



DJIBOUTI CODE OF CONDUCT/JEDDAH AMENDMENT

WG1 SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF STRATEGY AND ROADMAP FOR ENHANCEMENT OF THE DCOC/JA INFORMATION SHARING NETWORK. MEETING NO. 2

Virtual via Zoom at 14:00hrs EAT

Wednesday 13th October 2021

Record of the Meeting

1. The International Maritime Organization (hereinafter referred to as "IMO"), pursuant to the request of Signatory States to the Code of conduct concerning the repression of piracy and armed robbery against ships in the western Indian Ocean and the Gulf of Aden (the Djibouti Code of conduct), the Signatory States to the Jeddah Amendment to the Djibouti Code of Conduct, 2017 (hereinafter referred to as "the Jeddah Amendment"), and States eligible to sign these instruments (hereinafter referred to collectively as "Participants"), convened a meeting of the DCOC Working Group 1 (WG1) sub-committee on the development of Strategy and roadmap for the enhancement of the Information Sharing Network, Jeddah Amendment to the Djibouti Code of Conduct (DCoC(JA)) 2017, was held virtually, via ZOOM, on Wednesday 13th October 2021.

2. The meeting was chaired by Brigadier Loonena Naisho, Director General, Kenya Coast Guard Service, and the Chair of WG1. He began by welcoming the participants present and gave an opportunity for everyone to introduce themselves. The following attended the meeting:

KENYA - Chair of WG 1

MADAGASCAR – Deputy Chair of WG 1

SEYCHELLES – Sub- Committee Member

TANZANIA- Sub-Committee Member

YEMEN - Sub- Committee Member

MDA Experts and interested parties from the following Countries and International Organizations:

United Kingdom USA EU CRIMARIO and the Secretariat - IMO

The full list of participants is attached as **Annex A**.

Objective

3. The aim of the meeting was to have the IMO Consultant share with the Sub-Committee members the ISN Strategy and Roadmap for enhancement of the ISN as agreed in the sub-committee's inaugural meeting held on 19th August 2021. MDA Experts had also been invited to share their views on the ISN Strategy and Roadmap for the enhancement of



the ISN, for possible adoption by the sub-committee in the draft with the intention that the revised draft be submitted to the full WG 1 at its next meeting.

Opening Remarks

4. Mr. Peter Adams (Head of Maritime Security Section, IMO) in his opening remarks commended the efforts of the sub-committee for their commitment and reiterated the support of IMO in working with the DCoC/JA Signatory States. Sub-committee members were encouraged to share their input on the IMO Consultant's work as it is the Signatory States' document for their use and mutual benefit with an aim of creating a robust framework for Information Sharing. The opening remarks are attached as Annex B.

Agenda

5. The meeting adopted the agenda that had been circulated prior to the meeting. The agenda is attached as **Annex C**.

Presentation of the draft Information Sharing Network (ISN) Strategy and MDA Roadmap

6. The IMO Consultant Ms Maisie Pigeon shared the draft ISN Strategy and Roadmap for enhancement of the ISN which had various strategies for review by the Sub- Committee. Ms. Pigeon noted she developed the draft based on interviews and with experts and opensource research. The draft ISN Strategy had the following content in brief:

- Mission statement;
- Vision statement;
- Assumptions in the draft including: The process may take time; Signatory States will need government approvals and political goodwill to prioritize maritime security; progress is progress and progress begets progress; not all information needs to be shared; and it is up to the Signatory States to choose which information to be shared and how.
- Strategies recommended:
 - ✓ Establish and operationalise National Maritime Information Sharing Centres (NMISCs) in Signatory States;
 - ✓ Maximise regional information sharing centres by developing clear protocols for sharing information; and
 - ✓ Continue evolving the Information Sharing Network which shares information with a wide distribution list.
- Recommended Next Steps:
 - ✓ Establishment of National Maritime Security Committees (NSMCs);
 - ✓ NMISC self-assessment by each Signatory State;
 - ✓ Engage regional centres for joint exercises and operations to build trust and rapport between actors;



- ✓ Standard Operating procedures for sharing information; and
- ✓ Signatory States identify what information to share and how to share it.

