DJIBOUTI CODE OF CONDUCT/JEDDAH AMENDMENT

WG1 MEETING 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 03rd November 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", (DCoC/JA), and States eligible to sign these instruments (hereinafter referred to collectively as “Participants”), convened a meeting of the DCOC Working Group 1 (WG1) on the development of Strategy and roadmap for the enhancement of the DCoC/JA Information Sharing Network. The meeting was held virtually, via ZOOM, on Wednesday 03rd November 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 meeting was attended by the following Participating States:

   COMOROS    DJIBOUTI    ETHIOPIA    JORDAN
   KENYA      MADAGASCAR  MOZAMBIQUE  OMAN
   SAUDI ARABIA SEYCHELLES SOMALIA    SOUTH AFRICA
   TANZANIA   UAE        YEMEN

Objective

3. The aim of the meeting was to discuss and contribute to the final draft of the Strategy and Roadmap for enhancement of the DCoC/JA Information Sharing Network (ISN), having been completed by the dedicated sub-committee during its 2nd meeting held on 13th October 2021.

Opening Remarks

4. Mr. Peter Adams (Head of Maritime Security Section, IMO) in his opening remarks commended the efforts of the WG 1 for its commitment and reiterated the support of IMO in
working with the DCoC/JA Signatory States. WG 1 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 A.

Agenda

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

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

6. The Chair WG 1 presented the highlights of the draft ISN strategy and Roadmap and underscored its importance in developing a robust ISN and enhancing Maritime Domain Awareness (MDA) in the region. He called for speedy adoption of the draft. The presentation is attached as Annex C.

7. 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 WG1. The draft was developed based on interviews with subject matter experts and open source research. It contains the following:

- Mission and 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 draft ISN Strategy and RoadMap for enhancement of the ISN as revised following the input of this meeting is attached as Annex D.

Open Discussion

8. South Africa noted that they had considered the document and confirmed that it is a good document. They provided written input with suggested changes consideration. The remarks included:
   • Seeking clarification on what happens to those countries that are not signatory to the DCoC /JA, as the documents assumed that all members are party to the Jeddah Amendment.
   • Noting that in the vision section there is a mention of external parties and they sought clarification if this means the Friends of DCoC or other external parties. South Africa also noted that the draft should not mention the names by countries so that there is no need for constant reviews of the ISN Strategy when countries increase or reduce. They suggested we stick to Friends of DCoC when referring to the external parties and countries in that section.

The remarks are attached as Annex E.

9. UAE requested for more time to review the document, having not had an opportunity to review it conclusively and provide feedback through the secretariat. On the same day UAE reported that they were happy with the draft as discussed at the meeting.

10. Somalia thanked IMO for the support it has given to the Region and raised several points as hereunder:
   • Information sharing needs to be encouraged as Somalia has learnt great lessons from incidents that have happened in their waters which has made them realise that the need for a regional ISN is pertinent.
   • Recommended that all signatory states move with speed to establish NMISCs
   • Somalia called on IMO to consider providing technical assistance in carrying out capability assessments of the NMISCs
   • Called on the IMO to provide technical assistance to Signatory States to develop an integrated work plan.

11. Djibouti observed that it was a good document and called on signatory States to adopt it.
Summary of Discussion and Way Forward

12. Having heard the presentation from the IMO Consultant, 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:

- The Consultant amended the draft strategy as per the recommendations given in the meeting including noting that the Strategy is not only for Signatories of the Jeddah Amendment but also the DCoC signatory States eligible to sign the JA; amending the Vision and capturing external partners as Friends of DCoC for uniformity with the TORs of the Friends of DCoC. The Consultant also removed the countries mentioned by name;
- IMO was requested to provide technical assistance to lead the work of capability assessments for DCoC Signatory States;
- IMO was requested to provide technical assistance on the development of a joint work plan;
- Noting that the success of the ISN Strategy is dependent on establishment and functionality of the NMISCs, Signatory States were encouraged to determine minimum operability of NMISCs by carrying out self-assessments of their respective NMISCs, to speed up the process.
- The meeting agreed that issues of capacity building raised in the ISN Draft would be addressed during subsequent meetings of WG2.
- The updated ISN draft to be circulated by email to all Signatory States for final comments, if any, before being forwarded to the Steering Committee for approval and adoption.

Vote of thanks

13. The Chair WG 1 (Kenya) concluded the meeting by thanking all Participants for attending and wished them good health until the next meeting.

14. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 1600 hours EAT.

Annexes:

- Annex A – IMO Opening Remarks
- Annex B - Agenda
- Annex C – Presentation by Kenya
- Annex D - DRAFT ISN Strategy and Roadmap for enhancement of ISN
- Annex E- RSA Comments
Annex A - IMO OPENING REMARKS

DCOC(JA) WORKING GROUP 1 VIRTUAL MEETING HELD ON 03RD NOVEMBER 2021 AT 1400HOURS EAT

National Focal Points,

Members of Working Group 1

Distinguished participants,

Ladies and Gentlemen.

On behalf of the IMO, thank you for availing yourselves for this second meeting of Working Group 1 since we last met on 18 May 2021. I am always pleased by the enthusiasm and commitment of this Working Group to implement the provisions of the Jeddah Amendment with an aim to enhance the regional information sharing network and to address the problem of sea-blindness through a concerted effort to enhance Maritime Domain Awareness (MDA).

As you may be all aware, and will shortly hear in this meeting, the last meeting of this Working Group selected a Sub-committee consisting of Kenya, Madagascar, Seychelles, Tanzania and Yemen to work with the IMO Consultant (Ms. Maisie Pigeon) in developing a Strategy and Roadmap for enhancement of the DCoC JA Information Sharing Network. I am glad to note that the Sub-Committee and the IMO Consultant have had 2 virtual meetings and the Consultant has consulted widely with various Information Sharing stakeholders and MDA experts and organisations to prepare a draft that is uniquely carved for the DCoC Signatory States.

I would like to assure you that IMO’s commitment to supporting the DCoC Signatory States through provision of technical assistance to the DCoC signatory states and in particular the work of this Working Group to develop a Strategy and Roadmap for enhancement of the Information Sharing Network still stands. This was evidenced by the additional requests to provide technical assistance in capability assessments, review of the Information Sharing Standard Operating Procedures which we received from the sub-committee and we hope the Working Group will adopt the Sub-Committee’s requests for IMO to spearhead the work of Capability Assessment by identifying potential partners to carry out the same in the Signatory States.

We wish to highlight that although the draft was developed with the support of the IMO Consultant, and reviewed by the Sub-Committee members during their 2nd meeting on 13 October 2021, we kindly encourage all the Working Group 1 members to effectively participate and critique the document extensively to ensure that the final outcome is fit for purpose and fully regionally owned – a document that every Signatory State will be happy to implement for national benefit, as well as the entire DCoC Region, and ultimately contribute in the enhancement of MDA in the Western Indian Ocean and the Gulf of Aden.
In conclusion, we hope that with your support as Working Group 1 Members and the input into the work that will be shared in this meeting, the DCoC Signatory States can adopt a Strategy and Roadmap for enhancement of the ISN which will enable creating a robust and sustainable Information Sharing Network to meet the challenge of the maritime threat scenarios.

I wish you a great meeting ahead.

### Annex B- AGENDA

**Agenda - DCoC (JA) WORKING GROUP 1 MEETING**

**Date:** 03rd November 2021  
**Time:** 1400 Hrs. EAT time /1100 GMT  
**Application:** Zoom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Approx. Timing</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Decision Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Welcome remarks by the Secretariat</td>
<td>IMO</td>
<td>Members to go through the ISN Strategy and Roadmap for Enhancement of ISN Draft as submitted by the IMO Consultant with revisions of the Sub-committee incorporated. <strong>Doc Ref: DCoC (JA)WG1(2) ISN Strategy Rev 1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.       | 30 min         | **Presentation of the draft Information Sharing Network Strategy to WG 1**  
• Highlights and why the ISN Draft if important to the Region  
• The ISN Draft Presentation  
• Summary |
|          |                | Chair-WG 1                                                              | Ms. Maisie Pigeon Chair- WG 1 | To react, deliberate and recommend areas of revision of the ISN Strategy and Roadmap for enhancement of ISN Draft |
| 3.       | 30 min         | Open Discussion                                                          | ALL                       | To share comments and observations of the reactions received from WG 1 members    |
| 4.       | 10min          | IMO Consultant’s Remarks                                                 | IMO Consultant            |                                                                                  |
### 10 MINUTES BREAK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Chair/Person</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>Summary of Discussion and Way Forward</td>
<td>Chair- WG 1</td>
<td>To confirm consensus and adoption of the ISN Strategy draft and roadmap of enhancement of ISN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>A.O.B.</td>
<td>Chair/IMO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Vote of Thanks</td>
<td>Chair WG 1 - Kenya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex C- PRESENTATION BY KENYA

