



EN

THIS ACTION IS FUNDED BY THE EUROPEAN UNION

ANNEX

of the Commission Implementing Decision on the financing of the individual measure for EU foreign policy needs on Enhanced Maritime action in Gulf of the Guinea for 2022

Action Document for Enhanced Maritime Action in the Gulf of Guinea

MEASURE

This document constitutes the annual work programme in the sense of Article 110(2) of the Financial Regulation, and measures in the sense of Article 23 of NDICI-Global Europe Regulation.

1. SYNOPSIS

1.1. Action Summary Table

1. Title OPSYS business reference Basic Act	Enhanced Maritime Action in the Gulf of Guinea (EnMAR GOG) OPSYS number: ACT-60625 Financed under the Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument (NDICI-Global Europe)
2. Team Europe Initiative	No
3. Zone benefiting from the action	The action shall be carried out in the Gulf of Guinea.
4. Programming document	N/A
5. Link with relevant MIP(s) objectives/expected results	N/A
PRIORITY AREAS AND SECTOR INFORMATION	
6. Priority Area(s), sectors	Maritime Security
7. Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)	Main SDG: 16: Peace, justice and strong institutions Other significant SDG: 9: Industry, innovation and infrastructure
8 a) DAC code(s) ¹	15210 – Security system management and reform 15130 – Legal and judicial development
8 b) Main Delivery Channel @	Public sector institutions - 10000

¹ DAC sectors (codes and descriptions) are indicated in the first and fourth columns of the tab ‘purpose codes’ in the following document: <http://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/development-financestandards/dacandcrscodelists.htm>

9. Targets²	<input type="checkbox"/> Migration <input type="checkbox"/> Climate <input type="checkbox"/> Social inclusion and Human Development <input type="checkbox"/> Gender <input type="checkbox"/> Biodiversity <input type="checkbox"/> Education ³ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Human Rights, Democracy and Governance ⁴			
10. Markers⁵ (from DAC form)	General policy objective @	Not targeted	Significant objective	Principal objective
	Participation development/good governance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Aid to environment @	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Gender equality and women's and girl's empowerment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Trade development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Reproductive, maternal, new-born and child health	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Disaster Risk Reduction @	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Inclusion of persons with Disabilities @	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Nutrition @	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	RIO Convention markers	Not targeted	Significant objective	Principal objective
	Biological diversity @	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Combat desertification @	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Climate change mitigation @	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Climate change adaptation @	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Internal markers⁶ and Tags⁷:	Policy objectives	Not targeted	Significant objective	Principal objective
	Digitalisation @ Tags: digital connectivity digital governance digital entrepreneurship job creation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

² Actual contribution to targets will be confirmed ex-post based on a standardised methodology.

³ This target is specific to INTPA. If the action is marked as contributing to the Education target, please make sure the target on “Social inclusion and Human Development” is also marked.

⁴ Thematic target for geographic programmes (at least 15%) in delegated act.

⁵ For guidance, see <https://www.oecd.org/development/financing-sustainable-development/development-finance-standards/> (go to “Data collection and resources for reporters”, select Addendum 2, annexes 18 (policy) and 19 (Rio) of the reporting directive).

If an action is marked in the DAC form as contributing to one of the general policy objectives or to RIO principles as a principal objective or a significant objective, then this should be reflected in the logframe matrix (in the results chain and/or indicators).

⁶ The internal markers have been created to report on the implementation of the Commission’s own policy priorities in areas where no DAC reporting tool is available. For the sake of consistency and comparability, the methodology is equivalent to the DAC markers, with three possible positions (main target, significant target, not targeted)

⁷ Methodology for additional tagging providing granularity on internal markers is under development.

	digital skills/literacy		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	digital services		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Connectivity @ Tags: transport people2people energy digital connectivity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
	Migration @ (methodology for tagging under development)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Reduction of Inequalities (methodology for marker and tagging under development)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Covid-19	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BUDGET INFORMATION				
12. Amounts concerned	Budget line(s) (article, item): 14 02 03 30 Total estimated cost: EUR 4 990 000 Total amount of EU budget contribution EUR 4 990 000			
MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION				
13. Type of financing⁸	Indirect management the entity(ies) to be selected in accordance with the criteria set out in section 4.2.3			