7. The initial draft ISN Strategy and RoadMap for enhancement of the ISN is attached as **Annex D**.

Input from Maritime Domain Experts

8. Mr Richard Morris (Royal Navy MDA Expert, UK) began by thanking Ms. Pigeon for the good draft. The assumptions needed to be included in the ISN Strategy and Road Map for enhancement of the ISN as they are key in ensuring ownership of the process and driving it forward amidst stove piped and department bureaucracy that may be faced in the Signatory States. It is important to have success stories as this will build trust both nationally and regionally. Through the WG, the UK encouraged the Implementing Partners with expertise to offer capacity building in ISN and MDA and they should be included to assist the Signatory States accordingly. Signatory States should find opportunities to share and build trust through bilateral visits, conducting exercises and sharing operational success. It is essential to share best practises and find a way of exposing that to give the Signatory States confidence. It is also good to look at what has not worked as this may help others not make the same mistakes. Case studies from partners and stakeholders where they have achieved operational success may also be a useful way of building trust.

9. Mr Martin Cauchi-Inglott (EU CRIMARIO) noted that the document is workable and that he associates himself with the comments shared by Mr. Morris. The main question is how the Information Sharing will work. EU CRIMARIO recommend a co-platform which can provide autonomy for the Signatory States. This co-platform should have other linked platforms to provide data analysis.

10. Mr. Andrew Clarke (IMO) stressed that it was important for this work-stream to be linked with the work-stream under WG 2 to establish National Maritime Security Committee structures. A sub-committee of the National Committee should have responsibility for oversight of the capability, effectiveness, and business plan of the NMISC, and for ensuring the data it provides is used to help develop the National Maritime Security Risk Register and to help inform national maritime security policy development and decision making.

11. Mr. TJ Porter (USA) reiterated that when building trust, it is important to include both private and public participants. There is a need to build some incentives in encouraging the stakeholders to take care of their Blue Economy and show how maritime security enhancement supports the people's entire economic goodwill. A copy of the US capability matrix will be sent to Ms. Pigeon for comparison in developing a Capability Matrix for DCoC Signatory States.

Input from Sub-Committee Members

12. Mr. Jean Emond Randriainana (Madagascar) noted that they experienced all these challenges as mentioned in the presentations. The Regional Fusion Centre (RFC) is operational and was set up in 2016. It has a multi-agency approach with 13 ministries involved in the maritime spectrum activities. Through the MASE Program they have established a Regional Maritime Information Fusion Centre (RMIFC) where they have the 6



International Liaison Officers present at the Regional Centre, and have had great successes so far with information sent on either a daily or weekly basis.

13. Based on the above, the draft is adequate in terms of roadmap and priorities and highlights the Information Sharing Centres (ISCs) and engagement with existing centres and networks and international networks that may be exploited along with the DCoC framework.

14. There were two key points to highlight:

- The need to capitalise on what is already existing both at national and regional Level. DCoC should engage with what is already in place and this is in the proposed ISN Strategy and Roadmap for enhancement of the ISN draft. It is important to understand how we can interlink DCoC with the 2 Regional Centres of Madagascar and Seychelles; and
- Use of the systems that are already in place and the need to use these systems rather than create new systems altogether.

15. Madagascar is ready to share experience as they went through the challenges of building trust, developing tools used, legal background, setting Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) amongst others.

16. Captain Joachim Valmont (Seychelles) began by noting that Seychelles has established its National Maritime Information Sharing Centre (NMISC) and would concur with Madagascar's comments. It is important to understand how many DCoC Signatory States have established their NMISCs as this is the basis of this work and will provide a clear direction. They can provide their experience on the roadmap Seychelles took in developing their Centre.

17. Mr. Mohammed Almajashi (Yemen) began by thanking Ms. Pigeon for the good presentation. It is true that trust is key in Information Sharing. It was good to see from the proposed strategies the block arrangement of National, Regional, and International as everything begins from the National level.

18. It was noted that for countries who cannot share information nationally, there is a need for SOPs to share information which will include a multi-agency approach and the platforms for sharing the information and how to incorporate Liaison officers. Regional Level SOPs are also required to understand what information to share, how to share it and with who. We must note that various maritime threats have various information sharing protocols which must be adhered to and formulated if not already in place in terms of sharing with third parties. It is also important to inquire how to utilize resources using the embarked officers to facilitate operations within the DCoC framework through sharing equipment and undertake joint operations separately with English Speaking countries and non-English-speaking countries and additional operations also with both English and non-English speaking countries together. Yemen also agreed to the idea of operational success as it will build trust within Signatory States.