DCoC (JA)
ISN SUB-COMMITTEE ROUNDTABLE MEETING

Key highlights from the Draft Strategy Roadmap

INPUTS
BY
CHAIR WG1

3rd NOVEMBER 2021

STRATEGY HIGHLIGHTS

• The Mission Statement
• Nexus with Information Sharing Network established under the original DCoC
• Why a robust Information Sharing Network
• Calls for a foundation for a strong regional maritime security picture
• Builds a case for a whole of government approach and secure maritime domain as a prerequisite to developing the Blue Economy
• It further emphasizes that the value of information sharing networks continues to increase with more participants and more information.
SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS

Roadmap breaks the approach into three strategies:

I. Establish/operationalize NMISCs in all DCoC-JA signatory states to coordinate activities of all maritime security and law enforcement agencies.

II. Maximize information sharing centres across the region by establishing clear and common protocols for staff to share information.

III. Continue evolving the Information Sharing Network in the region with a wide distribution list for research and analysis products which help to identify criminal patterns.

CONCLUSION

The Strategy is dependent on the development of NMISCs and NMISCs, therefore:

Need to determine minimum operational capacity for national centres and for states to complete/update self-assessments so that we can develop a baseline understanding of capabilities and gaps.

Presentation of the ISN strategy as adopted by WG1 to the Steering Committee for adoption as captured.
Enhancing the Djibouti Code of Conduct – Jeddah Amendment Information Sharing Network: Strategy Roadmap
November 2021

Mission Statement: to improve regional maritime domain awareness (MDA) and maritime safety and security through dissemination of reliable information-sharing on incidents of maritime crimes like piracy and armed robbery; illegal, unreported, and unregulated (IUU) fishing; illicit trades; human smuggling; and maritime terrorism.

Vision:
- Every DCoC-Jeddah Amendment member state has established its National Maritime Security Committee structure which oversees the work of the operationalised National Maritime Information Sharing Centre (NMISC) and effectively utilises the information it provides in national maritime security decision making
- DCoC members’ national agencies cooperate in sharing information through NMISCs
- Friends of the DCoC cooperate in sharing information through MOUs established with NMISCs and regional centres
- Analysis of incidents by regional centres distinguishes patterns in illicit maritime activities and supports disruption of maritime crime by guiding regional policy decisions

Assumptions:
- This process will take time and require patience to achieve ideal levels of operationalisation
- Internal advocacy will be necessary to convince governments of the value of prioritising maritime security and combating sea blindness; regional governments will be at varying levels of buy-in
- Progress begets progress; even small victories are important pieces of the overall picture
- Not all information will need to be shared between partners and it is up to the states to decide the modalities for sharing information

Roadmap: The following roadmap was developed based on feedback from the Sub-Committee on Enhancing Information Sharing, as well as interviews with experts in developing information-sharing networks.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Tactics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>Establish NMISCs (operational) in all member states</td>
<td>• Determine minimum operational capacity necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify NMISCs capabilities and gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Direct funding and capacity-building to non-operational NMISCs in signatory states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Maximise regional information-sharing centres by developing clear protocols for information sharing</td>
<td>• Establish common or compatible protocols for sharing information between NMISCs and regional ISCs; incorporate into training and orientation for centre personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Establish common or compatible information-sharing SOPs to promote interoperability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Implement joint trainings, workshops, conferences, TTX, meetings, reciprocal centre visits, operations at sea to build trust and rapport, and to normalise communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>Reports and analysis are produced and disseminated widely</td>
<td>• Identify what unclassified information is needed and what purpose it serves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Decide on frequency of reports/ briefings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Determine methods by which information is shared</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategy #1:** Establish and operationalise NMISCs in all signatory states, which coordinates activities of national maritime security agencies and maritime law enforcement in maritime domain awareness.

