

**REGIONAL STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES BY  
FAO MEMBERS TO THE 2013 QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE  
CODE OF CONDUCT FOR RESPONSIBLE FISHERIES  
IMPLEMENTATION**

### **Note on Europe FAO region data**

The European Union (EU) is mandated to respond to the Code questionnaire in the name of its member countries. This limits the responses from the Europe FAO region to seven European non-EU member countries and the EU itself, except for questions relating to the legal frameworks in place for integrated coastal zone management, conflicts within the fisheries sector and with other sectors, conflict resolution mechanisms and the flagging and/or authorization of fishing vessels to operate on the high seas, which are also replied to individually by EU member countries (tables 25, 26 and 41).

### **Abbreviations and Acronyms**

EAF	ecosystem approach to fisheries
EEZ	exclusive economic zone
HACCP	Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points
HR	human resources
IPOA	International Plan of Action
IUU fishing	illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing
MCS	monitoring, control and surveillance
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
NPOA	National Plan of Action
RFMO	regional fisheries management organization
RPOA	Regional Plan of Action
SOP	standard operating procedure
Strategy-STA	Strategy for Improving Information on Status and Trends of Aquaculture
Strategy-STF	Strategy for Improving Information on Status and Trends of Capture Fisheries
VMS	vessel monitoring system

**TABLE 1**  
**FAO Members responding to the Questionnaire on the Code of Conduct**

FAO region	Country	Responded in:							
		2000	2002	2004	2006	2008	2010	2011	2013
Africa	Algeria				✓		✓		
	Angola	✓	✓		✓				
	Benin	✓	✓		✓	✓			✓
	Botswana		✓						✓
	Burkina Faso	✓	✓		✓				
	Burundi	✓	✓				✓		✓
	Cameroon	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
	Cape Verde	✓	✓	✓	✓				
	Central African Republic				✓				✓
	Chad	✓	✓		✓				✓
	Comoros		✓	✓					
	Congo, Democratic Republic of the	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	
	Congo, Republic of	✓	✓		✓	✓			✓
	Côte d'Ivoire	✓	✓	✓					✓
	Equatorial Guinea								✓
	Eritrea	✓	✓					✓	
	Ethiopia	✓	✓			✓			
	Gabon	✓							✓
	Gambia	✓							✓
	Ghana	✓	✓				✓		✓
	Guinea	✓	✓	✓	✓				
	Guinea-Bissau	✓	✓		✓				
	Kenya	✓	✓		✓			✓	
	Lesotho					✓			
	Liberia								✓
	Madagascar	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	
	Malawi	✓	✓					✓	✓
	Mali	✓			✓		✓		✓
	Mauritania	✓			✓	✓			✓
	Mauritius	✓	✓		✓	✓			✓
	Morocco	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
	Mozambique		✓	✓		✓			✓
	Namibia	✓	✓						
	Niger	✓	✓				✓		✓
	Nigeria		✓			✓			✓
	Rwanda	✓			✓				
	Sao Tome and Principe								
	Senegal	✓	✓		✓		✓		✓
	Seychelles	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
	Sierra Leone	✓	✓						
	Somalia								

FAO region	Country	Responded in:							
		2000	2002	2004	2006	2008	2010	2011	2013
	South Africa	✓	✓						✓
	South Sudan								
	Swaziland	✓			✓				✓
	Tanzania, United Republic of		✓			✓			
	Togo		✓		✓	✓	✓		✓
	Tunisia	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
	Uganda	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			
	Zambia		✓						
	Zimbabwe	✓	✓		✓				
Asia	Bangladesh	✓	✓				✓		✓
	Bhutan		✓						
	Brunei Darussalam								
	Cambodia	✓	✓	✓					
	China	✓			✓		✓	✓	✓
	India	✓	✓	✓		✓			✓
	Indonesia	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	
	Japan	✓			✓	✓		✓	✓
	Kazakhstan								
	Korea, Democratic People's Republic of	✓	✓	✓	✓				
	Korea, Republic of	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓
	Lao People's Democratic Republic	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			
	Malaysia	✓	✓					✓	✓
	Maldives								✓
	Myanmar	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
	Mongolia								
	Nepal		✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
	Pakistan		✓		✓	✓		✓	
	Philippines	✓	✓			✓			
	Singapore								
	Sri Lanka	✓	✓	✓		✓			
	Thailand	✓				✓		✓	✓
	Timor-Leste								
	Uzbekistan								
	Viet Nam	✓							
Europe	Armenia				✓				
	Albania		✓						
	Andorra								✓
	Austria	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
	Azerbaijan								
	Belarus								
	Belgium				✓		✓	✓	✓
	Bosnia and Herzegovina								
	Bulgaria					✓			