19. Ms Joyce Awino (Kenya) noted that having reviewed the strategy Kenya's input is as follows:



- **Under strategy 1:** At the National level, there is a need for a roadmap on how establishment of NMISCs can be fast tracked in member states and also the need to specify “multi-agency” as that’s the best approach in maritime security.
 - ✓ At the regional level, on the need for protocols on information sharing there is a need to proceed and develop this to have agreed positions even as member states establish NMISCs. At the Regional Level, the MASE Program has a finite period while DCoC on the other hand is an open-ended agreement. All MASE member states are members of DCoC. Would protocols for information sharing not suffice for all ISCs in the region (both DCOC and MASE Region)? There is also a need to incorporate MASE ISCs as DCoC given the wider geographic scope of the DCoC (IOC/MASE is in DCoC and not the other way round). Further how can effective ways be identified to make best use of RCoC Seychelles? – is there room for shared MDA assets? e.g., drones, Maritime Patrol aircraft?
 - ✓ Under the International level, who is being targeted in this case to generate the reports as it is not clear who the reports are for?
- **Under Strategy 2:** MASE countries e.g., Kenya has representatives at the RMIFC and collaborate with the RCOC on many fronts. Indeed, there are no defined protocols on information sharing but information is shared on diverse issues and vessels of interest but not by all countries in the region. The RMIFC also generates reports which are shared but also not to all ISCs.
 - ✓ An MOU noting that MASE has a finite period would not meet the threshold since once MASE period ends then the MoU would end too, and this will leave DCoC Signatory States hanging. She highlighted that DCoC Signatory States can consider incorporating MASE Centres to be part of DCoC instead of working through an MOU. The MASE project has a finite period, making it difficult to make long term plans. What is required is Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for information sharing agreed at DCoC noting that all MASE states are DCoC members.
 - ✓ In addition, consideration needs to be made for the MASE ISCs to be considered as part of the DCoC network of ISCs. This would ensure that the centres collaborate and implement the identified SOPs. As proposed in the strategy regional exercises, reciprocal visits for benchmarking will ensure the identified protocols are implemented as opposed to an MOU which would take time to negotiate and which some countries, not signatories of MASE, may not be comfortable with.
- **Under Strategy 3:** Sharing information to wider areas is for the regional centres. National centres would be limited by national laws and sovereignty matters. What could work are protocols on information sharing on agreed maritime crimes that do not include analysed reports. IMO had identified SOPs in the past for ISCs and this would be a good place to start to review the same.
 - ✓ It was noted that given the different level of preparedness and political will some Signatory States will be slower than others in implementing the ISN



Strategy and road map for enhancement of the ISN, while some might adopt a wait and see attitude. Considering this, Kenya recommended that it is important to have progress by taking small bites at a time therefore there is a need to commence with a review of SOPs and continuous reviews will automatically generate the next steps. It is also essential to allow those that are ready to proceed to continue as this will encourage others. Signatory States can consider developing a binding agreement in line with article 17 of the Jeddah Amendment whose timeline was 5 years which will be January 2022.

20. A copy of Kenya's presentation is attached as **Annex E**.

Open Discussion

21. It was noted that the substance of the document is the main area of discussion today and the systems and operationalising will come at a later stage.

22. There was an inquiry on how the capability matrix for regional centres can be linked to the current work

23. It was noted that starting on capability self-assessment from the National Centres is a good idea and the template can be provided and can also be incorporated as an Annex to the Draft ISN Strategy and Roadmap for enhancement of the ISN.

24. It was noted that the Jeddah Amendment envisaged a NMISC that is multi-agency, unlike Regional Maritime Coordination Centres (RMCCs) or single Agency Maritime Operations Centres (MOCs). So far, the ones that have met this threshold that IMO is aware of include Kenya, Madagascar, Oman, Seychelles.

25. It was noted that the key thing to look at is a staged approach which includes having a picture of how the NMISC should be structured and how the capability assessments should look like and how it should be undertaken.