**Status quo:** Some NMISCs are established and operational while other states are not currently operational [or do not have NMISCs]

**Roadblocks:** Securing sustainable funding sources to build and maintain operational capability of NMISCs; turnover in personnel; lack of political will/maritime security not a priority to regional governments (so-called “sea blindness”)

**Tactics:** Determine minimum capability necessary for operations; DCoC Working Group coordinates funding and capacity-building efforts to gaps in NMISCs under DCoC framework
Proposed next steps: States develop National Maritime Security Committees, who oversee the establishment, enhancement and operations of NMISCs, and information they supply is utilised to develop National Maritime Security Risk Registers, contribute to the development of National Maritime Security Strategies, and assist with national maritime security decision-making; DCoC Information Sharing Working Group determines minimum capability requirements for information sharing centres; states complete NMISC self-assessments to determine capabilities and gaps and develop individual roadmaps to full operationalisation of NMISCs; DCoC Information Sharing Committee identifies gaps and determines priorities for future capacity building efforts and funding and, in coordination with DCoC Working Group 2, and seeks support from the Friends of the DCoC to address capability gaps; States awaiting establishment of NMISCs develop clear SOPs for multi-agency information-sharing

Strategy #2: Maximise regional information-sharing centres by establishing clear protocols for sharing information.

Status quo: ISCs are at different levels of operability

Roadblocks: Lack of trust at the national, regional, and international levels limits information sharing between agencies, which in turn may impede the region from developing complete maritime security picture and identifying patterns which would help maritime enforcement authorities to prevent future threats across the region and beyond

Tactics: Establish clear and common or compatible information sharing SOPs between agencies at the national level; establish clear and common or compatible information sharing SOPs for regional centres; establish training for information sharing and standardise across all centres in the region

Proposed next steps: Engage national stakeholders in scenario-based exercises to collectively identify the types of information to be shared with regional centres and establish clear information sharing SOPs between NMISCs and regional ISCs based on the processes laid out in Articles 11 and 12 of the Jeddah Amendment; establish clear information-sharing SOPs for ISCs in the region which details what information is exchanged between centres, based on the process laid out in Article 11 of the Jeddah Amendment; implement joint trainings, workshops, table top exercises, conferences, meetings, reciprocal centre visits, and operations at sea between actors operating in the region to build trust and rapport and to share success stories, best practices, and lessons learned, and to normalize communications; establish training specific to information sharing protocols which is standardized across all centres operating in the region; consider future SOPs for two-way information sharing with private actors
Strategy #3: Continue evolving Information Sharing Network which shares information with wide distribution list.

**Status quo:** Information sharing network is focused on incidents of piracy and armed robbery at sea and is not currently inclusive of other maritime threats pertinent to the region including IUU fishing, illicit trades, human smuggling, and maritime terrorism.

**Roadblocks:** Lack of trust at national, regional, and international levels; absence of reporting requirements or agreed upon incident reporting system; difficulties with interoperability of information reporting systems.

**Tactics:** Identify/establish trusted, independent source to sanitise/anonymise data received from multiple sources and distribute reports widely; determine methods by which information is shared; design universal incident report; build effective working relationships between colleagues at centres across the region.

**Proposed next steps:** Stakeholders explore what information to share using collective scenario-based exercises and build clear information-sharing protocols with international partners based on the exercise as well as the processes laid out in Article 12 of the Jeddah Amendment; stakeholders incorporate information-sharing protocols into training/orientation of NMISC and regional ISC personnel; stakeholders collectively identify trusted source to anonymise, sanitise, and analyse data; based on the process laid out in Article 12 of the Jeddah Amendment, regional reports are compiled by regional centres and distributed widely within the network, allowing recipients to decide if/how to act on information received; collectively weigh the benefits of various information sharing systems and decide on best options for expanded ISN.