FAO region	Country	Responded in:							
		2000	2002	2004	2006	2008	2010	2011	2013
	Croatia								✓
	Cyprus	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	
	Czech Republic	✓	✓			✓			✓
	Denmark	✓	✓			✓	✓		✓
	Estonia		✓				✓		✓
	European Union	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
	Faroe Islands							✓	✓
	Finland	✓	✓			✓			
	France			✓				✓	
	Georgia			✓					
	Germany	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	
	Greece	✓	✓			✓	✓		✓
	Hungary		✓			✓		✓	
	Iceland	✓					✓		✓
	Ireland								
	Israel								
	Italy				✓		✓	✓	✓
	Latvia								
	Lithuania		✓		✓	✓			✓
	Luxembourg								
	Macedonia, Former Yugoslav Republic of								
	Malta							✓	✓
	Monaco								
	Moldova, Republic of								✓
	Montenegro								
	Netherlands	✓							✓
	Norway	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Poland		✓				✓		
	Portugal	✓					✓	✓	✓
	Romania	✓			✓	✓			
	Russian Federation						✓		
	San Marino								
	Serbia								
	Slovenia				✓			✓	✓
	Slovakia						✓		✓
	Spain		✓		✓		✓		
	Sweden		✓					✓	
	Switzerland			✓					✓
	Turkey		✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
	United Kingdom						✓		
	Ukraine								

FAO region	Country	Responded in:							
		2000	2002	2004	2006	2008	2010	2011	2013
Latin America and the Caribbean	Antigua and Barbuda					✓	✓	✓	✓
	Argentina	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Bahamas		✓						✓
	Barbados	✓	✓					✓	
	Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	✓			✓	✓		✓	
	Brazil	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓
	Belize				✓				✓
	Chile		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Colombia		✓	✓	✓		✓		✓
	Costa Rica	✓		✓			✓		
	Cuba	✓							✓
	Dominica	✓	✓					✓	✓
	Dominican Republic		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Ecuador	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		
	El Salvador		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
	Grenada	✓						✓	
	Guatemala	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
	Guyana		✓					✓	
	Haiti	✓	✓						✓
	Honduras	✓	✓					✓	
	Jamaica	✓							
	Mexico		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Nicaragua	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Panama	✓	✓		✓		✓		✓
	Paraguay	✓							
	Peru	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
	Saint Kitts and Nevis								
	Saint Lucia	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	
	Saint Vincent/Grenadines							✓	
	Suriname	✓			✓				
	Trinidad and Tobago	✓	✓					✓	
	Uruguay	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
	Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of		✓		✓	✓	✓		✓
Near East	Afghanistan					✓	✓		
	Bahrain	✓					✓		
	Djibouti								✓
	Egypt	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓
	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓
	Iraq	✓				✓	✓	✓	✓
	Jordan		✓		✓				
	Kuwait	✓				✓	✓	✓	
	Kyrgyzstan					✓	✓		✓

FAO region	Country	Responded in:							
		2000	2002	2004	2006	2008	2010	2011	2013
	Lebanon	✓	✓			✓			✓
	Libya								
	Oman			✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
	Qatar			✓		✓			✓
	Saudi Arabia								✓
	Sudan	✓	✓		✓		✓		✓
	Syrian Arab Republic		✓					✓	
	Tajikistan								
	Turkmenistan								
	United Arab Emirates	✓						✓	
	Yemen	✓		✓					✓
Northern America	Canada	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	United States of America	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
South West Pacific	Australia	✓	✓		✓			✓	✓
	Cook Islands		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
	Fiji, Republic of	✓	✓			✓	✓		✓
	Kiribati								✓
	Marshall Islands	✓	✓			✓	✓		✓
	Micronesia, Federated States of			✓			✓		
	Nauru		✓	✓					✓
	New Zealand	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓
	Niue					✓	✓		
	Papua New Guinea		✓				✓		
	Palau			✓					
	Samoa		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
	Solomon Islands		✓						✓
	Tokelau								
	Tonga	✓	✓			✓	✓		
	Tuvalu					✓	✓		
	Vanuatu		✓			✓			✓
Sum of counts	197	100	106	50	71	67	69	56	96