1.2. Summary of the Action

With an annual transit of more than 11.500 vessels per year, the Gulf of Guinea is a global epicentre for shipping trade. However in 2020, 95%⁹ of the world's piracy attacks took place in this region endangering major trade routes and the lives of seafarers. At the same time, organised crime and illicit maritime trade exacerbate the security situation in a somewhat volatile region. The EU's engagement in the Gulf of Guinea is very wide-reaching, building local capacities against all kinds of maritime threats in the region. However despite this comprehensive engagement, there exists a number of gaps, both within the EU's efforts and in the region's capacities, requiring increased attention, such as the EU's political and operational impact, coordination and strategic communication, including as regards the Coordinated Maritime Presence concept.

In this regard, the proposed action has **the overall objective to strengthen the cohesion of the EU's efforts in enhancing maritime security and economic prosperity in the Gulf of Guinea**, including by supporting the recently appointed EU Senior Coordinator on Maritime Security in the Gulf of Guinea. **The specific objectives are to support the EU political engagement with partners on maritime security; support synergies and the coherence of EU, EU Member States and non-EU actions; provide technical assistance to operational centres of champion countries and the Yaoundé Architecture; and increase regional awareness about the EU's objectives and actions in support of maritime security.**

⁸ Art. 27 NDICI

⁹ <https://www.icc-cs.org/index.php/1301-gulf-of-guinea-records-highest-ever-number-of-crew-kidnapped-in-2020-according-to-imb-s-annual-piracy-report>

2. RATIONALE

2.1. Context

With 90% of world trade transiting through sea lanes, maritime security is today an international priority. With an annual transit of more than 11.500 vessels per year, the Gulf of Guinea is a global epicentre for shipping trade, both European and international. However, in 2020, 95% of the world's piracy attacks took place in this region endangering major trade routes and the lives of seafarers. At the same time, organised crime and illicit maritime trade exacerbate the security situation in a somewhat volatile region. Besides, threats for the sustainable management of the fish stocks like Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated fishing (IUU), and environmental challenges like the dumping at sea are of regional relevance, as they hamper the sustainable development of coastal communities.

The EU's engagement in the Gulf of Guinea is wide-reaching, covering a broad range of activities and applying focus grounded in African initiatives to strengthen maritime security capacities across West and Central Africa, at regional and/or interregional level. At the same time, EU projects work, to different extents, with individual coastal states and the launch of the Coordinated Maritime Presences (CMP) in January 2021 adds a more targeted function within the EU's portfolio, emphasising the presence of European naval vessels within the overall scope of EU activities in the Gulf of Guinea, and an envisioned military action under the European Peace Facility (EPF) targeting coastal state navies will further address response capabilities in the region.

2.2. Problem Analysis

Despite this comprehensive engagement, there are a number of gaps, both within the EU efforts and in the region's capacities, requiring increased attention. The EU's political engagement lacks resources and effective strategic communication to pave the way and open relevant doors, both when it comes to existing dialogue, follow-up and negotiations, as well as the beginning of new projects. Naturally, this has negative effects too upon EU operational engagement (both within and outside the support to the Yaoundé Architecture) which also misses a structured coordination framework. EU efforts to enhance legal finish face a challenge of missing handover agreements, leading to the importance to better acknowledge that maritime crime, maritime threats and maritime law enforcement are all dependent upon land. Despite long-term assistance provided by the EU's programmes and projects, there are still critical needs in the Gulf of Guinea to improve their maritime coordination and operational capacities.

Identification of main stakeholders:

EU stakeholders: EEAS, European Commission, EUDs, EU Member States (Embassies, navies and projects).

Regional entities: ECOWAS, ECCAS, Gulf of Guinea Commission, Yaoundé Architecture, MCF/SHADE
Coastal and Island states.

International partners: US, UK and other countries.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE ACTION Objectives and Expected Outputs

The Overall Objective (Impact) of this action is to strengthen the cohesion of the EU's efforts in enhancing maritime security and economic prosperity in the Gulf of Guinea.

The Specific Objectives (Outcomes) of this action are to:

1. Support EU political engagement with partners on maritime security;
2. Support synergies and coherence of EU, EU MS and non-EU actions;
3. Provide technical assistance/capacity building to champion countries and the Yaoundé Architecture;
4. Increase regional awareness about the EU's objectives and actions in support of maritime security.