**Milestones:**
- Roadmap agreed to amongst DCoC member states.
- NMSCs are established to enhance and oversee the operations of NMISCs and the information they supply is used to develop National Maritime Security Risk Registers, contribute to the development of National Maritime Security Strategies, and assist with national maritime security decision making.
- NMISCs established and operationalised coordinate the activities of national agencies engaged in maritime security and maritime law enforcement, and facilitate interagency cooperation.
- Establish clear information-sharing protocols between agencies and centres, establish information-sharing MOUs with non-DCoC information-sharing centres in the region.
- Data is collected from multiple sources, sanitised to remove all identifying information by a trusted source, analysed, and distributed, helping actors in the region to identify criminal patterns and risk factors.
- Information is used to disrupt and prevent maritime crime in the region.
### Annex 1 – DcoC Capability Assessment Grid for National and Regional Information Sharing Centres (for NMISC self-assessment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines Of Development</th>
<th>High Level</th>
<th>Medium Level</th>
<th>Low Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctrine and Concepts</strong></td>
<td>National Regional Mandate/Policy 'Higher Level Linkage to all the other Lines of Development'</td>
<td>National/Regional Maritime Strategy (Signed), Mandate to define Capability Requirement, Command and Control, Identify the Threats (Piracy, Smuggling, IUU, CT, Narcotics, etc.), MDA Centre Plan (2-year road-map) - including how to measure performance (through Operational Assessment Grid), Standing Operating Procedures (SOPs). Information Sharing Agreements (MOU).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>Building Facilities, Services</td>
<td>Power, Shelter, Water, Secure Environment, Dedicated IT Space (Controlled), Internet Access (Bandwidth aligned with system requirements), Telephony, Business Continuity Plan (BCP), Meeting Room, Secure Storage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment</strong></td>
<td>MDA Capability</td>
<td>MDA System (National, Regional, International). National and/or Regional Comms, Open Systems, GMDSS, Conference Facilities (Video Tele-Conferencing),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation</strong></td>
<td>Internal Manning Structure</td>
<td>Roles and Responsibilities (IT Security, COS, Information Officer, etc.). Hours of Operation (365/24/7), Organogram.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interoperability</strong></td>
<td>External Organisation Exchange/Interface</td>
<td>National Interfaces (Fish, Defence, Coastguard, Home Office, Foreign Office, etc), Regional Interfaces (Other MDA Centres, Regional MOCs, etc.), International Interfaces (International MDA Centres, International Organisations and Maritime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component Commands) - Digital, Voice and Physical Meetings/interaction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People</strong></td>
<td>Suitably Manned for the Operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maritime Background, Suitably Qualified (generic), Sustainability and Manning Plan. Maritime English proficiency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training</strong></td>
<td>Facilities, Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Logistics</strong></td>
<td>Access, Transport, Finance Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robust and sustainable finance model (law endorsed Mandate), Roads, Mail Service, Cleaning, Environmental.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2 – United States Maritime Operation Centre Capabilities Survey

MOC Capabilities Survey

You have been identified as the Assessor responsible for completing this assessment survey. We are using this information to properly assess the Partner Nations’ capacity and capabilities to conduct Maritime Operations during this exercise. This survey only needs to be completed one time per event / exercise and will take approximately 45 minutes to complete.

This questionnaire is essentially a checklist of the required MOC instructions, equipment, and support. Please complete the survey as thoroughly as possible but do not be afraid to leave areas blank if you cannot determine the information. It is recommended that you continue filling in portions of this survey throughout your time in the MOC in order to gather as much information as possible. Due to how we extract the data, it is necessary to use Adobe Acrobat Reader which can be found at https://get.adobe.com/reader/.

We are using this information to accurately assess the Partner Nations’ capacity and capability to conduct Maritime Operations during this exercise and the answers to this survey are confidential and will not be shared with any other organization. If you have questions at any time about the survey or the procedures, you may contact the NAVF Assessor using the contact information specified below. Thank you very much for your time and support. Please save using this convention: Country_SurveyTitle_DDMMYY_LastName

NAVF Assessor
N9 Operational Assessments CNE-CNA-C6F
Email: PhoenixExpress/Assessor@gmail.com

Basic Information

Last Name:

Organization:

What is your level of qualification / experience in MOC functions?

Email where you can be reached:

What day is this survey for?

Which country are you assessing? (Select from drop down or write in as necessary.)

Which MOC are you assessing? (Select from drop down or write in as necessary.)

Please provide comments on how to improve today’s events.
Essential Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs)
Procedures are written, approved, familiar to watch standers, and used for all of the following:

Enduring Tasks (select all that apply)
☐ Daily activities schedule (battle rhythm) (reports, weather briefs, equipment status, etc.)
☐ Daily operations brief/report to Chain of Command
☐ Periodic meetings with the Chain of Command regarding current priorities, focus, interests
☐ Watch handover (turnover)
☐ Communications checks
☐ Watch log (with backup and alternative for power outage if needed)
☐ Watch bill, roster, personnel directory
☐ Maintenance: notify/track/report procedures
☐ Critical personnel and emergency numbers (short list, easily accessible)