**TABLE 2**  
**Comparative response rates by FAO regions**

FAO region	Number of Members	Number of responding Members* 2013	Percentage response by FAO region 2013	Percentage response by FAO region 2011
Africa	50	25	50	13
Asia	25	10	40	30
Europe	50	22	44	30
Latin America and the Caribbean	33	17	52	58
Near East	20	11	55	24
Northern America	2	2	100	100
South West Pacific	17	9	53	13
<b>Total count and percentages</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>29</b>

\* Counting EU members that submitted a filled questionnaire

**TABLE 3**  
**Ranking of the Objectives of the Code of Conduct by decreasing order of top priority (figures in %)**  
**(Ranking: 5=extremely relevant, 3=relevant, 1=not very relevant)**

Objectives	Region (number of responses in brackets)	5	4	3	2	1	Not applicable
Establish principles for responsible fisheries considering all their relevant biological, technical, economic, social environmental and commercial aspects.	Africa (25)	64	12	24	0	0	0
	Asia (10)	50	40	10	0	0	0
	Europe (8)	75	12.5	12.5	0	0	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	82.4	11.8	5.9	0	0	0
	Near East (11)	72.7	18.2	0	9.1	0	0
	Northern America (2)	100	0	0	0	0	0
	South West Pacific (9)	55.6	33.3	11.1	0	0	0
	<b>Total (82)</b>	<b>68.3</b>	<b>18.3</b>	<b>12.2</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Establish principles and criteria to implement policies for the conservation of fishery resources and fisheries management and development.	Africa (25)	76	8	12	0	4	0
	Asia (10)	60	30	10	0	0	0
	Europe (8)	50	37.5	12.5	0	0	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	58.8	23.5	11.8	0	5.9	0
	Near East (11)	54.5	27.3	9.1	0	9.1	0
	Northern America (2)	100	0	0	0	0	0
	South West Pacific (9)	55.6	33.3	11.1	0	0	0
	<b>Total (82)</b>	<b>63.4</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>0</b>
Promote the contribution of fisheries to food security and food quality giving priority to the nutritional needs of local communities.	Africa (25)	72	20	8	0	0	0
	Asia (10)	50	30	20	0	0	0
	Europe (8)	37.5	25	12.5	12.5	12.5	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	35.3	29.4	29.4	5.9	0	0
	Near East (11)	45.5	18.2	36.4	0	0	0
	Northern America (2)	50	50	0	0	0	0
	South West Pacific (9)	55.6	22.2	22.2	0	0	0
	<b>Total (82)</b>	<b>52.4</b>	<b>24.4</b>	<b>19.5</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0</b>



