g. DESI).
 - d. **Master guidance** e.g. provide legal clarity on data priorities and the flexibility in the legal framework regarding data harmonisation priorities.

2. To what degree would you agree to the following statements: (1 star = I do not agree – 5 stars = I fully agree)
 - a. The main driver for setting data priorities should be the existing reporting obligations under the environmental acquis.
 - b. We should clarify the interaction with the Open Data Directive and more specific the High Value Data sets.
 - c. Legal clarity e.g. data harmonisation – is it really needed to harmonise all data? We should further explore if we can use the legal framework to prioritise certain data sets for harmonisation. It is important to back up the work on e.g. priority data sets with legal guidance to make sure the selection has a legal foundation and cannot be come back on later.
 - d. The prioritisation of data to be harmonised should be user- and usage-driven. This principle should be enshrined in future legislation as the corner stone for the development of a set of pan-EU coverages that will provide a common foundation for a European base map (road networks, addresses, administrative boundaries, orthophotos, elevation models ...).
 - e. We should add “check” to compliance. There should be a number of prioritised data sets that are harmonised across EU. There should be an EU authority that checks for these data sets who has not delivered and if provided data is harmonised, has the expected quality and is compliant or not. This to help MS to reach better compliance, develop useable pan-EU data sets and avoid that data providers are losing motivation when putting all the effort in harmonising and seeing others are not coming through.
 - f. A Geospatial Code of Practice should be developed to ensure minimum quality requirements.
 - g. A central body or knowledge centre on geographical information is needed to help MS to harmonise, reorganise their data or at least build a common capacity and competence that helps to stitch all data from all MS together in a seamless way.

- h. To better communicate and marketing the possible benefits of the INSPIRE Directive to management, policy makers and data users, existing pan-European data sets should be made visible and accessible in a central location.
- i. The INSPIRE geoportal is focussing on MS data. We should bring in EMODnet, EEA, ESTAT data. Available pan-EU data at EU level should be visible to promote their use and motivate the data providers by showing that the data is being reused for developing pan-EU data sets. An overview map with what is available where and direct visualisation/download of the actual data.
- j. Compliance is the priority. The focus is to avoid infringements with minimal effort. There is a high focus on the DESI framework. Linking LIFO with DESI would give INSPIRE more political visibility and put INSPIRE as a higher priority. We should explore if we can link LIFO with DESI. LIFO seems a good framework to make the added value of spatial data services for society visible.
- k. Some implementers only look at the technical guidelines and partially implement them without knowing the legal background and obligations. When they only partially implement the guidelines, they risk falling short on their legal obligations. Lack of knowledge of the legal framework in many cases leads to uncertainty of legal compliance. MS should get better insight in their compliance. Implementers should have legal certainty that what they are implementing is not only compliant with technical guidelines but also legally compliant. Practical examples of fully compliant data, services and metadata would be very helpful as master guidance.
- l. The metadata guidelines and the EC geoportal should be extended with the profile for Applications to be able to present the content of the metadata about apps that make use of the data.
- m. Compliance promotion and enforcement should be strengthened.
- n. We should develop shared examples to demonstrate how data can be easily used and deployed in practice (e.g. data analytics). Visualize complex topics through data in an understandable way for politicians and citizens.
- o. We should improve the exchange of good practices, implementation examples, successes and added value so this can be used as arguments/defensives for the implementation of INSPIRE and data sharing in general at national level.
- p. Once only. A Member State should always be able to reuse data made already available in the INSPIRE infrastructure when asked to provide this data to the European Commission or an EU institute.

This survey is accessible in [EUSurvey](#). You are kindly requested to take the survey in preparation of this MIG mini-workshop. To give the Commission the opportunity to process the survey results as input for the workshop, we would ask you to complete the survey by Wednesday 30 March 18:00.

5 Workshop organisation (60')

(20') Introduction, presentation of survey results and warm-up for the brainstorm

(30') Brainstorm on the proposed prioritisation criteria and possible actions using an online interactivity tool.

(10') Conclusions and way ahead