



EN

THIS ACTION IS FUNDED BY THE EUROPEAN UNION

ANNEX IV

of the Commission Implementing Decision on the 2022 annual action plan for the global threats part of the thematic programme on peace, stability and conflict prevention

Action Document for Critical Infrastructure Protection

ANNUAL PLAN

This document constitutes the annual work programme in the sense of Article 110(2) of the Financial Regulation, and action plans in the sense of Article 23 of Regulation (EU) 2021/947 establishing the Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument – Global Europe.

1. SYNOPSIS

1.1. Action Summary Table

1. Title CRIS/OPSYS business reference Basic Act	Critical Infrastructure Protection OPSYS/CRIS ¹ number: ACT-60761 Financed under the Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument Global Europe (NDICI-Global Europe) Regulation			
2. Team Europe Initiative	No			
3. Zone benefiting from the action	The action shall be carried out worldwide.			
4. Programming document	Peace, Stability and Conflict Prevention Thematic Programme 2021 – 2027			
5. Link with relevant MIP(s) objectives/expected results	Priority 7 - Addressing trans-regional and global threats to critical infrastructure Specific objective 3: Increased engagement of national authorities in addressing global challenges related to maritime security			
PRIORITY AREAS AND SECTOR INFORMATION				
6. Priority Area(s), sectors	Global, trans-regional and emerging threats 152 - Conflict, Peace & Security			
7. Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)	Main SDG: 16 (Promote Peace and end violence) Other significant SDGs and where appropriate, targets: 5 (Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls), 9 (Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure)			
8 a) DAC code(s)	15130 – Legal and judicial development 15210 – Security system management and reform			
8 b) Main Delivery Channel	Public Sector Institutions – 10000			
9. Targets	<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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Human Rights, Democracy and Governance			
10. Markers (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"/>

¹ Depending on the availability of OPSYS at the time of encoding, a provisional CRIS number may need to be provided.

	Gender equality and women's and girl's empowerment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Trade development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 markers and Tags:	Policy objectives	Not targeted	Significant objective	Principal objective
	Digitalisation Tags: digital connectivity digital governance digital entrepreneurship job creation digital skills/literacy digital services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
	Connectivity Tags: transport people2people energy digital connectivity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" 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): BGUE-B2022-14.020230 – STABILITY AND PEACE - GLOBAL AND TRANSREGIONAL THREATS Total estimated cost: EUR 6 000 000 Total amount of EU budget contribution: EUR 6 000 000			
MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION				
13. Type of financing	Indirect management with Expertise France			

1.2. Summary of the Action

The resilience of critical infrastructure and critical maritime routes, from a broad range of security, environmental and safety-related threats, is essential to safeguarding core societal and economic activities in various sectors, including transport, energy, food supply and health, and to facilitating global trade and cooperation, as outlined in the EU Maritime Security Strategy and its revised Action Plan, among others. In a globalised world, major disruptions resulting from intentional or unintentional harm or damage caused to this infrastructure can have significant repercussions, including for the EU.

The action “Critical Maritime Routes Indo-Pacific” (CRIMARIO) has since 2015 supported partner countries in the Indian Ocean and Southeast Asia to adequately address maritime security and safety challenges in a comprehensive manner, through cross-sectorial, inter-agency and cross-regional approaches, with the view to secure the lines of communication at sea.

This top-up of the existing action will allow to extend the action to the Pacific in line with the EU Strategy for Cooperation in the Indo-Pacific as well as to extend the duration of the project.

The **overall objective** is to contribute to improving maritime security and safety, encouraging cross-sectorial, inter-agency and (trans-)regional approaches.

The two Specific Objectives of the action focus on enhancing information exchange and analysis to support maritime

coordination and crisis management (notably through the promotion of the **IORIS maritime coordination platform**); and on strengthening maritime surveillance, policing, investigation and judicial matters (with a view to enhance inter-agency collaboration).

All components will be implemented in full complementarity with bilateral and regional programmes and in coordination with EU Delegations and relevant units in INTPA, MARE and MOVE as well as EEAS.

