

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

REMARKS

BY

ADMIRAL THAD ALLEN

37th IFPA-Fletcher Conference on National Security Strategy
and Policy
Washington, DC
27 September 2007

1 ADM ALLEN:

2 It's great to be with you here today. It's
3 been an extraordinary year working with the Navy and
4 Marine Corps on maritime strategy, and I'm sure you've
5 heard a lot about it and will hear a lot more about
6 it.

7 I'm going to take a little different tack
8 here at lunch today. I'm going to talk about
9 something that's been on the front of Time Magazine,
10 in the papers, USA Today and so forth, and I'd like to
11 give you a Coast Guard perspective of what's going on
12 in the Arctic in relation to where we're at in Arctic
13 policy.

14 It's something that's been around for the
15 last 10 or 20 years, but until the recent implications
16 of climate change, the surface and the reduction of
17 sea ice in the Arctic, there hasn't been a lot of
18 national discussion about it, and I'd like to take a
19 little bit of time today to do that with you, if I
20 could.

21 But before I do that I thought I'd give you
22 a little bit of a historical perspective, visually a

1 little more entertaining than I am and then I'd like
2 to add and embellish on that a little bit. So if we
3 could, roll the videotape, please.

4 (A video was played.)

5 ADM ALLEN: We are a Coast Guard of all
6 coasts, east and west and north and south. You saw a
7 little bit of an overview of our ice-breaking
8 capabilities. What you saw right at the beginning
9 were three Coast Guard buoy tenders moored side by
10 side.

11 This year we are celebrating the fiftieth
12 anniversary of the first circumnavigation of North
13 America by three Coast Guard cutters, the Storis, the
14 Spar and the Bramble in September of 1957. At that
15 time we had constructed a series of DEW lines during
16 the Cold War for early warning in the Arctic, and the
17 Navy had concerns after a heavy ice year about whether
18 or not they could be resupplied, and they wanted to do
19 a test with Coast Guard vessels with ice breaking
20 capability not only to have access but to do some
21 mapping up there and create the ability to reach those
22 stations, should they need to do it.

1 And for my Navy friends in the room,
2 apparently there was a meeting convened in Seattle
3 with a Navy Admiral who was asking did the Coast Guard
4 support it. And we walked into the room, he said I'm
5 really glad to see that the hooligan navy is here.
6 And a very grizzled, old salty sea captain said,
7 "well, sir, I don't have any problem with 'hooligan;'
8 I do object to the term 'navy.'"

9 (Laughter.)

10 ADM ALLEN: Actually our link to the Arctic
11 in Alaska is a very old and storied link in the Coast
12 Guard. Right after Alaska became under the possession
13 of the United States in the mid-1860s we dispatched in
14 1865 a U.S. lighthouse service tender up there to
15 start working on coastal navigation vital to shipping
16 up there.

17 In 1872 the Treasury Department, which we
18 were part of at the time, sent somebody up to take a
19 look at the Pribilof Islands and the seal rookeries,
20 which were being vastly exploited. That ultimately
21 led to the Fur Seal Treaty of 1911, which laid the
22 groundwork for the Marine Mammal Protection Act in the

1 United States.

2 But probably our most famous link with
3 Alaska and the Arctic came in the 1880s when we
4 deployed the Coast Guard cutter Bear, which served as
5 the floating federal presence in Alaska. We
6 transferred prisoners. It was a court room. We
7 provided medical services. We carried the mail. We
8 enforced the law. And the commanding officer of the
9 Bear, a guy called Roaring Mike Healy, had the idea to
10 assist Eskimos who were facing starvation and famine
11 from year to year, depending on conditions. He went
12 to Siberia and introduced reindeer to Alaska, and --
13 something that has permanently transformed the state.

14
15 We found out that was a particularly wise
16 decision because in 1897 eight whalers were stranded
17 off the north coast of Alaska. There were 235 people
18 on them and the Bear could only get just a little
19 above Nome, 1,600 miles away by land. The Bear
20 dispatched three officers. One of them was Mike
21 Bertholf, who would become the first commandant of the
22 modern Coast Guard in 1915. And with Eskimos and

1 dogsleds, the started a 1,600-mile trek over land,
2 driving 450 reindeer with them. And three-and-a-half
3 months later they landed on the north coast of Alaska
4 and rescued the stranded whalers in what has become
5 now the Overland Expedition, a feat that has been
6 unparalleled in Coast Guard history.

