MAPPING MARITIME SECURITY SECTORS

SAFE SEAS Concept Note, Nr. 3, April 2017.

Maritime security capacity building in the Western Indian Ocean remains a largely experimental process. At SAFE SEAS we are interested in mapping Maritime Security Sector Reform (MSSR) processes in this region, centred on practices or 'concrete' activities rather than conceptual or theoretical approaches. This allows for a more nuanced representation of a states maritime sector and will help in developing guidelines and best practices for the coordination, programming and implementation of future maritime security capacity building and MSSR.

This concept note outlines the framework for mapping maritime security sectors further developing the SPIP methodology as a framework (see SAFE SEAS Concept Notes 1 & 2). This consists of a series of exploratory questions that expand on other methodological approaches, such as the U.S. Maritime Security Sector Reform Guide of 2010. The goal is to construct a more politically nuanced and locally representative picture of a state's maritime security sector under four specific headings: *Spaces*, *Problems*, *Institutions* and *Projects*. Some questions are intentionally broad, but some are specific and may not be relevant to every countries maritime security context, therefore it is important to establish the national relationship with the 'maritime' as a foundation for the mapping process. For the mapping the main focus is on the past decade.

NATIONAL CONTEXT

The first step in the process is outlining, in a general sense, the importance of the maritime for 'country X'. Is the country a maritime nation? In what sense is a country's development, economy and security dependent on the sea? What political importance is given to the maritime? This should also briefly consider historical developments and whether any significant contemporary incidents or events have shaped country X's position to the sea and influenced the public policy debate. This might include, for example, a major environmental disaster (such as an oil spill) or incidents of piracy and armed robbery in a country's territorial waters or perhaps prominent cases of fishery crime. A nuanced and locally engaged understanding of wider maritime security debates, approaches and understandings will allow for a more representative mapping process as outlined below.

SPACES

The next step is to identify the regulatory and physical maritime spaces of a state or region. This should take the shape of an overview of the state's maritime space, which will vary from country to country and region to region. What kind of spaces can be identified? What particular maritime zones are part of the state? What beaches and coastal zones, ports, anchoring zones, territorial sea, Exclusive Economic

Zone, Search and Rescue Areas, fishing zones, marine protected areas, resource extraction areas (including fossil resources, but also wind farms) are part of the maritime policy of the state? One particular focus during this phase of the mapping process should be on the particular regulatory spaces of a state's waters: How do states organise surveillance within these zones (e.g. fishing zones)? Are there designated naval patrol zones? What are the jurisdictions of these zones? Are there interstate naval disputes/tensions or maritime border disputes within identified zones/spaces? It is important at this stage to identify where and how there is overlap, gaps or ambiguity and which capabilities are available for each zone.

PROBLEMS

This section begins with two core questions: (1) Which maritime security issues have been identified by the government as top priority issues? (2) What are the Maritime Security issues of the state within the spaces identified in the previous section, but do not feature as political priorities? With this established, the identification of specific problems and responses should be carried out within the framework of the questions outlined below drawing on available data concerning incidents of maritime crime, or environmental protection issues, etc. The responses to specific problems should be outlined in as much detail as possible. If there are multiple incidents, illustrative examples should be used that are representative of the problem.

(i) Is *armed robbery/ piracy* considered to be a priority issue? What incidents have there been in the countries maritime zones? With what frequency? What have been the responses to these incidents?

(ii) Is *illegal, unreported, unregulated fishing* considered to be a priority issue? What incidents have there been in the countries maritime zones? With what frequency? What have been the responses to these incidents? How is the fisheries sector regulated? How are fishing licenses controlled?

(iii) Is *maritime safety* considered to be a priority issue? What incidents (accidents, oil spills, search and rescue, natural disasters) have there been in the countries maritime zones? With what frequency? What have been the responses to these incidents?

(iv) Is *maritime crime* considered to be a priority issue? What incidents have there been in the countries maritime zones? With what frequency? What have been the responses to these incidents? What forms of maritime crime take place? How does it manifest? What are the responses?

(v) What *other maritime insecurities or problems* does the state identify as issues? What have been the responses to these issues?

INSTITUTIONS

At this stage in the mapping process, we have identified country X's maritime spaces/zones and established what problems occur within these spaces and what responses have been initiated to address these problems. The next step is to describe in detail each of the actors that are part of the responses

discussed in the previous section. Which actors (e.g. coast guard, navies, maritime police, maritime and port authorities, search and rescue centres, governmental agencies, ministries, professional associations or civil society organizations, etc.) have been involved in addressing the issues above?

Key questions should be asked here: Have there been any controversies between these organisations in terms of authority, allocation of resources, tendering, investment etc.? What wider stakeholders are involved including civil society stakeholders (e.g. fishing associations, co-operatives, industry associations, etc.)? The primary goal is to gather an organizational overview, but also to identify contradictions, inefficiencies as well as gaps.

PROJECTS

The mapping process should conclude with identifying whether there have been any major reform projects in the maritime security sector within the last ten years. What institutional reform processes or capacity building projects have been launched? What actors are involved in these projects (national or regional organisations, NGO's etc.)? How are they implemented? Who are the beneficiaries? What are the concrete effects of these projects on the problems identified in the previous section? It is also important to establish what external actors have offered support and what kind of support has been offered (financial, equipment, training, etc.)?

CONCLUSION

The outcome of using the framework will be dedicated country profiles of how maritime security sectors are organized, and how a country manages its respective maritime security issues. Taken together and compared, the studies will show the variance in organizing maritime security sectors and offer guidance for academics and practitioners operating in the countries.

When completed, it will also provide the empirical basis for further analysis that more closely scrutinizes reform processes and concrete capacity building projects. This next step will allow for reflection on what kind of effects different types of capacity building projects have, where the practical challenges lie, and how successes can be transferred into best practices for future programmes. This will be covered in more detail in Concept Note 4.

LITERATURE

Bueger, Christian. 2014. Counter-Piracy and Maritime Capacity Building: Fallacies of a Debate. Working Paper of the Lessons Learned Project of the Contact Group on Piracy off the Coast of Somalia, Cardiff: Cardiff University, available at http://www.lessonsfrompiracy.net/2014/08/19/counter-piracy-and-maritime-capacity-building-fallacies-of-a-debate/

Bueger, Christian. 2015. "What Is Maritime Security?" *Marine Policy* 53: 159–64.

Edmunds, Tim. 2014. Maritime Security Sector Reform: Lessons from the Mainstream. Working Paper of the Lessons Learned Project of the Contact Group on Piracy off the Coast of Somalia, Cardiff: Cardiff

University, available at http://www.lessonsfrompiracy.net/files/2014/08/Edmunds-Maritime-Security-Sector-Reform-2.pdf

SAFE SEAS. 2017a. Maritime Security Capacity Building: Spotting the Gaps, SAFE SEAS Concept Note 1, Cardiff: Cardiff University, available at http://www.safeseas.net/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/SAFESEAS-Concept-Note-1-Spotting-the-gaps.pdf

SAFE SEAS. 2017b. Capacity Building and the Ownership Dilemma, SAFE SEAS Concept Note 2, Cardiff: Cardiff University, available at http://www.safeseas.net/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Concept-Note-2-Local-Ownership.pdf