2. RATIONALE

2.1. Context

Maritime Routes are the routes considered crucial to maritime trade, transport, fishing and other essential maritime activities. As maritime transport represents by far the largest proportion by volume of world trade and around 90% of Europe's global trade is transported by sea, the Indian Ocean, the Gulf of Guinea and the South East Asia are of strategic importance to Europe.

This action concentrates on contributing to securing critical maritime routes in the Indo-Pacific. A number of maritime threats, such as kidnap for ransom, maritime terrorism, and illicit trafficking plague these regions. Illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing is also a challenge.

The complex threat landscape in the Indo-Pacific (including in relation to the South China Sea dispute) has led to rising levels of national maritime security spending amongst countries in recent years. Nevertheless, the capabilities of most countries remain insufficient. This growth in spending requires complementary efforts in the professionalisation of maritime law enforcement at the national level, as well as to address the numerous maritime security and safety threats that countries in continue to face.

Maritime domain awareness capabilities are receiving investments but remain insufficient in most parts of the Indo-Pacific. Surveillance and control have been falling behind the growing challenges linked to increased threats. Strengthening these capabilities by using IT technologies and by promoting a cross-sectorial, inter-agency and cross-regional approach would assist coastal nations in their efforts to build maritime domain awareness and a coordinated capacity to respond to security and safety incidents at sea. The use of IT technologies need to be accompanied by strengthening of security related to these technologies.

In this regard, the CRIMARIO II was launched in 2020 expanding its geographical scope from the Western Indian Ocean to cover also South and Southeast Asia, and increasing its focus from maritime information exchange and coordination also to law enforcement cooperation. This top-up of CRIMARIO II will allow to extend the project to the Pacific in line with the EU Strategy for Cooperation in the Indo-Pacific as well as to extend the duration of the project.

The Pacific Ocean is a region of resources of high economic and strategic value (e.g. fisheries), as well as a maritime corridor for both licit and illicit goods between major source countries and destinations in Asia and the Americas. The maritime domain is also where the relationship between security and development is most strikingly apparent. Many Pacific islands are dependent on their blue economy and, as such, maritime security is a key lever on the region's economy.

Maritime security challenges and threats are shared across the 18 member countries² of the Pacific Islands Forum (PIF), with a strong regional consensus on the importance of maritime security with respect to the three core and intersecting maritime security priorities: fisheries; transnational crime; and ocean governance. Such consensus is formally reflected in key security declarations including the PIF Boe Declaration on Regional Security of 2018.

However, there are wide discrepancies between PIF members in terms of maritime security capabilities and capacities, as well as between the regional architecture and national level responses. Unlike other regions, the Pacific lacks a broad-based regional information fusion centre that could produce actionable information/intelligence across the maritime domain, including trafficking of drugs, small arms and human beings, armed robbery at sea and piracy. Challenges also lie with the analysis of information itself, caused by distrust that reduces information sharing both at international and interagency level. The collation and analysis of data, moreover, is an ongoing concern across most of the Pacific countries and territories.

² Australia, Cook Islands, Fiji, French Polynesia, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Nauru New Caledonia, New Zealand, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu

2.2. Problem Analysis

Short problem analysis:

There is a clear gap in some countries in the Indian Ocean and Southeast Asia: capacity within maritime administrations, law enforcement and coast guards to address maritime security challenges remains insufficient in some cases. The regions are faced with a rising threat landscape characterised by complex and intertwined maritime security and safety challenges. Mitigating the threats requires especially improved capabilities in maritime domain awareness and inter-agency cooperation and functioning maritime law enforcement.

As regards the Pacific, there are two critical gaps: (1) the capacity gap; and (2) the law enforcement gap. For example, there are deep discrepancies between the PIF member states in terms of their capacities and capabilities to address maritime security threats, risks and challenges. A gap is also observed in law enforcement capabilities, which provides an entry point for the trafficking of drugs, small arms and human beings. Moreover, information technology and management are recognised as critical areas where it is important to strengthen maritime security capabilities and MDA. Increased IT capabilities in terms of skills and equipment would enable Pacific countries to broaden engagement and build capacities across the region.