7 But I will tell you, history repeats itself,
8 and earlier this year in April off Newfoundland with
9 sea ice, not hard-packed ice, but sea ice that had
10 broken free and was drifting, 100 sealers from Canada
11 became trapped in the ice with 400 people and Canada
12 required five icebreakers and a number of helicopters
13 to bring in provisions until they ultimately freed
14 those ships.

15 The reason I bring these two incidents up is
16 when you think about climate change, you think about a
17 shrinking icecap in the Arctic you think why should
18 there be an issue with icebreakers? Well, sometimes
19 it's more difficult to deal with ice that is moving
20 than ice that is hard and fast, and if you think about
21 the missions the United States Coast Guard carries
22 out, search and rescue, law enforcement, environmental

1 response, oil spill response, and you think about the
2 time and distance equation of having to do that in the
3 Arctic region with or without ice or in the proximity
4 of ice, it becomes very, very challenging.

5 In the 1980s we had a cruise ship catch on
6 fire in the Gulf of Alaska. We successfully evacuated
7 everybody off the ship, 500 people, but we did it
8 because we had helicopters nearby, we had a merchant
9 vessel in Williamsburg that we were able to use as a
10 launch platform and successfully, by knowing how fast
11 the fire would spread, were able to save everybody. I
12 don't know if you'd do that 100 miles north of Point
13 Barrow without a forward presence or a forward
14 operating base to work from.

15 Two years ago Unimak Pass in the Aleutians,
16 lost ability to maneuver, ran aground, broke in half,
17 deposited 300,000 gallons of oil in one of the most
18 sensitive ecological bird nesting areas in Alaska. We
19 had to mount an environmental response in an area that
20 was virtually inaccessible, and in the process of
21 trying to save the crewmen we lost the helicopter.

22 Earlier this year over a 600-foot car

1 carrier, the Cougar Ace, made a mistake in ballasting
2 and listed over 90 degrees 230 miles south of the
3 Aleutians. It took us 24 hours to get a helicopter on
4 scene by paring them down, refueling them and finally
5 getting them out there. We saved that vessel by
6 slowly looking at the schematics, the design
7 characteristics of the ship, working with our industry
8 partners, but the time and distance equation of that
9 case when it was south of the Aleutians still almost
10 overwhelmed. But ultimately the ship was salvaged
11 without a loss of life, without an oil spill and
12 without all the legal problems that tend there too --
13 to all that other stuff.

14 Just this summer, there's a small town 90
15 miles north of the Arctic Circle, Kivalina. It's a
16 spit of land that has no road access. Everything has
17 to be barged in. In 2006 they built a sea wall to
18 protect the small village because there usually was
19 ice there to protect it from the storms that came
20 through.

21 The seawall was built, millions of dollars
22 in cost, and the first storm wiped it out. They lost

1 100 feet of the island. This year they lost 35 more
2 feet and they came within 35 more of breaching the oil
3 tanks that are on that island.

4 Climate change presents issues in the
5 Arctic, it's time to have a discussion about this,
6 folks. It's time to have a discussion about the
7 national security implications. It's time to have a
8 discussion about the issues regarding increased
9 shipping, increased use of those waters for eco-
10 tourism, increased use of these waters for oil and
11 natural gas development and exploration, increased use
12 of these waters if there is a warm water path over the
13 top of Russia or through the Northwest Passage that
14 saves 4,000 to 5,000 miles from a Panama Canal or Suez
15 Canal transit.

16 We need to understand there are important
17 resources up there. The Red Dog Mine, north of the
18 Arctic Circle in Alaska is the largest zinc mine in
19 the world. They now can ship 365 days a year.

20 These are significant implications. The
21 current policy for the Arctic was developed in 1994 in
22 a presidential decision document. That discussion has

1 been reopened. We are now taking a look at what our
2 policy options are or could be in the Arctic.

3 For the Coast Guard, this couldn't come at a
4 better time. We are facing significant challenges in
5 our ability to provide presence up there. The Coast
6 Guard assumed the ice-breaking mission in this country
7 from the U.S. Navy in the 1960s when they got out of
8 the business.