Emergent Tasks (select all that apply)
☐ Communication content checklists/templates for each event
☐ Piracy, hijacking events
☐ Illegal trafficking (drugs, arms, human, ...) events
☐ IUU Fishing events
☐ Biological/Ecological (pollution, ...) disasters
☐ Natural (crisis response) disasters
☐ Search and rescue (SAR)
☐ Maritime MEDEVAC
☐ Hot pursuit, contact handover
☐ Contact Reports (surface)
☐ Continuity of Operations - Evacuate/Relocate

Review and Updates (select all that apply)
☐ Procedures are updated, signed and dated by the chain of command
☐ Procedures are reviewed at least annually and revised from lessons learned

Comments on this section
Critical Systems and Equipment
The MOC has the following equipment:

Communications (select all that apply)
- Telephone, radio (HF/VHF) system, and chat, email systems
- Backup radio system
- Weather report / monitoring system

Recommended additional communications equipment (select all that apply)
- VOIP between center & sites
- Satellite telephone and/or Inmarsat

Data & display systems (select all that apply)
- Maritime Global Picture system (i.e. SeaVision or equivalent web-based system)
- Up/Downlink display (i.e. TV32)
- Local sensor control and fusion systems (i.e. RMAC/SureTrak, MTM300, FalconEye, etc)
- Data network status display (i.e. Solar/Winds or equivalent)

Sensors: RADAR (select one)
- No working RADAR
- 1 Site
- All critical sea space covered
- Full coastline coverage

Sensors: Other (select all that apply)
- AIS sensor (shared via MSSIS)
- Cameras at all critical sites
- LRIT sensor
- Satellite Synthetic Aperture RADAR
- EO/IR
- MF/HF Direction Finder

Administration Equipment (select all that apply)
- Computer workstation(s)
- Dedicated MOC telephone
- Printer/copier/scanner
- Networks and web access (separate from local systems & sensor networks)

Infrastructure (select all that apply)
- Power management system
- Certified grounding for systems, towers, power systems, buildings
- Back-up power system such as a generator, auto-switchover
- Back-up power system sustainable for 24 hours

Recommended Additions (select all that apply)
- Wall displays, status boards
- Charts, chart tables

Comments on this section
Personnel / Staffing Responsibilities

Defined Responsibilities (select all that apply)
- Watch Chief/OIC
- Watch officer roles and responsibilities
- Watch supervisor roles and responsibilities
- Communications watch stander (voice/radio, chat/email, record logger) role and responsibilities
- MDA system operator (system, chart, nav-plot) role and responsibilities

Manning (select if applicable)
- No less than two of the above watch positions manned 24 hours a day

Maintenance: on site or on call (select all that apply)
- IT software and systems support, troubleshooting
- Electrical and power support
- Site and systems support

Intel Access (select if applicable)
- MOC personnel have the ability to communicate / coordinate with intelligence agencies

Interagency Access (select if applicable)
- MOC personnel have the ability to communicate / coordinate with other national agencies (i.e.: fisheries, law enforcement, judicial, etc.)

Legal Access (select most appropriate response)
- A Legal advisor is present in the MOC
- MOC personnel have instant access to a legal advisor (via phone or email)
- MOC personnel have no access to outside legal advice but have extensive training in legal matters
- MOC personnel have no access to any legal advice and have limited/no legal training

Comments on this section
Personnel, Qualifications, and Training

Personnel management for MOC staffing & prerequisites (select all that apply)

☐ Officers/ratings/interagency personnel are assigned based on experience in an appropriate field; e.g., communications, information technologies (IT), electrical engineering, navigation/radar plotter
☐ MOC assignment supports career progression and promotion – the intent is to make MOC assignment appealing to the best-qualified personnel.

Training as a continual process (select all that apply)

☐ Pre-assignment training/qualifications and OJT plan documented
☐ A training program with qualification standards and process. JQR/PQS (job qualification requirements and personnel qualification standards) (or appropriate equivalent) process and documentation
☐ Watch standers qualify in multiple watch positions, responsibilities. Cross-rate training, operational capability efficiency enhancement.