In this regard, CRIMARIO has developed, and continues developing, IORIS, a tailor-made web-based platform to:

- coordinate maritime operations including real-time management of incidents at sea; and
- offer secure communications between users allowing each to control access rights for their respective designated areas;
- offer certain surveillance capabilities;
- to be used at national (inter-agency) as well as regional (international) level.

The platform has been operational since 2018 and is currently used by a growing number of national and regional maritime actors and agencies in the Western Indian Ocean, Horn of Africa and the Red Sea, including the Regional Maritime Information Fusion Centre (RMIFC) in Madagascar and the Regional Center for Operations Coordination (RCOC) in Seychelles, as well as Operation EUNAVFOR Atalanta, and potentially the Coordinated Maritime Presence in North-West Indian Ocean.

In the Pacific, the establishment of the Pacific Fusion Centre (PFC) in 2019 reflected growing recognition that the practice of focusing on challenges individually rather than addressing the convergences and synergies across and between issues was hampering a coordinated regional response. However, unlike other regional fusion centres, the PFC does not produce operational information on specific security threats. Moreover, there is a paucity of data pertinent to MDA in the Pacific, particularly with respect to activities on the high seas. Consequently, there remains a need for a Pacific regional maritime information fusion centre to fuse and share operational information and actionable intelligence, which could strongly benefit from a platform like IORIS.

It is in this context that maritime coordination and information-sharing initiatives are the cornerstones upon which law enforcement capacity building, exercises and other forms of cooperation shall be hinged. CRIMARIO II therefore focuses on promoting the development of single information-sharing environment, through concept development and technologies. Key in all this is support to existing information fusion and information sharing centres, and linking them and promoting interoperability to facilitate exchange of information and coordination of operations.

The proposed top-up of CRIMARIO focuses on integrating the Pacific region in the scope of the project to be in line with the EU Strategy for Cooperation in the Indo-Pacific. This would enable the adoption / inclusion / use of CRIMARIO - an experienced and already proven EU instrument for regional cooperation in the area of maritime security – as a reliable and useful tool directly supporting the implementation of the Strategy in the following years.

In addition, though IORIS was designed to enhance regional security architectures, there remains the danger that national and regional platforms could replicate IORIS functions, which could be counter-productive and not in line with the concept of an enhanced information sharing environment. Enabling the use of IORIS at a larger scale would, therefore, improve the platform's credibility and in so doing, its chances of survival and the opportunity to share costs of its future employment. CRIMARIO II should, consequently, expand the use IORIS to the Pacific, to also facilitate the promotion of the enhanced information sharing environment.

EU Fundamental Values

CRIMARIO II has been targeting most coastal and island countries in three regions (WIO, South Asia and Southeast

Asia). Additional countries in the Pacific would be now added. All its activities and operations will contribute to, and be accounted for under, the general objectives of the von der Leyen Commission: "A stronger Europe in the world".

The selection of partner countries and organisations takes into account their respect of the fundamental values of democracy, Human Rights and the Rule of Law.

Key cross-cutting issues

Human rights, rule of law, management/leadership, justice, law enforcement, gender, capacity building.

Relevance and credibility of Partner Country's/Regional Policies and Strategies

CRIMARIO II has been targeting coastal and island countries in three regions (WIO, South Asia and Southeast Asia) and a number of relevant international and regional organisations, and is now proposed to cover the Pacific region too. The action partners with, and provides support to those countries and organisations which aim to enhance maritime security and safety in a coordinated and collaborative manner.

The Djibouti Code of Conduct (DCoC), adopted in 2009 by 21 countries with an interest in the Western Indian Ocean and originally focusing on counter-piracy, now through the Jeddah Amendment (DCoC(J)) includes also other illicit maritime activities such as illicit trafficking and illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing. The IMO receive support from CRIMARIO and will have to choose an information-sharing tool in due course. IORIS was developed to serve the needs of the DCoC, purchasing a life-time license for each country).

The Indian Ocean Commission (IOC) has been actively enhancing its capacities and building up maritime security architecture in the region through the RMIFC and RCOC regional maritime centers, benefitting from the EU support via the MASE Programme, formalising two international agreements including 7 countries of the region. Both IOC centres make use of IORIS on a daily basis.