The Outputs to be delivered by this action contributing to the corresponding Specific Objectives (Outcomes) are

- 1.1 The EU political engagement, bilaterally as well as multilaterally through existing regional formats and for a, is strengthened
- 1.2 The buy-in of EU's actions including CMP is enhanced
- 1.3 The process leading to agreements on handover of suspected pirates to countries in the region is supported
- 2.1 The programming of new EU actions addresses capacity gaps in line with the EU's priorities and avoids overlaps.
- 2.2. Coordination and cooperation of EU, EU MS and non-EU actions is enhanced.

- 2.3. The coherence of EU and EU MS actions contributes to achieving the EU's political objectives in the region.
- 3.1. Capacities of selected champion countries and Yaoundé Architecture (YA) centres to respond to incidents at sea in a coordinated manner are enhanced.
- 4.1. The visibility and greater understanding of the EU and its objectives and actions are increased among beneficiary countries, partner countries and the private sector.

3.2. Indicative Activities

Activities related to Outcome 1:

1. Support the organisation of political dialogues and exchanges with the participation of the high-/senior-level officials of the EEAS and Commission services, especially in support of the EU Senior Coordinator for the GoG.
2. Support the EU's participation in the appropriate G7++ FOGG and GoG-MCF/SHADE working groups through provision of expertise, in line with the EU's interests.
3. Support the process leading to handover agreements, especially through legal expertise, human rights assessment and scoping of prisons.

Activities related to Outcome 2:

1. Support the coordination efforts of the EU Senior Coordinator for GoG, both as regards the programming of new actions and regarding ongoing projects (including to promote EU projects' capacity building activities on board EU MS vessels).
2. Organise regular coordination meetings for donors and implementers, in appropriate formats, in line with the guidance of the EU Senior Coordinator for GoG.
3. Establish and maintain an online database collecting information about EU, EU MS and non-EU actions related to maritime security and safety in the region.

Activities related to Outcome 3:

1. Scope / assess the needs of the operational centres of selected champion countries (with a possible focus on Togo, Benin, Nigeria, Cameroon, Angola, Ghana, Equatorial Guinea and Gabon) and Yaoundé Architecture (focus on Multinational Maritime Coordination Centres at zonal level).
2. Provide technical assistance and capacity building to the selected countries and centres especially in the areas of maritime domain awareness, information-exchange, inter-agency collaboration, maritime coordination including with CMP.

Activities related to Outcome 4:

1. Organise visibility, strategic communication and public outreach events, to engage with governmental officials, non-governmental stakeholders, the academic sector and the general public, including for participation of high-/senior-level EU officials.
2. Support the EU's strategic communication on the internet as well as through publications and visibility material.

3.3. Mainstreaming

This action mainstreams the following cross-cutting issues: Multilateralism (building alliances) contributing to a global order based on international law, EU principles and values (democracy, rule of law, human rights and fundamental freedoms, respect for human dignity, the principles of equality, including gender equality, and solidarity); and resilience .

3.4. Risks and Lessons Learnt

Category	Risks	Likelihood (High/Medium/Low)	Impact (High/Medium/Low)	Mitigating measures
	Irritants coming from political developments that negatively affect EU relations with key partners	Medium	High	Careful monitoring of the political agenda, continuous engagement with main stakeholders and diversification of interlocutors/partners, constant identification of less sensitive topics of mutual interest that could be explored.
	Lack of local buy-in	Medium	High	Address the issues at political level
	Covid-related travel restrictions	Medium	Medium	Organise remote meetings

Lessons Learnt:

The implementation of the CMP GOG pilot case since 2021 has shown, among others, a need for a programme of outreach combined with strategic communication with coastal states and regional organisations, including at relevant regional fora. This is essential to explain the CMP concept and secure local buy in. In this regard, the EU Integrated Approach is essential to ensure concerted efforts including with Commission funded programmes.

In the case of “Enhancing Security Cooperation in and with Asia” (ESIWA), another key project designed to strengthen the EU’s role as a global security provider (with an initial emphasis on six Asian pilot countries and four thematic areas, one of them being maritime security), experience shows that an in-country presence is important to ensure good partner country understanding of the project’s goals and establish meaningful and regular engagement with official representatives from pilot countries.

4. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

4.1. Indicative Implementation Period

The indicative operational implementation period of this action, during which the activities described in section 3 will be carried out and the corresponding contracts and agreements implemented, is 60¹⁰ months from the date of adoption by the Commission of this Financing Decision.

Extensions of the implementation period may be agreed by the Commission's responsible authorising officer by amending this Financing Decision and the relevant contracts and agreements.

4.2. Implementation modalities

4.2.1. Direct Management (Grants)

N/A

4.2.2. Direct Management (Procurement)

N/A

4.2.3. Indirect Management with a Member State Organisation

This action may be implemented in indirect management with an entity, which will be selected by the Commission's services using the following criteria: 1) long proven experience in the region, 2) demonstrated professional track record in conducting maritime security-related projects, 3) experience of close cooperation with EEAS, European Commission DGs, other EU institutions and EU Member States, 4) specific experience operating in difficult environments.

4.2.4. Changes from indirect to direct management mode (and vice versa) due to exceptional circumstances (one alternative second option)

N/A

4.3. Indicative Budget

Indicative Budget components¹¹	EU contribution (amount in EUR)	
Implementation modalities – cf. section 4.2		
Grants – total envelope under section 4.2.1	0	N.A.
Procurement – total envelope under section 4.2.2	0	N.A.
Indirect management with MS Organisation, - cf. section 4.2.3	4 990 000	
Totals	4 990 000	

¹⁰ This can be extended for a period not exceeding the same duration.

¹¹ N.B: The final text on audit/verification depends on the outcome of ongoing discussions on pooling of funding in (one or a limited number of) Decision(s) and the subsequent financial management, i.e. for the conclusion of audit contracts and payments.

4.4. Organisational Set-up and Responsibilities

The action shall be implemented under indirect management. A strong policy steering and monitoring of the action will be ensured by the EEAS and FPI in coordination with other Commission services. The EU delegations in the region will also ensure monitoring of the activities and direct contacts with the implementing partners.

A dedicated steering committee may be established to act as an advisory and reporting mechanism in order to provide the strategic and policy guidance needed to ensure smooth project implementation. The steering committee should meet twice a year and will define the priority work streams to be addressed. The steering committee will review and endorse annual work plans, monitor project outputs and achievements and not least provide advice on how to address obstacles and challenges identified during implementation. The steering committee, whose composition will be further detailed at the contract level, will comprise representatives of the EEAS, FPI, INTPA and the relevant sections of the EU Delegations.

As part of its prerogative of budget implementation and to safeguard the financial interests of the Union, the Commission may participate in the above governance structures set up for governing the implementation of the action.

5. PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

5.1. Monitoring and Reporting

The day-to-day technical and financial monitoring of the implementation of this action will be a continuous process, and part of the implementing partner's responsibilities. To this aim, the implementing partner shall establish a permanent internal, technical and financial monitoring system for the action and elaborate regular progress reports (not less than annual) and final reports. Every report shall provide an accurate account of implementation of the action, difficulties encountered, changes introduced, as well as the degree of achievement of its results (Outputs and direct Outcomes) as measured by corresponding indicators, using as reference the logframe matrix (for project modality) and the partner's strategy, policy or reform action plan list (for budget support).

The Commission may undertake additional project monitoring visits both through its own staff and through independent consultants recruited directly by the Commission for independent monitoring reviews (or recruited by the responsible agent contracted by the Commission for implementing such reviews).

5.2. Evaluation

Having regard to the importance of the action, a final evaluation will be carried out for this action or its components via independent consultants contracted by the Commission.

The final evaluation will be carried out for accountability and learning purposes at various levels (including for policy revision).

The evaluation report shall be shared with the partner countries and other key stakeholders following the best practice of evaluation dissemination¹². The implementing partner and the Commission shall analyse the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation and, where appropriate, in agreement with the partner country, jointly decide on the follow-up actions to be taken and any adjustments necessary, including, if indicated, the reorientation of the project.

5.3. Audit and Verifications

Without prejudice to the obligations applicable to contracts concluded for the implementation of this action, the Commission may, on the basis of a risk assessment, contract independent audit or verification assignments for one or several contracts or agreements.

