

Considering the above, the opinion on a given doctoral dissertation should include the following elements:

- 1) An evaluation with justification of whether the doctoral dissertation presents the general theoretical knowledge of the candidate in the specified discipline or disciplines;
- 2) An evaluation with justification of whether the doctoral dissertation demonstrates the candidate's ability to conduct independent scientific or artistic work;
- 3) An evaluation with justification of whether the doctoral dissertation constitutes an original solution to a scientific problem, an original solution in the application of the candidate's own research results in the economic or social sphere, or an original artistic achievement.

Doctoral Dissertation Review Form
Council of the Discipline of Security Sciences
Federation of Military Academies

Candidate's Name:
Artur Pierzyński

Title of Doctoral Dissertation:
Rules of Engagement and Maritime Security

Supervisor:
Professor Andrzej Makowski

Co-supervisor/Second Supervisor/Co-supervisor (if applicable):
Doctor Rafał Depczyński

Reviewer:
Dr. Kleanthis Kyriakidis, Director of Research Conferences and Intellectual Engagement,
American University in the Emirates, Dubai.

1. ****Scientific Value of the Dissertation****
 - a. Originality of Research (25-200 words):

The research is original and groundbreaking. Due to the sensitivity and classification of ROE there is not much research on a subject of critical importance for maritime security including counter-piracy operations, counterterrorism and inter-state conflicts (national sovereignty/sovereign rights). Hence, it offers insights never analyzed before and having been discussed only superficially.

The PhD candidate demonstrates a very high degree of deep theoretical knowledge in the specified discipline and a deep understanding of the ROE that only Naval Officers can demonstrate. Having been myself a Naval Officer before becoming an Academic, I scrutinized the dissertation only to find out that the research is flawless. As an example of the dissertation's high quality and contribution to the field, the development of the ROE Decision Analysis Algorithm in Chapter 3, is of great academic/ scientific value.

This research is also important for two reasons: It both lays the foundation for future research in more specific maritime domains, and it provides policy recommendations which can influence decision making. It is an excellent dissertation for both academics and practitioners. The discussion on the role of commanding officers and their responsibilities in executing ROE, with the emphasis on ethical and legal considerations, is particularly insightful and thoroughly explores the challenges faced by military leaders in such high-stakes environments.

b. Scientific Value of Chapters/Articles (25-200 words):

In Chapter 1 the author clearly illustrates the evolution of security as a concept tied to state and national structures. The inclusion of various international perspectives, such as Russian and American definitions of national security, enriches the discussion and underscores the multidimensional nature of the topic. Along with the presentation of the intersection of national security, international law, and the legal use of force, the analysis of contemporary challenges adds a timely and relevant dimension, making the discourse both academically robust and practically significant.

In Chapter 2 the integration of case studies illustrates the complexities and nuances of maritime security challenges and solutions. Its emphasis on international cooperation and governance, as well as the role of advanced technology, intelligence, and maritime forces, contributes to a holistic understanding of the subject. Moreover, we see a comprehensive and detailed exploration of the multifaceted roles of maritime forces, both in times of peace and in the broader context of international relations. The division into distinct functions—diplomatic, constabulary, and military—provides clarity and allows for a discussion of the specific tasks and contributions of maritime forces. Moreover, the inclusion of concepts like maritime diplomacy and its various forms (co-operative, persuasive, and coercive) adds depth and breadth to the discourse.

In Chapter 3 where the main analysis lies, the dissertation excels in its comprehensive examination of various international and national definitions of ROE, revealing how different nations interpret and apply these rules. The author effectively integrates historical examples, such as the Srebrenica massacre and the Gulf War, to illustrate the real-world impact of ROE on military operations and the protection of civilians. The categorization of ROE into permissive and restrictive forms, as well as the exploration of different types of command, adds depth and clarity to the topic. The call for urgent action, including the development of training programs and clearer directives, is solid and the scientific value of the recommendations is beyond any doubt.