The Foreign Ministers of the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) agreed, through the 2010 Hanoi Plan of Action, to implement the ARF Vision Statement. Priority areas include: promoting compliance and adherence to relevant international legal instruments and regional arrangements; forging closer cooperation to enhance the safety and security of navigation (implementation of standards, best practices, data-sharing for small vessel registration on a national and (potentially) regional basis); promoting regional maritime security capacity-building through concrete activities (information sharing, exchanges of officials, table top exercises, joint training activities); and promoting cooperation (maritime security and safety, search and rescue, technological cooperation, combating maritime terrorism and national crimes like piracy, armed robbery against ships, hijacking, smuggling, trafficking in persons). The 2016 ARF Ministerial Conference determined that the EU and ASEAN have shared interests in maritime security, and that the EU as ARF Inter-Sessional Meeting co-chair would have until mid-2021 to help guide ASEAN's maritime security agenda.

The EU has a long-term partnership with the Pacific region, which it seeks to reinforce through the Partnership Agreement. There is a strong foundation upon which to build a maritime security partnership between the EU and the Pacific expanding on existing initiatives within the security-development nexus. Together with the EU's Economic Partnership Agreement with Pacific States, it will provide the basis for stronger political and strategic engagement based on common values and objectives. In 2000, the EU became a Pacific Islands Forum (PIF) Dialogue Partner, with the establishment of the EU-Ministerial Troika in 2008. The EU is also a Permanent Observer of the Pacific Community (SPC) and has a diplomatic presence in four Forum member states.³ The EU also partners with 15 Pacific countries⁴ as part of the Pacific-European Union Marine Partnership (PEUMP) programme, which promotes sustainable management and ocean governance.

EU added value

In line with the EU Global Strategy and the EU Maritime Security Strategy (EU MSS), the EU aims to act as a global maritime security provider. This is further supported by the EU Strategy for Cooperation in the Indo-Pacific.

Among its objectives, the EUMSS pursues its actions to ensure freedom, safety and security of navigation, and to ensure coherence between the activities of various organisations, notably in the fisheries, environment and transport fields. One of the main features of the revised Action Plan is the emphasis on the regional approach, which is considered fundamental to tailoring responses to security challenges in European sea basins and other key maritime

³ These are: Australia, Fiji, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea.

⁴ These are: the Cook Islands, Fiji, Federated States of Micronesia (FSM), Kiribati, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Republic of the Marshall Islands, Tuvalu, Tonga, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Timor-Leste and Vanuatu.

hotspots, such as the Eastern Indian Ocean. The regional focus is viewed as much more dynamic and productive, capable of promoting a more concerted effort among all interested countries, regardless of their level of development.

Moreover, the EU Global Strategy notes that in the Eastern Indian Ocean, the EU will help build maritime capacities and support an ASEAN-led regional security architecture. The EU-ASEAN High Level Dialogue aims to gather ideas and inputs on how and where ASEAN and the EU can cooperate on maritime security. Specifically, the Dialogue explores pathways for bilateral cooperation between EU and ASEAN Member States to improve maritime surveillance, information sharing, law enforcement at sea, and the development of efficient, secure and environmentally friendly ports.⁵

The EU Strategy for Cooperation in the Indo-Pacific foresees to extend CRIMARIO to the Southern Pacific, and to increase synergies with likeminded partners. The EU will build maritime capacity against drug trafficking, human trafficking and wildlife crime, and also illicit financial flows linked to terrorism. The EU will also encourage the consolidation of information-sharing mechanisms through information fusion centres, including through the IORIS platform.

The Concept note for an implementation of the Coordinated Maritime Presences concept in North Western Indian Ocean adopted on 21 February 2022 foresees that the EU Member States naval assets participating in the CMP could use IORIS for communication with external partners such as local countries, information sharing / fusion centres and non-regional actors, for the purposes of coordination at sea and conduct of exercises. The EU's added value also consists in the fact that the EU is mostly seen as rather a neutral actor in these regions and thus is a credible, reliable partner to support strengthening maritime security, especially in Southeast Asia where there are maritime disputes between countries.