9 We've gone from a fleet of nearly 10
10 icebreakers down to the three, the Polar Sea, the
11 Polar Star and the Healy. The Healy is new, the Polar
12 Sea and the Polar Star are over 30 years old. The
13 Polar Sea is operational. The Polar Star is in
14 commissioned special status, laid up; it will take 18
15 months to put it back into service.

16 As we look at maritime strategy on a global
17 basis, we can't ignore the future of the Arctic, the
18 implications of access to the Arctic, national
19 security issues, environmental issues, energy issues
20 associated with it. In the Coast Guard, we need to
21 ask ourselves some serious questions. Where do we
22 invest our money? How do we develop policies? Where

1 are we going with our icebreaker fleet?

2 And I would submit to you, the answer is not
3 simply to build new icebreakers; although it probably
4 is. The answer is to get the policy right, lock down
5 the requirements, understand forward presence, either
6 through continual presence in the water or through
7 forward operating basis from which you stage a
8 response to in the Arctic. How do they impact,
9 support and extend our national policies for national
10 security and so forth up there? It is time to have
11 the discussion.

12 The discussion is underway not only in the
13 media and the press, as you've seen, but inside the
14 administration and in the Congress. As we move
15 forward we need to think about not only domestic
16 governance as it relates to Arctic policy; how do we
17 knit together all of the various roles and missions of
18 the agencies that are involved up there, EPA, NOAA,
19 Coast Guard, National Science Foundation?

20 We need to think about international
21 governing bodies as well, the Arctic Council. In the
22 Antarctic there is an international treaty that

1 governs what goes on there. There is no treaty in the
2 Arctic, so this is work to be done. I'm not saying we
3 need a treaty, but we need to think about governance
4 models and how we need to work internationally as well
5 as domestically to move forward.

6 There are significant issues up there right
7 now regarding development of the continental shelf
8 resources. Under the Law of the Sea Treaty countries
9 can claim continental shelf areas beyond the 200-mile
10 exclusive economic zone based on providing empirical
11 data to an international forum that then accepts that
12 proposal. That is underway right now under the law of
13 the sea.

14 U.S. government has equities up there as
15 well off the north slope of Alaska, but I would tell
16 you, this will be an incomplete process if the United
17 States is not at the table. The United States must
18 ratify the Law of the Sea Treaty. We must become an
19 international player. We must be at the table. We
20 must have a say, not only for the equities that relate
21 to the United States, but as a member of the
22 international community and a member of the Arctic

1 community as well.

2 What I'd like to do today, because my time
3 is short, I would like to engage you in a
4 conversation. So I'm going to finish my comments here
5 very shortly and you can be thinking about some
6 questions. But as we move forward, inside the Coast
7 Guard we'll be looking at several things. Number one,
8 what kind of requirements will we need to establish
9 infrastructure to be able to forward operate off the
10 north coast of Alaska? How do we work with our
11 international partners?

12 We have a tremendous relationship with
13 Canada and the U.K. We have a three-part search and
14 rescue agreement that's already in place that we
15 operate under now. We need to take a look at how that
16 impacts catastrophic events at high latitudes.

17 We have a very robust agreement and
18 engagement with Canada on oil spill response. We need
19 to figure out how that works in high latitudes as
20 well.

21 We have talked in several international
22 forums with our Russian counterparts. I think we need

1 to consider at some point whether or not the Bering
2 Strait needs a traffic separation scheme. With
3 increased traffic, that will become an international
4 choke point, and we need to think right now about the
5 safety, security, environmental impacts associated
6 with increased traffic through the strait. And we are
7 prepared to have that discussion and ultimately have
8 that discussion at IMO, if necessary.

9 So as we move forward, there are significant
10 equities not only for the Coast Guard but for the
11 United States and the world related to climate change
12 in the Arctic. Now is the time to seize on the
13 initiative to have the discussion. Now is the time to
14 look for international coordinating mechanisms and
15 establish governance models that can help us all
16 develop whatever is going to go on in the Arctic in
17 terms of policy, presence and national interest in a
18 way that benefits us all in a world that we all share
19 together.

20 Arthur C. Clarke, the author of Space
21 Odyssey 2001, once said if you looked at this planet
22 from space you would call it ocean. And we are all

1 crewmen, not passengers on this great planet that's
2 traveling through space. It is time to have a
3 discussion about Arctic policy. And I'd be glad to
4 take your questions.

5 (Applause.)