2. **Substantive Value of the Dissertation**

(Ability to introduce the research topic, clarity of formulated research hypotheses, selection of research methods and statistical tools for data analysis, presentation of results, critical analysis of results, and ability to interpret them in the context of the relevant literature, clarity and correctness of conclusions) (25-200 words):

The introduction to the topic is impeccable. The research hypotheses are clear. The selection of research method is excellent (the mixed-methods approach is the best for this kind of dissertation, and I tackle on it also in the final assessment of my report). The

presentation of the results is clear, and it does not need special statistical tools. The literature review is extensive as regards the theoretical background and less so as regards ROE, exactly because there is a relative gap in the literature, which this dissertation comes to bridge.

3. **Editorial Accuracy of the Dissertation**

(Structure, clarity of style, graphic layout, etc.) (25-200 words):

The structure is very clear and the train of thought of the author is easily followed. The language is academic but clear and easily understood, despite the necessary naval terminology used. As in all PhDs, we can trace a small amount of verbosity, which does not harm the overall result, which is impressive.

A specific issue is that in Chapter 2 the title should really be "Practical Aspects of the use of force" because the titled use is the same as both in Chapter and in sub-Chapter 2.3.3. Moreover, my personal preference as regards structure is to see one by one the ROE in different cases studies (for instance the current operation ASPIDES, Anti-pirate operations in Gulf of Aden by NATO and EU, Operation IRINI) as sub-Chapters.

Still, I need to stress that these remarks do not undermine the overall result of the dissertation.

4. **Critical Remarks**:

There could be little done to improve this dissertation. For instance, there is limited discussion on how ROE might sometimes constrain operational effectiveness or lead to delayed responses in high-pressure situations. Moreover, I would like to see more as regards the intersection between UNCLOS and ROE. Another field that could be further exploited is how emerging technologies (drones, AI) are influencing ROE and changing the nature of maritime security operations. I think these are issues to be further explored by another researcher in the future.

5. **Final Assessment (Justification 25-200 words)**:

This dissertation demonstrates an impressive depth of research and intellectual rigor, tackling a complex and underexplored subject with clarity and organization. The author skillfully bridges theoretical frameworks (such as Just War Theory and international legal principles), with practical applications in the maritime domain, offering a well-rounded perspective. He also demonstrates a deep understanding of the complex interplay between political, diplomatic, and military processes, underscoring the importance of adaptability, collaboration, and technological advancements in responding to evolving threats. The integration of historical context and contemporary challenges enriches the analysis, making it both comprehensive and forward-looking.

The methodology section provides a comprehensive and structured framework for investigating the impact of ROE on maritime security. The mixed-methods approach ensures a well-rounded and nuanced understanding of the topic. The systematic breakdown of objectives, questionnaire development, and data analysis demonstrates thorough planning

and rigorous execution. Especially the insights from his detailed research questionnaire enrich the work, grounding it in real-world practice.

I, the undersigned, hereby confirm that the reviewed doctoral dissertation by Mr. Artur Pierzyński, meets the conditions specified in Article 13.1 of the Act of 14 March 2003 on Academic Degrees and Titles and on Degrees and Titles in the Field of Art (Journal of Laws No. 65, item 595, as amended) and recommend that the Council of the Discipline of Security Sciences, Federation of Military Academies, allow Mr. Artur Pierzyński, to proceed to the next stages of the doctoral process.

I, the undersigned, recommend the doctoral dissertation for distinction. Justification of the recommendation (25-200 words):

As I understand, and without knowing the Polish literature, the dissertation's focus on addressing significant gaps in issues related to Rules of Engagement (ROE) and therefore greatly advance the scholarly discourse in maritime security. It is a groundbreaking work and the author should get the PhD with flying colors.

Discussions as regards the exploration of the relationship between ROE and political guidance, through tools like Political Policy Statements (PPS) and Political Policy Indicators (PPI), or the distinction between Measures of Effectiveness (MOEs) and Measures of Performance (MOPs) are particularly noteworthy and will definitely lay the ground for further research.

Last but not least, the difference of an excellent dissertation from a good one is related to feasible, timely and actionable recommendations. The author's recommendations for addressing the challenges in ROE implementation fulfil this criterion.

Kleanthis Kyriakidis