Complementarity with EU and other Donors/Partners

CRIMARIO has established itself as a well-known actor in the maritime security community in the Western Indian Ocean and is progressively more known in South and Southeast Asia. It continues to build a high level of credibility with the expertise provided to key actors and has succeeded to develop synergies and a permanent flow of information with other EU initiatives covering the Indian Ocean such as MASE (in January 2021, a joint Action plan was elaborated by Indian Ocean Commission/MASE and CRIMARIO), MSCHOA (Maritime Security Centre – Horn of Africa), CRIMSON (in coordination, communications and evaluation).

Potential for collaboration in the field of maritime domain awareness with the EDF-funded Red Sea Programme is currently being analysed.

In Asia, a close cooperation has been established with the “Enhancing Security Cooperation in and with Asia” project.

Links will be established with the South East Asia Regional programme for labour migration in the fishing sector, combatting illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing, in particular with an aim to raise labour standards in export-intensive fishing and seafood processing sectors. Strong links have been established with other partners, including the United States, Japan, India and Singapore.

Identification of main stakeholders and corresponding institutional and/or organisational issues (mandates, potential roles, and capacities) to be covered by the action:

The key stakeholders are:

- Maritime Law Enforcement authorities/agencies of coastal and island states in the Indo-Pacific
- International and regional organisations such as Indian Ocean Commission, International Maritime Organisation/Djibouti Code of Conduct, ASEAN, Regional Cooperation Agreement on Combating Piracy and Armed Robbery against Ships in Asia (ReCAAP), the Pacific Community (SPC) the Pacific Islands Forum (PIF), the Forum Fishery Agency (FFA), the Western and Central Pacific Commission (WCPFC)
- Information fusion and information sharing centres such as Regional Maritime Information Fusion Centre (RMIFC) in Madagascar, the Regional Center for Operations Coordination (RCOC) in Seychelles, Information Fusion Centre-Indian Ocean Region (IFC-IOR) in India, Information Fusion Centre in Singapore (Changi), the Pacific Fusion Centre (Vanuatu)
- Third countries active in the regions such as US, Japan, Australia, and New Zealand

⁵ The Bandari Seri Begawan Plan of Action responds to the decision of Foreign Ministers made at the 18th ASEAN-EU Ministerial Meeting in Madrid, on 26 May 2010. It aimed to bring cooperation to a higher level, by addressing regional and global challenges of shared concern over the coming five years (2013-2017). It covered a wide range of areas – political/security, economic/trade, sociocultural – reflecting the multifaceted character of ASEAN-EU relations. Articles 1.2.2, 1.2.8, 1.2.9, and 1.2.10 of the Plan of Action specifically referred to maritime security issues.

- European actors and entities: EU-funded actions such as MASE Programme, Red Sea Programme, Enhancing Security Cooperation in and with Asia (ESIWA)

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE ACTION

3.1. Objectives and Expected Outputs

The overall objective (Impact) is to contribute to improving maritime security and safety, encouraging cross-sectorial, inter-agency and (trans-)regional approaches.

The **Specific Objectives** of this component of the action are:

1. Enhance information exchange and analysis, to support maritime coordination and crisis management.
2. Strengthen maritime surveillance, policing, investigation and judiciary.

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

- 1.1 Information sharing mechanism established to promote an enhanced information sharing environment in the Indo-Pacific.
- 1.2 National institutional structures and procedures reviewed to improve the decision-making processes related to maritime governance.
- 2.1 Cooperation amongst law enforcement agencies and judiciary strengthened at national, international and regional level (not essentially only on maritime issues).

3.2. Indicative Activities

This top-up will extend the duration and geographical scope (Pacific region) of the ongoing CRIMARIO activities. It will also lead to strengthening technical advice / capacity building in support of CRIMARIO's key partners.

Main indicative activities under Outputs 1.1 and 1.2 in relation to the Pacific region:

The action will support the establishment of an interoperable data gathering/sharing information system to promote Maritime Domain Awareness (MDA). Capacity building activities include the provision of software, equipment and training. Continuous support will be offered to regional organisations. The action may also support partners improve national institutional structures and procedures reviewed to improve the decision-making processes related to maritime governance.

Main indicative activities under Output 2.1 in relation to the Pacific region:

The project will organize training, awareness raising, operational workshops and inter-agency exercises. The activities will seek complementarity and coordination with fora like the Joint Heads of Pacific Security (JHOPS).