6 ADM ALLEN: Yes, sir.

7 QUESTION: I'll be very quick and say that
8 once in the Arctic, some decades ago, we were looking
9 to do some special rescue missions way up near the
10 pole. I was an E-3, I thought I did something nobody
11 else could do in trying to accomplish this mission
12 under awful weather conditions. And the next thing I
13 knew I had a C-130 from the Coast Guard on my wing,
14 saying, "yes, that looks pretty good."

15 So I will never forget that skill. I wonder
16 if you'd talk for a few minutes about what you're
17 doing with the Chinese MSA, the cooperation between
18 the Coast Guard and the Chinese agency.

19 ADM ALLEN: Actually, I'd really like to
20 couch it a little larger term if I can. The United
21 States Coast Guard is a member of something called the
22 North Pacific Coast Guard Forum. That includes the

1 United States, Canada, Russia, South Korea, Japan and
2 China. As part of our engagement with these Coast
3 Guard agencies we expand that because in many cases
4 all the things we do in the United States Coast Guard
5 aren't covered in a single agency or ministry with our
6 international partners. And we usually need to be
7 involved with the transportation ministries, any
8 maritime safety agencies, public safety agencies,
9 Coast Guard-like agencies.

10 In our work with the Chinese government we
11 have established a very, very significant bilateral
12 relationship. We have a Coast Guard Captain that is
13 stationed in Beijing to carry out liaison for us. We
14 have made trips to China to look at the international
15 shift in port security safety codes. We have offered
16 reciprocal visits.

17 For several years in a row now we have had
18 cutters make port calls. The most recent one was the
19 Coast Guard cutter Boutwell, which was in Shanghai
20 earlier this year. And as a result of that we have
21 embarked Chinese ship-riders on our high seas driftnet
22 patrols out in the Pacific.

1 Our relationships with all of our partners
2 in China is a very, very robust and a very strong one.

3 We have another reason to be involved with China. A
4 lot of the international ship repair work is done in
5 China now. A lot of the LNG construction is being
6 done in South Korea. And to the extent these vessels
7 call into the United States and are subject to our
8 port state control program we need to be knowledgeable
9 of how the shipbuilding industry in China is working
10 and our relationship with them. And it's a very
11 strong, very robust, very amiable relationship.

12 QUESTION: Do you think this is part of the
13 Global Maritime Partnership?

14 ADM ALLEN: Everything is part of the Global
15 Maritime Partnership. When Mike Mullen talks about a
16 1,000 ship Navy, I would say Navy and Coast Guard, and
17 he understands that too because in some countries
18 you'll have a Navy and a Coast Guard under the
19 Ministry of Defense. In other cases you'll have a
20 Coast Guard under the Ministry of Interior. We can't
21 discount any of those organizations, and they really
22 transcend the traditional MOD model, the Ministry of

1 Defense model, where most of the engagement takes
2 place.

3 That's the reason that our partnership with
4 the Navy has never been more relevant. That's the
5 reason when the maritime strategy assigned, the CNO's
6 name will be on it, GEN Conway's name will be on it,
7 and my name will be on it. We need to multiply our
8 effect on how all of us interact internationally.

9 QUESTION: Could you comment on the recent
10 Russian expedition to put the flag on the North Pole?
11 Is that just a clever public relations stunt or does
12 it have any real impact on things?

13 ADM ALLEN: The only way under international
14 law that I'm aware of, and I'm not a lawyer. To my
15 knowledge the way that you assert a claim over
16 anything beyond the 200-mile limit, your exclusive
17 economic zone, is to put the case forward to the UN
18 Law of the Sea Commission, make your claim and have
19 that claim accepted. You can do whatever you want,
20 but in law and in practice that's what you need to do.

21 QUESTION: -- now with Raytheon. We've
22 heard a number of times this week about necessity to

1 join the Law of the Sea Conference and to ratify it.
2 It's kind of intuitive, I think, to most of us in the
3 room, but then when you take that argument out of here
4 with a little bit more strength and power, what are we
5 arguing against? I mean what's the push back? It
6 used to be deep sea mining and -- modules, but what
7 exactly is the other side of the argument?

8 ADM ALLEN: Well, I think there was that
9 argument, but through the 1980s most of the
10 objectionable portions of the treaties that we had
11 were fixed.