Objectives	Region (number of responses in brackets)	5	4	3	2	1	Not applicable
Promote research on fisheries as well as on associated ecosystems and relevant environmental factors.	Africa (25)	60	16	24	0	0	0
	Asia (10)	30	40	30	0	0	0
	Europe (8)	50	37.5	12.5	0	0	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	47.1	23.5	23.5	5.9	0	0
	Near East (11)	54.5	36.4	9.1	0	0	0
	Northern America (2)	100	0	0	0	0	0
	South West Pacific (9)	44.4	33.3	22.2	0	0	0
	<b>Total (82)</b>	<b>51.2</b>	<b>26.8</b>	<b>20.7</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Facilitate and promote cooperation in the conservation of fishery resources, fisheries management and development.	Africa (25)	44	16	40	0	0	0
	Asia (10)	70	30	0	0	0	0
	Europe (8)	25	37.5	25	12.5	0	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	47.1	29.4	17.6	5.9	0	0
	Near East (11)	45.5	36.4	18.2	0	0	0
	Northern America (2)	100	0	0	0	0	0
	South West Pacific (9)	44.4	33.3	22.2	0	0	0
	<b>Total (82)</b>	<b>47.6</b>	<b>26.8</b>	<b>23.2</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Promote protection of living aquatic resources and their environments and coastal areas.	Africa (25)	44	24	28	4	0	0
	Asia (10)	60	20	20	0	0	0
	Europe (8)	25	37.5	37.5	0	0	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	35.3	29.4	35.3	0	0	0
	Near East (11)	54.5	9.1	27.3	9.1	0	0
	Northern America (2)	100	0	0	0	0	0
	South West Pacific (9)	55.6	22.2	22.2	0	0	0
	<b>Total (82)</b>	<b>46.3</b>	<b>23.2</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Serve as an instrument of reference to improve legal and institutional framework for appropriate management measures.	Africa (25)	48	16	36	0	0	0
	Asia (10)	50	40	10	0	0	0
	Europe (8)	25	37.5	25	0	0	12.5
	Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	47.1	11.8	41.2	0	0	0
	Near East (11)	36.4	9.1	54.5	0	0	0
	Northern America (2)	0	100	0	0	0	0
	South West Pacific (9)	44.4	33.3	22.2	0	0	0
	<b>Total (82)</b>	<b>42.7</b>	<b>23.2</b>	<b>32.9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1.2</b>
Promote trade in fish and fishery products in conformity with relevant international rules.	Africa (25)	48	24	24	4	0	0
	Asia (10)	40	20	40	0	0	0
	Europe (8)	25	50	12.5	0	0	12.5
	Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	41.2	17.6	29.4	11.8	0	0
	Near East (11)	18.2	18.2	54.5	9.1	0	0
	Northern America (2)	100	0	0	0	0	0
	South West Pacific (9)	44.4	33.3	11.1	0	11.1	0
	<b>Total (82)</b>	<b>40.2</b>	<b>24.4</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.2</b>

Objectives	Region (number of responses in brackets)	5	4	3	2	1	Not applicable
Provide standards of conduct for all involved in the fisheries sector.	Africa (25)	56	24	20	0	0	0
	Asia (10)	40	40	20	0	0	0
	Europe (8)	12.5	62.5	25	0	0	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	47.1	23.5	23.5	5.9	0	0
	Near East (11)	27.3	36.4	27.3	9.1	0	0
	Northern America (2)	50	50	0	0	0	0
	South West Pacific (9)	11.1	55.6	22.2	11.1	0	0
	<b>Total (82)</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>35.4</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Provide guidance to formulate and implement international agreements and other legal instruments.	Africa (25)	44	20	36	0	0	0
	Asia (10)	40	50	10	0	0	0
	Europe (8)	0	37.5	50	12.5	0	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	41.2	23.5	35.3	0	0	0
	Near East (11)	27.3	45.5	27.3	0	0	0
	Northern America (2)	50	50	0	0	0	0
	South West Pacific (9)	11.1	66.7	22.2	0	0	0
	<b>Total (82)</b>	<b>32.9</b>	<b>35.4</b>	<b>30.5</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**TABLE 4**  
**Ranking of themes in the Code of Conduct by decreasing order of top priority (figures in %)**

Theme	Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Top Priority	Priority	Low Priority	Not applicable
Fisheries management	Africa (25)	80	16	4	0
	Asia (10)	90	10	0	0
	Europe (8)	62.5	12.5	25	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	76.5	17.6	5.9	0
	Near East (11)	54.5	45.5	0	0
	Northern America (2)	100	0	0	0
	South West Pacific (9)	88.9	11.1	0	0
	<b>Total (82)</b>	<b>76.8</b>	<b>18.3</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>0</b>
Fisheries research	Africa (25)	60	32	8	0
	Asia (10)	80	20	0	0
	Europe (8)	50	50	0	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	58.8	35.3	5.9	0
	Near East (11)	45.5	36.4	18.2	0
	Northern America (2)	100	0	0	0
	South West Pacific (9)	44.4	44.4	11.1	0
	<b>Total (82)</b>	<b>58.5</b>	<b>34.1</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>0</b>
Aquaculture development	Africa (25)	72	20	8	0
	Asia (10)	80	20	0	0
	Europe (8)	25	62.5	12.5	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	58.8	29.4	11.8	0
	Near East (11)	45.5	36.4	18.2	0
	Northern America (2)	50	50	0	0
	South West Pacific (9)	44.4	55.6	0	0
	<b>Total (82)</b>	<b>58.5</b>	<b>32.9</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>0</b>