Training Areas (select all that apply)

☐ MOC mission and roles (local, national, regional and international)
☐ MDA (C4I)
☐ MOC procedures and responsibilities
☐ Watch officer training
☐ Watch supervisor training
☐ Watch stander training
☐ System and equipment use and administration
☐ System and equipment technical maintenance (as part of a maintenance program)

Comments on this section


Required Support for the MOC

Budget (select all that apply)
- Basic funding for costs, supplies, power, etc.
- Annual funding plan
- Lifecycle funding plan covering continuing costs over the expected life of the system until replacement

Maintenance Staff and Skills (select all that apply)
- Basic technical skills available; e.g. electronics technician, electrician
- The specific / specialized technical skills required for each system are available no later than the next working day

Maintenance Program (select all that apply)
- Maintenance plan with priorities for timely response
- Master Maintenance Schedule - appropriate (vendor recommended) routine maintenance for every system and component. Task assignment includes checklists for reporting
- Master status board or report, updated daily
- Staff watch bill for on-call support 24/7
- Record of all maintenance events (failures, repairs, routine maintenance, replacement, new installations)
- Library: Manufacturer documentation (use, troubleshooting, repair instructions) for each component (master plus checkout copies. All maintenance documentation should be available via checkout and included in training
- Maintenance training covering all tasks, classroom, or on-the-job (OJT). Training may be managed within the branch or in a separate program
- Job qualification requirements (JQR or PQS) plan and certifications for maintenance personnel

Maintenance Program: Corrective Action Timeline (select one)
- Corrective action within 24 hours
- Next day corrective action
- Longer delay for corrective action

Supply (select all that apply)
- Procurement and inventory, managed in response to requests
- Procurement plan based on required spares, consumption rate, lead-time
- Inventory managed with safe storage, accounting, and feedback to procurement

Comments on this section

Additional comments for this MOC

Clear Form  Submit
Annex E- RSA COMMENTS

SOUTH AFRICAN INPUTS ON:

ENHANCING THE DJIBOUTI CODE OF CONDUCT – JEDDAH AMENDMENT
INFORMATION SHARING NETWORK: STRATEGY ROADMAP

VISION:

1st Bullet – what about the DCoC-Jeddah Amendment Non-signatory countries who remain DCoC member states?

3rd Bullet Point – Delete the names of the listed “external partners”, it is not advisable to mention external partners as the list may change and increase which might result in the need to review the Strategy. The strategy document should cover short, medium and long-term strategic plans.

“External Partners” – is this the same as Friends of the DCoC? In the Terms of Reference, we refer to the “Friends of the DCoC” why change the terminology in the Strategy. Proposal for the “External Partners” to be changed to “Friends of the DCoC”

Insert: “National, Regional and International organisations” in the sentence before “cooperation…”

ASSUMPTIONS:

4th Bullet point – delete “what to share and how” and replace with the insertion of “the modalities for sharing information”

ROADMAP TABLE:

NATIONAL (LEVEL) – STRATEGY

What about the DCoC Member states who have not yet signed the Jeddah Amendment?

REGIONAL (LEVEL) - TACTICS

1st & 2nd Bullet Points – insert “or compatible” after “common” to read “common or compatible” to avoid limiting member states.

INTERNATIONAL (LEVEL) – TACTICS

1st Bullet Point – propose that the “information needed” be limited to unclassified information.

PROPOSED NEXT STEP – 4TH point (DCoC Information Sharing Committee identifies gap and determines priorities for future capacity building efforts and funding and, in coordination with DCOC WG2, communicates these to the Friends of the DCOC and seek support to address capability gaps)

What about the establishment of the DCoC Fund? It was proposed that DCoC establishes a Fund to be used in capacity building of Member states?
It is proposed that the last part of the sentence be re-phrased because it sounds as if DCoC will be reporting to the “Friends of the DCoC”

**STRATEGY #2**

**TACTICS** - insert “or compatible” after “common” to read “common or compatible”

**STRATEGY #3**

**MILESTONES:**

1st **Bullet Point**: is this inclusive of DCoC-JA non-signatory members?

2nd **Bullet Point**: delete “to establish”

---

**ANNEX 1 – DCOCCAPABILITY ASSESSMENT GRID FOR NATIONAL AND REGIONAL INFORMATION SHARING CENTRES (FOR NMISC SELF-ASSESSMENT)**

4th **ROW: ORGANISATION – 3RD COLUMN (LOW LEVEL):**

Spelling error: delete “Organigrim” and replace with “Organogram”

---

**ANNEX 2 – UNITED STATES MARITIME OPERATION CENTRE CAPABILITIES SURVEY**

Will USA be conducting the surveys or will the DCoC member States conduct the survey by themselves?

Why can’t we customise Annex 2 to fit DCoC and DCoC-JA member states (similar to Annex 1).