12 From a Coast Guard standpoint, there are
13 some nations in the world that have claimed a 200-mile
14 territorial sea. If we're concerned about migrant
15 interdiction and drug interdiction, the ability to
16 operate off these coasts in what would legitimately be
17 international waters for the purposes of our national
18 security goals and the law enforcement goals of this
19 country, that gets very, very complicated.

20 When we challenge these countries on their
21 territorial sea and we say we've only claimed 12-mile
22 territory sea in a 12-mile contiguous zone, consistent

1 with the law of the sea convention, we have very
2 little credibility when we haven't ratified the
3 convention.

4 QUESTION: First thing I'd like to do is
5 thank you and commend you for your leadership.

6 My question is in this conference we've seen a
7 number of different regional agreements on maritime
8 cooperation, and you mentioned the U.K. in there. Do
9 you see coming out of this policy maybe a call for a
10 joint maritime force in the north?

11 ADM ALLEN: That may happen someday. I think
12 in the meantime we need to take a look at getting
13 together and taking and having a dialogue. We were so
14 buoyed with the success that we've had with the North
15 Pacific Coast Guard forum, which went into its eight-
16 year -- Russia hosted this year just three weeks ago
17 in St. Petersburg, and I was there. We will host next
18 year in San Francisco.

19 We have been successful working with our
20 partners in the Atlantic and later on in October we
21 will have the first ever North Atlantic Coast Guard
22 Forum, hosted by Sweden, to be followed next year --

1 hosting by Iceland. We think because of the players
2 that will be involved there, which will include Russia
3 and Canada as well because of the Coasts they have,
4 that is an appropriate forum for us to start talking
5 about Coast Guard issues related to the Arctic.

6 So issues like ice-breaking, environmental
7 response, search and rescue response and so forth, we
8 think this is a perfect venue to do that. It allows
9 us to meet in a plenary session and talk about issues
10 together, issue a statement at the end, but it also
11 allows us to have bilateral meetings with individual
12 countries, and we're already setting up agendas how
13 we're going to do that.

14 I opine to George Da Pont, who is my
15 Canadian counterpart in the Canadian Coast Guard, that
16 it might be nice -- one could envision five to ten
17 years from now the development of regional
18 coordinating mechanisms because regions are different,
19 specific and unique. And I think what I would like to
20 see is the emergence of regional low barriers to entry
21 governance constructs where everybody can work
22 together at a regional level to achieve the goals they

1 all agreed to.

2 In other words, the Indian Ocean is a far
3 different place than the Bering Sea. But you can make
4 a case that they need a Coast Guard-like forum there,
5 even though we wouldn't be involved in it, to
6 coordinate the multinational issues that are there.

7 And I told George when we were in St.
8 Petersburg, George Da Pont, wouldn't it be wonderful,
9 five to ten years from now, if we could have a world
10 Congress of Coast Guard forums?

11 But right now there's a little bit of
12 asymmetry in where we're organized and where we're
13 not. But I think certainly, given the resources
14 associated with the oceans, the national security
15 implications, the transportation implications, that
16 this is a construct that works.

17 The North Pacific Coast Guard Forum is a
18 very low barrier to entry, low overhead organization.

19 Here's how it works, folks. If you're going to host
20 the meeting the following year, you're the executive
21 secretariat. That's it.

22 And we have a subject matter experts meeting

1 six months before the forum to lock down the agenda,
2 and we have work groups that are set up, led by each
3 country, and law enforcement, illegal migration, drug
4 trafficking, emergency response and so forth. They
5 get together and in the North Pacific at least we're
6 going to move to an annual schedule of multi-mission,
7 multilateral exercises. They will be rotated among
8 the countries three years after they host the event in
9 their country.

10 You got to make it value added, low barriers
11 to entry, open communications, and mindful that
12 everybody has different budgeting processes and you
13 need to plan out several years in advance for
14 exercising.

15 QUESTION: -- Congressional Budget Office. I
16 was wondering if you could take a moment to elaborate
17 about why national ice-breaking capability is in our
18 national interests. Why, and what sort of would be
19 the approximate cost of replacing and improving or
20 including that ice-breaking capability would be.

21 All too often, in my interactions up on
22 Capitol Hill, you mention icebreakers and eyes sort of

1 glaze over and it's kind of so what. I'm not sure how
2 much of that story has been told very well.