Theme	Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Top Priority	Priority	Low Priority	Not applicable
Fishing operations	Africa (25)	36	52	8	0
	Asia (10)	80	10	10	0
	Europe (8)	25	37.5	37.5	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	41.2	35.3	23.5	0
	Near East (11)	54.5	36.4	9.1	0
	Northern America (2)	100	0	0	0
	South West Pacific (9)	44.4	44.4	11.1	0
	<b>Total (82)</b>	<b>46.3</b>	<b>37.8</b>	<b>14.6</b>	<b>0</b>
Trade	Africa (25)	40	40	20	0
	Asia (10)	60	40	0	0
	Europe (8)	25	37.5	37.5	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	29.4	58.8	11.8	0
	Near East (11)	36.4	18.2	45.5	0
	Northern America (2)	50	50	0	0
	South West Pacific (9)	55.6	44.4	0	0
	<b>Total (82)</b>	<b>40.2</b>	<b>41.5</b>	<b>18.3</b>	<b>0</b>
Post-harvest practices	Africa (25)	36	48	16	0
	Asia (10)	60	30	10	0
	Europe (8)	25	50	0	25
	Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	5.9	70.6	23.5	0
	Near East (11)	27.3	27.3	45.5	0
	Northern America (2)	50	50	0	0
	South West Pacific (9)	33.3	66.7	0	0
	<b>Total (82)</b>	<b>30.5</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>17.1</b>	<b>2.4</b>
Inland fisheries development	Africa (25)	32	40	24	4
	Asia (10)	20	40	30	10
	Europe (8)	0	37.5	50	12.5
	Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	11.8	35.3	41.2	11.8
	Near East (11)	36.4	18.2	18.2	18.2
	Northern America (2)	0	50	50	0
	South West Pacific (9)	11.1	22.2	55.6	11.1
	<b>Total (82)</b>	<b>20.7</b>	<b>34.1</b>	<b>34.1</b>	<b>9.8</b>
Integration of fisheries into coastal and basin area management	Africa (25)	24	52	8	12
	Asia (10)	20	40	20	20
	Europe (8)	0	62.5	12.5	25
	Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	11.8	64.7	23.5	0
	Near East (11)	18.2	54.5	18.2	9.1
	Northern America (2)	50	50	0	0
	South West Pacific (9)	22.2	55.6	22.2	0
	<b>Total (82)</b>	<b>18.3</b>	<b>54.9</b>	<b>15.9</b>	<b>9.8</b>

**TABLE 5**  
**Percentage of FAO Members with fisheries policies conform to the Code of Conduct (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Have a fisheries policy	Yes	No	Partially	Planning to align policy with the Code**
		Policy consistent with the Code*			
Africa (24)	100	54.2	12.5	33.3	66.7
Asia (10)	90	77.8	0	22.2	-
Europe (8)	100	50	0	50	-
Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	94.1	81.2	6.2	12.5	100
Near East (11)	72.7	50	12.5	37.5	100
Northern America (2)	100	100	0	0	-
South West Pacific (8)	87.5	71.4	0	28.6	-
<b>Total (80) and averages</b>	<b>92.5</b>	<b>64.9</b>	<b>6.8</b>	<b>28.4</b>	<b>80</b>

Note: figures in the column marked (\*) only refer to the group of countries that have a fisheries policy in place. Figures in the column marked (\*\*) only refer to the group of countries where the policy is not at all in line with the Code.