3.3. Mainstreaming

Environmental Protection & Climate Change

Through assistance to addressing maritime pollution, this component of the action contributes to environmental protection.

Gender equality and empowerment of women and girls

Gender aspects are crucial as women are an important part of the maritime community in the Indo-Pacific. For instance, in Somalia the role of a mother is important to help combat piracy which is perpetrated by the youth. A lot of women work in the maritime law enforcement agencies, in the fisheries sector and shipping industry in South and Southeast Asia. Therefore, the integration of a gender-sensitive perspective throughout the project cycle and in accordance to the specificities of the crimes at hand shall make the actions more sustainable through: (i) ensuring that national authorities are aware of relevant women's human rights norms and standards and that they are trained to respect and protect these rights while performing their functions; (ii) promoting the balanced representation of women in the security sector; and (iii) fostering the increased participation of women in all operational activities related to the actions.

Human Rights and Democracy

A human rights perspective should be mainstreamed especially in the activities under the Specific Objective 2.

Disability

As per OECD Disability DAC codes identified in section 1.1, the action is labelled as D0.

Conflict sensitivity, peace and resilience

By enhancing the resilience of the critical infrastructure as regards maritime security and safety, this action contributes to enhancing the resilience of the relevant countries to security threats.

Disaster Risk Reduction

Through assistance to addressing maritime pollution, this component of the action contributes to disaster risk reduction.

3.4. Risks and Lessons Learnt

Risks	Likelihood (High/ Medium/ Low)	Impact (High/ Medium/ Low)	Mitigating measures
Difficulty to involve different administration / agencies that should be targeted by the action due to lack of information, lack of interest, competition amongst them. Slow 'political' process necessary for inter-agency initiatives.	High	High	Need for access to high-level country representatives to include decision makers in the processes. Maximise the use of EU political support, including the role of the EU Delegations.
Due to the sensitivity of maritime information, authorities are not inclined to cooperate.	High	Medium	Activities will be flexible and adjusted to the willingness of each beneficiary country to receive support.
Difficulties to foster international cooperation	High	Medium	Participation in international events and a good visibility strategy to advocate for the project action.
Overlaps with existing EU-funded projects at national and regional level and with projects from other donors	Medium	Medium	Constant assessment of the project environment within EU structures. Formal and informal coordination with other donors and implementing agencies.
Changes in the priorities of partner countries	High	Medium	The project design introduces necessary level of flexibility to adapt to changes by focusing on particular topics and/or by involving stakeholders from a wide spectrum.
Current COVID 19 situation and travel ban measures hamper the deployment of the experts in the regions and slow down the implementation.	High	High	Project activities are planned essentially remotely. This necessitates adaptation of the content of the activity and will be organised in person if and when the situation so allows.
Difficulty to identify a potential owner for IORIS and to transfer the ownership in due time.	Medium	High	Since the EU Strategy for Indo-Pacific foresees a long-term cooperation, including through CRIMARIO, the hand-over of IORIS is not seen as requiring clarity now. The decision on the future governance and ownership of IORIS will be made at a later stage according to implementation progress and the level of interest of different stakeholders. The future governance would most likely include IORIS users, and might also involve private industries as well as potentially the EU.
Involvement in a political sensitivity or a maritime dispute.	Medium	Medium	Ensure that activities planned take into account political sensitivities. Avoid to be involved in maritime disputes.
Duplication of info-exchange systems in the regions.	Medium	Medium	Work closely with information fusion centres to deconflict efforts by offering the IORIS to promote interagency coordination at the national level in Southeast Asia.
Risk of fragmentation or dilution of the action in case of a too high number of beneficiaries	Medium	Medium	Sequence the project's implementation through a rolling plan by region, finding the right balance between EU political priorities, interest and the needs of beneficiary countries to use IORIS in the long term.