3 ADM ALLEN: No, it's a great question. Let
4 me go back and make sure I repeat what I said earlier
5 because it's very, very important. Each time we walk
6 into a room in this town, our credibility tends to be
7 impeached, the Coast Guard's credibility, because the
8 perception is we just want new icebreakers.

9 Icebreakers are probably the solution, but
10 they can't go ahead of a policy construct and the
11 development of requirements that provide capability to
12 meet national needs. That's the reason it's going to
13 be so important to align what we want to do
14 domestically and internationally because that will
15 drive us.

16 There are a lot of ways you can create
17 presence in the Arctic, forward operating basis, and
18 we need to understand, what kind of presence do we
19 want? Do we want the ability to operate from there or
20 do we want to have the ability to be there, and when
21 do we want to be there?

22 And a lot of that is driven by the changes

1 in vessel traffic, which -- big studies going on right
2 now, changes in the environment and so forth. I don't
3 think there's going to be any question that we need
4 some kind of ice-breaking capability because even when
5 ice breaks loose and floats in a pack it presents
6 significant problems. Or how do you do an oil spill
7 response in and around ice without ice-breaking
8 capability?

9 So inherently I think there's a reason to
10 take a look at it, but I'm not going to put the cart
11 before the horse here. What we really want to drive
12 is a policy discussion and a development of national
13 requirements and an international consensus of how we
14 need to move forward with governing structures first.

15 QUESTION: -- joint staff. On the heels of
16 that last comment, sir, can you comment on the
17 collaboration of the maritime services, great
18 initiative? Do you see that same kind of momentum
19 going at the secretary level, developing a national
20 strategy?

21 And what comes to mind is the ongoing
22 crafting of the national defense strategy for the

1 Secretary of Defense. Do you see that same kind of
2 effort going into that document?

3 ADM ALLEN: I think we do because you need
4 both vertical and horizontal integration and
5 alignment. You can't make these policy documents in a
6 vacuum. I put out a Coast Guard strategy document
7 back in February but the development of the maritime
8 strategy document is integrated and they understand
9 each other exist and some things already preexist.

10 What you want is a framework, a family of
11 plans, if you will, that reinforce each other but are
12 all focused on the national goals you're trying to
13 achieve.

14 As it relates to the Arctic we've gotten
15 very good support. All the meetings that I attend,
16 National Security Council and so forth, we have both
17 OSD and J-5 representation.

18 QUESTION: Admiral, we hear a lot here during
19 this conference about maritime domain awareness.
20 We've also heard a bunch of comments from also those
21 in the shipping industry, and it seems to me there is
22 a tug of war on how you adequately were able to

1 monitor the vast amount of shipping that comes into
2 the country, without stagnating economic viability.
3 I'd like your comments on that, sir.

4 ADM ALLEN: That's a great question. First
5 of all, maritime domain awareness is only a part of
6 three things that are needed in what we would call a
7 governance structure for what is arguably the last
8 global commons. We need to understand the legal
9 regimes and the structures that are out there. And
10 that's a combination of domestic legislation,
11 international treaties, agreements and so forth, what
12 creates a legal status for what goes on out there.

13 The second is, once you understand that you
14 need to be aware of what's going on so if there's a
15 threat you can sense and act. That is maritime domain
16 awareness.

17 And the third is operational capability to
18 be able to act. And that's kind of how we frame the
19 notion of governance in what I said is arguably the
20 last global common.

21 The way ahead really on the commercial side
22 is through ship tracking, and we're doing that in two

1 steps right now. The first is through automated
2 identification systems, which were originally evolved
3 as a safety mechanism for ships who are lying aside of
4 each other, who know each other's position for
5 collision avoidance.

6 That technology has matured now, and now
7 there are mandatory carriage requirements for all
8 vessels greater than 300 gross tons to carry this, and
9 this has been worked through the International
10 Maritime Organization. That is not enough because
11 that is line of sight. It's not the right technology
12 to give you the kind of persistent, comprehensive
13 surveillance that you need. We have recently
14 negotiated successfully at IMO, an international
15 agreement for long-range tracking. It would kind of
16 go to the larger issue of the approaches, and these
17 are being done in 1,000 and 2,000 mile bands whether
18 or not you intend to enter a state or you're in
19 transit. If you declared your intent to enter a
20 coastal state then you will have to have a long range
21 tracking device available that could be identified
22 2,000 miles out.