26. There was an inquiry on to what extent it is possible to assist Signatory States in information sharing documents by UK or any other interested party. It was noted that it depends on what organisation is undertaking the task based on what type of reporting centres they are and whether information is shared openly or closed and to who through the established procedures available. In terms of information on Maritime Situational Awareness the information is shared bilaterally through MOUs nationally. The UK has the NIMIC which is how the UK has facilities for information sharing and a discourse across all government agencies in the UK.

Summary of Discussion and Way Forward

27. Having heard the presentation from the IMO Consultant, input from MDA Experts and sub-committee members, the meeting noted with appreciation the observations, recommendations, and critique on the draft ISN Strategy and Roadmap for enhancement of the ISN and adopted the summary of discussion and way forward as follows:



- IMO was requested to approach the Friends of DCoC and identify partners to undertake the capability assessment for DCoC Signatory States. IMO accepted this role and agreed to take this up with the Friends of DCoC.
- The Secretariat was requested to share the template of National Centres self-assessment and make it an Annex to the ISN Strategy and MDA Roadmap draft for Signatory States to use for establishment of their NMISCs.
- For Signatory States who are yet to have NMISCs, there is need to have multi-agency SOPs for Information Sharing at National Level pending the establishment of the NMISCs as envisioned in the Jeddah Amendment.
- Undertake Capability Assessments of the NMISCs. USA to share their capability Assessment Matrix for guidance and comparison.
- Have Regional SOPs and Protocols for Information Sharing to ensure accountability and transparency.
- The previously identified SOPs for ISCs by IMO be reviewed and agreed upon for adoption and use by the WG 1.
- Exploit the provisions of Articles 11 and 12 of the Jeddah Amendment to enable information as far as practicable before considering entering into any MOUs on Information Sharing.
- IMO Consultant to revise the ISN Strategy and Road Map for enhancement of ISN draft with views provided and share with IMO and Chair of WG 1.
- It was agreed that the next meeting being a WG 1 meeting be scheduled in consultation with the Chair of WG 1.

Vote of thanks

28. The Co- Chair WG 1 (Madagascar) concluded the meeting by thanking every member for attending and wished them good health until the next meeting.
29. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 16:30 hours EAT.



Annexes:

- Annex A - List of Participants
- Annex B - Opening Remarks IMO
- Annex C - Agenda
- Annex D - DRAFT ISN STRATEGY AND MDA ROADMAP
- Annex E - KENYA PRESENTATION

Annex A- List of Participants

Name	Country	Email address
Brigadier Loonena Naisho	Kenya	kcgs@interior.go.ke
Joyce Awino	Kenya	gakiiawino@gmail.com
Col. Shiundu	Kenya	kcgs@interior.go.ke
Jean Edmond Randraianana	Madagascar	dgapmf@apmf.mg
Captain Joachim Valmont	Seychelles	ceo@smsa.sc
Mohammed Almajashi	Yemen	malmajashi@gmail.com
Karen Cahill	UK -British Peace Support Team	Maritime-Adviser@bpst-africa.org
Richard Morris	UK- Royal Navy MDA Program	Richard.Morris407@mod.gov.uk
T.J Porter	USA	torrance.porter@eu.navy.mil
Martin Cauchi-Inglott	EU CRIMARIO	martin.cauchi-englott@crimario.eu
David Natrass	EU CRIMARIO	dave.natrass@crimario.eu
Maisie Pigeon	IMO Consultant	maisie.pigeon@gmail.com
Peter Adams	IMO	PAdams@imo.org
Kiruja Micheni	IMO	KMicheni@imo.org
Andrew Clarke	IMO	AClarke@imo.org
Nyambura Kimani	IMO	NKimani@imo.org
Winnie Maina	IMO	WMaina@imo.org
Esther Kung'u (Njonde)	IMO	EKungu@imo.org



Annex B- OPENING REMARKS IMO



IMO Opening
Remarks- 2nd WG 1 S

Annex C- AGENDA



Agenda- 2nd
Meeting of the Subcom

Annex D- DRAFT ISN STRATEGY AND MDA ROADMAP



DRAFT-Enhancing
the Djibouti Code of C

Annex E- PRESENTATION BY KENYA



Presentation by
Kenya Final.docx