Unsustainability of the actions/tools put in place	High	High	Put in place low cost solutions and advocate to facilitate mutualisation of costs.
--	------	------	--

3.5. The Intervention Logic

The underlying intervention logic is that

IF an information sharing mechanism is established to promote an enhanced information sharing environment in the Indo-Pacific and **IF** national institutional structures and procedures are reviewed to improve the decision-making processes related to maritime governance, **ASSUMING** that countries have an interest and see the benefit in using IORIS and information fusion centres are willing to take an active role in developing the SHARE.IT interface initiative,

THEN information exchange and analysis are enhanced, to support incident coordination and crisis management.

IF cooperation amongst law enforcement agencies and judiciary is strengthened at national, international and regional level (not essentially only on maritime issues), **ASSUMING** that COVID allows the conduct of in-country courses,

THEN maritime surveillance, policing, investigation and the judiciary are strengthened.

3.6. Logical Framework Matrix

Results	Results chain	Indicators	Baselines (values and years)	Targets (values and years)	Sources of data	Assumptions
Impact	Contribute to improving maritime security and safety, encouraging cross-sectorial, inter-agency and (trans-) regional approaches.	Number of countries adopting and implementing constitutional, statutory and/or policy measures for addressing maritime security	TBD (2022)	TBD (2025)		<i>Not applicable</i>
Outcomes	O1: Enhance information exchange and analysis, to support maritime coordination and crisis management.	Number of countries/regional organisations actively using ⁶ IORIS (disaggregated by region)	8 (2022)	25 (2025)	IORIS audit logs	Countries and regional organisations understand the need and value of information exchange and maritime awareness
		Number of countries connected through SHARE.IT for exchanging maritime security information	0 (2021)	25 (2025)	Share.it reports	
		Average number of information exchanges through IORIS per month	22 Documents 130 Messages (2020)	150 Documents 700 Messages (2025)	IORIS audit logs	
		Percentage of trained stakeholders with improved analysis skills	0% (2022)	70% (2025)	Pre/post testing of IORIS courses	Countries and regional organisation have an interest in cooperation
	O2: Strengthen inter-agency maritime surveillance, policing, investigation and judiciary.	Inter-agency and inter-country communication and collaboration is strengthened	Currently, many agencies and countries are working in siloes not communicating well (2022)	Agencies and countries understand the benefit of collaboration and are using the IORIS platform to do so (2024)	Project Monitoring and evaluation (progress report) Statistics of IORIS	Countries have an interest in international cooperation on maritime surveillance Countries have the capabilities to coordinate adequately
		Number of countries reporting to have conducted at least one joint exercise without support of CRIMARIO II	TBD (2022)	TBD (2025)	MTR / Endline	
Outputs		Information available in IORIS is enhanced and the platform further developed, incl. satellite imaging	Satellite imaging is not available in the	Satellite imaging and other enhancements	Internal activity reporting and BCN's update on IORIS improvements	

⁶ Actively using is defined as at least one user from a country/regional organisation logging into the IORIS hub on 80% of the weeks after their first training.

	OP 1.1: Information sharing mechanism established to promote a single information sharing environment in the Indo-Pacific.		IORIS platform (2022)	improve the user experience and usability of IORIS (2025)		Countries have an interest and see the benefit in using IORIS
		Number of other maritime security/surveillance tools connected to IORIS through the use of SHARE.IT	0 (2022)	5 (2025)	SHARE.IT activity reports	
	OP 1.2: National institutional structures and procedures reviewed to improve the decision-making processes related to maritime governance.	Number of information fusion centres supported	0 (2022)	5 (2025)	SHARE.IT activity reports	Information fusion centres are willing to take an active role in developing the SHARE.IT interface initiative
	OP 2.1: Cooperation amongst law enforcement agencies and judiciary strengthened at national, international and regional level (not essentially only on maritime issues)	Number of maritime law enforcement courses conducted	0 (2022)	3 (2025)	Activity reporting	COVID allows the conduct of in-country courses
		Average number of different law enforcement agencies and judiciaries participating in the same law enforcement course.	0 (2022)	3 (2025)		

4. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

4.1. Financing Agreement

In order to implement this action, it is not envisaged to conclude a financing agreement with the partner countries.

4.2. 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 72 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.

4.3. Implementation Modalities

The Commission will ensure that the EU appropriate rules and procedures for providing financing to third parties are respected, including review procedures, where appropriate, and compliance of the action with EU restrictive measures⁷.