1 These are devices that automatically
2 transmit information about the vessel and its
3 position, not unlike transponders on airplanes that
4 are key to the safety of the air transportation
5 system. The question is putting the infrastructure in
6 place that can receive this information and broadcast
7 it back out and make it available to the mariner.

8 Right now we are trying to develop systems
9 to collect AIS information and to rebroadcast that out
10 to whomever needs it. Probably the most successful
11 operation going on right now is with the NATO standing
12 forces and their presence since 9/11 in and around
13 Gibraltar where they collect AIS information from the
14 receivers on the ships and then they translate that
15 back out to all the nations that are partners with
16 them.

17 They also take that AIS information and they
18 compare it to open data sources like Lloyds list. And
19 believe it or not, just from having that information
20 in the open data sources, they detect anomalies. And
21 when they do that, they refer it to the port of
22 destination for that country to act on when they

1 arrive. So I think the pieces are there.

2 And when we talk about maritime domain
3 awareness, it's being able to identify threats. IN
4 the past, anonymity has been the hallmark of people
5 who use the oceans. There are proprietary advantages
6 to being anonymous. Where you were fishing, where
7 that tanker was with the oil, vis-a-vis the spot
8 market; no matter what you were involved in a certain
9 amount of anonymity was what you sought.

10 We're trying to change the paradigm. The
11 more we make this transparent and we know who's
12 legitimate we will know who is not legitimate, how we
13 can separate the legitimate conveyances from what we
14 really need to look at and be able to make that
15 (inaudible) problem less. But that's where we're
16 going.

17 QUESTION: ADM Allen, I have a question and a
18 comment. I'm sure it hasn't escaped your notice that
19 after ADM Mullen traveled to Russia the CNO was
20 changed with Russia, so I hope your counterpart is
21 still in place.

22 ADM ALLEN: He is. GEN Pronichev

1 QUESTION: The question I wanted to ask you
2 concerns engagement that U.S. Coast Guard has with
3 foreign navies. A large part of this conference
4 talked about theater security cooperation, phase zero
5 planning, and I know the Coast Guard does a great deal
6 of this. A lot of the burden falls upon the Coast
7 Guard because -- navies around the world.

8 How do you within the Coast Guard prioritize
9 countries and/or (inaudible) in terms of tasking for
10 yearly or biannual events? With the creation of
11 AFRICOM, will that complicate your resource
12 (inaudible)?

13 ADM ALLEN: That's a really good question.
14 When we look at our international engagement at large
15 for the entire Coast Guard we understand a couple of
16 things. Number one, we have separate equities related
17 to our missions, the missions we own in the Coast
18 Guard that make certain regions and countries more
19 consequential to us than say, maybe, the Navy or
20 anybody else based just on our mission set. But we
21 also know we have the competencies, the capability and
22 some capacity to be used for theater security

1 cooperation for the co-coms (phonetic) and we are
2 oversubscribed.

3 It's not a matter of not having the
4 competency, it's a matter of how much we can do. So
5 therefore we have to prioritize not only what we think
6 we need to do for the Coast Guard but what we need to
7 do internationally.

8 And then the third piece is there may be a
9 crying need, and that particular country may want our
10 type of capability, but then there's a funding piece
11 and all the governance structures that go together
12 with putting that type of capability into training the
13 country. And that gets us back to working with not
14 only the combatant commander but with the State
15 Department as well.

16 The final piece that makes this somewhat
17 difficult is some of the people that need our help
18 again don't work for the Ministry of Defense, so some
19 of the current authorizing legislation and funding
20 mechanisms fail to allow us to put the ammunition on
21 target, if you will, to be able to put the training
22 team in that particular country because the country

1 may be requesting it for their coast guard, but the
2 coast guard works for the ministry of the interior,
3 and there's no ready mechanism by which to do that.

4 Now there's authorizing legislation on the
5 Hill this year on the part of the Defense Department
6 to expand their capability to use those -- 1206 funds
7 is what they call it. We support that, and we've
8 actually sought some legislation in the Coast
9 authorizing bill that would allow us to be able to do
10 that. It doesn't necessarily fund it, but we're not
11 constrained by legislation when we need to do it.

12 We're pretty close to being on time.
13 Anybody else? I'll let you enjoy the rest of your
14 lunch. Thank you, folks.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5