6. COMMUNICATION AND VISIBILITY

The 2021-2027 programming cycle will adopt a new approach to pooling, programming and deploying strategic communication and public diplomacy resources. At country level, resources required for strategic communication

¹² See best [practice of evaluation dissemination](#)

will, in principle, be consolidated in Support Facilities, allowing EU Delegations to plan and execute multiannual strategic communication actions with sufficient critical mass to be effective on a national scale.

To that end, Delegations will develop short strategic communication and public diplomacy plans that reflect the objectives of the Delegation as a whole in this domain, initially covering the period up to the Mid-Term Review (MTR). The strategic plan will include key administrative information and cover the following main elements:

1. Audiences targeted
2. The principal objective(s)
3. The core narrative
4. Preliminary suggestions for content, partnerships and channels

Communication activities foreseen under the current action will be fully in line with this strategic communication plan. Activities will be funded by the support facilities and, if necessary, will optimize communication and visibility resources of the components of this action.

It remains a contractual obligation for all entities implementing EU-funded external actions to inform the relevant audiences of the Union's support for their work by displaying the EU emblem and a short funding statement as appropriate on all communication material related to the actions concerned. This obligation will continue to apply equally, regardless of whether the actions concerned are implemented by the Commission, partner countries, service providers, grant beneficiaries or entrusted or delegated entities such as UN agencies, international financial institutions and agencies of EU member states. The implementing partner(s) shall also provide any content requested by the EU Delegation to support their own communication activities, including by giving full access to relevant audio, photo and video material that the partner(s) has the rights to.

Communication and visibility measures may be also funded from the amounts allocated to the action. For the purpose of enhancing the visibility of the EU and its contribution to this action, the Commission may sign or enter into joint declarations or statements, as part of its prerogative of budget implementation and to safeguard the financial interests of the Union. Visibility and communication measures should also promote transparency and accountability on the use of funds.

Effectiveness of communication activities on awareness about the action and its objectives as well as on EU funding of the action should be measured.

Implementing partners shall keep the Commission and concerned EU Delegation/Office fully informed of the planning and implementation of specific visibility and communication activities before work starts. Implementing partners will ensure adequate visibility of EU financing and will report on visibility and communication actions as well as the results of the overall action to the relevant monitoring committees.

APPENDIX 1 REPORTING IN OPSYS

An Intervention¹³ (also generally called project/programme) is the operational entity associated to a coherent set of activities and results structured in a logical framework aiming at delivering development change or progress. Interventions are the most effective (hence optimal) entities for the operational follow-up by the Commission of its external development operations. As such, Interventions constitute the base unit for managing operational implementations, assessing performance, monitoring, evaluation, internal and external communication, reporting and aggregation.

Primary Interventions are those contracts or groups of contracts bearing reportable results and respecting the following business rule: 'a given contract can only contribute to one primary intervention and not more than one'. An individual contract that does not produce direct reportable results and cannot be logically grouped with other result reportable contracts is considered a 'support entities'. The addition of all primary interventions and support entities is equivalent to the full development portfolio of the Institution.

Primary Interventions are identified during the design of each action by the responsible service (Delegation or Headquarters operational Unit).

The level of the Primary Intervention is defined in the related Action Document and it is revisable; it can be a(n) (group of) action(s) or a (group of) contract(s).

Tick in the left side column one of the three possible options for the level of definition of the Primary Intervention(s) identified in this action.

In the case of 'Group of actions' level, add references to the present action and other action concerning the same Primary Intervention.

In the case of 'Contract level', add the reference to the corresponding budgetary items in point 4.6, Indicative Budget.

Option 3: Contract level		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Single Contract	Indirect management with MS Organisation, - cf. section 4.2.3

¹³ [ARES \(2021\)4204912](#) - For the purpose of consistency between terms in OPSYS, DG INTPA, DG NEAR and FPI have harmonised 5 key terms, including 'action' and 'Intervention' where an 'action' is the content (or part of the content) of a Commission Financing Decision and 'Intervention' is a coherent set of activities and results which constitutes an effective level for the operational follow-up by the EC of its operations on the ground. See more on the [concept of intervention](#).