4.3.1. Indirect Management with a Member State Organisation

This action may be implemented in indirect management with Expertise France.

The entity was selected by the Commission's services using in particular the following criteria: operational capacity, experience and value added. The implementation by this entity entails achieving all the activities as described in chapter 4.1 aiming to support partner countries in the Indian Ocean and Southeast Asia to adequately address maritime-related issues and maritime security challenges in a comprehensive manner, encouraging cross-sectorial and interregional approaches.

In case the envisaged entity would need to be replaced, the Commission's services may select a replacement entity using the same criteria.

4.3.2. Changes from indirect to direct management mode (and vice versa) due to exceptional circumstances

In the interest of the programme, or if the negotiations with the selected entities fail, all parts of this action may be implemented in indirect management according to the same selection criteria as above.

4.4. Scope of geographical eligibility for procurement and grants

The geographical eligibility in terms of place of establishment for participating in procurement and grant award procedures and in terms of origin of supplies purchased as established in the basic act and set out in the relevant contractual documents shall apply.

4.5. Indicative Budget

Indicative Budget components	EU contribution (amount in EUR)
Indirect management with a Member State Organisation (Expertise France) - cf. section 4.3.1	6 000 000
Evaluation – cf. section Error! Reference source not found. ; Audit – cf. section 5.3	will be covered by another Decision
Communication and visibility – cf. section Error! Reference source not found.	will be covered by another Decision
Contingencies	N/A

⁷ www.sanctionsmap.eu. Please note that the sanctions map is an IT tool for identifying the sanctions regimes. The source of the sanctions stems from legal acts published in the Official Journal (OJ). In case of discrepancy between the published legal acts and the updates on the website it is the OJ version that prevails.

Totals	6 000 000
---------------	-----------

4.6. Organisational Set-up and Responsibilities

The implementation of this component will be coordinated and led by the European Commission. CRIMARIO II's management structure will continue to be applied to ensure the coherence of the activities under this component.

Moreover, in order to guarantee the necessary strategic orientation of the programme, the Contracting Authority together with the implementing partner will establish and co-chair a *Steering Committee* for the action aiming to monitor progress made in implementation, approve the work plans of the respective components, approve ad-hoc support to a specific country, review progress reports and other documentation, ensure the participation of all relevant stakeholders in activities, promote synergies with actions of bilateral and regional cooperation of the EU and its Member States and coordination with actions financed by other donors.

4.7. Pre-conditions

N/A

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).

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

In case an evaluation is not planned, the Commission may, during implementation, decide to undertake such an evaluation for duly justified reasons either on its own decision or on the initiative of the partner.

The Commission shall inform the implementing partner at least one month in advance of the dates foreseen for the evaluation missions. The implementing partner shall collaborate efficiently and effectively with the evaluation experts, and inter alia provide them with all necessary information and documentation, as well as access to the project premises and activities.

The evaluation reports may be shared with the partner country and other key stakeholders. The implementing partner and the Commission shall analyse the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluations 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.

The financing of the evaluation shall be covered by another measure constituting a financing decision.

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

Communication and visibility is a contractual obligation for all entities implementing EU-funded external actions to advertise the European Union's support for their work to the relevant audiences.

To that end they must comply with the instructions given in the [Communication and Visibility Requirements of 2018](#) (or any successor document), notably with regard to the use of the EU emblem and the elaboration of a dedicated communication and visibility plan, to be completed for every action at the start of implementation.

These obligations apply equally, regardless of whether the actions concerned are implemented by the Commission, the partner country (for instance, concerning the reforms supported through budget support), contractors, grant beneficiaries or entrusted entities. In each case, a reference to the relevant contractual obligations must be included in the respective financing agreement, procurement and grant contracts, and delegation agreements.

Communication and visibility measures may be 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 Intervention⁸ (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 4.5, Indicative Budget.

Option 1: Action level		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Single action	Present action: all contracts in the present action
Option 2: Group of actions level		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Group of actions	Actions reference (CRIS#/OPSYS#):
Option 3: Contract level		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Single Contract 1	Contract with Expertise France
<input type="checkbox"/>	Group of contracts 1	

⁸ [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](#).