**TABLE 6**  
**Percentage of FAO Members with fisheries legislation conform to the Code of Conduct (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Yes	No	Partially	Planning to align law with the Code*
	Fisheries law consistent with the Code			
Africa (25)	60	8	32	100
Asia (10)	60	10	30	100
Europe (8)	75	0	25	-
Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	58.8	11.8	29.4	100
Near East (11)	45.5	27.3	27.3	100
Northern America (2)	100	0	0	-
South West Pacific (9)	77.8	0	22.2	-
Total (82) and averages	62.2	9.8	28	100

Note: figures In the column marked (\*) only refer to the group of countries that have laws that are not at all in line with the Code.

**TABLE 7**  
**Year of enactment of fisheries base legislation - as currently in force (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Before 1970	Between 1970 and 1975	Between 1976 and 1980	Between 1981 and 1985	Between 1986 and 1990	Between 1991 and 1995	Between 1996 and 2000	Between 2001 and 2005	Between 2006 and 2010	After 2010
Africa (22)	27.3	4.5	4.5	0	4.5	4.5	18.2	0	18.2	18.2
Asia (10)	50	0	0	0	30	0	20	0	0	0
Europe (8)	25	12.5	0	0	0	12.5	0	12.5	25	12.5
Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	11.8	5.9	17.6	0	5.9	11.8	11.8	17.6	17.6	0
Near East (11)	18.2	0	9.1	27.3	9.1	0	18.2	9.1	9.1	0
Northern America (2)	50	0	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South West Pacific (8)	12.5	0	12.5	12.5	12.5	0	25	0	0	25
<b>Total (78)</b>	<b>24.4</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>15.4</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>12.8</b>	<b>9</b>

**TABLE 8**  
**Most commonly used mechanisms to raise awareness about the Code of Conduct (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Meetings, workshops and seminars	Publishing and distributing Code documents	Training of administration staff	Developing guidelines and codes based upon the Code	NGO work, and other project activities
Africa (23)	91.3	52.2	73.9	17.4	39.1
Asia (10)	70	60	40	30	10
Europe (8)	12.5	12.5	37.5	37.5	0
Latin America and the Caribbean (16)	68.8	68.8	25	68.8	25
Near East (8)	50	75	37.5	50	25
Northern America (2)	50	100	50	50	0
South West Pacific (9)	55.6	11.1	33.3	44.4	22.2
<b>Total (76) and averages</b>	<b>65.8</b>	<b>51.3</b>	<b>46.1</b>	<b>39.5</b>	<b>23.7</b>

Note: other important lacking data sources included (in descending order) [Translating Code, or parts thereof], [other].

**TABLE 9**  
**Number of fishery management plans reported to have been developed and implemented by FAO Members for marine and inland capture fisheries in accordance with the Code of Conduct**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries with no management plans (in %)	Number of plans developed (count)		Percentage of plans currently implemented	
		Marine	Inland	Marine	Inland
Africa (25)	0	58	77	77.6	11.7
Asia (10)	0	25	26	80	100
Europe (8)	0	50	3	100	100
Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	11.8	109	33	68.8	84.8
Near East (11)	0	31	15	71	40
Northern America (2)	0	239	60	100	100
South West Pacific (9)	0	760	13	99.5	100
<b>Total (82) and averages</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>1272</b>	<b>227</b>	<b>94.9</b>	<b>63.9</b>

**TABLE 10**  
**Measures implemented in marine and inland fishery management plans, designed to promote responsible resource use in accordance with the Code of Conduct (in decreasing order) (figures in %)**

Measures	Region (number of specified responses in brackets for both marine and inland fisheries)	Marine Fisheries Management Plans	Inland Fisheries Management Plans
Addressing fishing capacity, including the economic conditions under which the industry operates	Africa (16) (12)	93.8	66.7
	Asia (6) (6)	83.3	83.3
	Europe (5) (3)	100	100
	Latin America and the Caribbean (14) (9)	100	88.9
	Near East (5) (2)	100	100
	Northern America (2) (1)	100	100
	South West Pacific (8) (3)	100	66.7
	<b>Total (56) (36)</b>	<b>96.4</b>	<b>80.6</b>

Measures	Region (number of specified responses in brackets for both marine and inland fisheries)	Marine Fisheries Management Plans	Inland Fisheries Management Plans
Providing for the protection of endangered species	Africa (16) (12)	93.8	66.7
	Asia (6) (6)	83.3	83.3
	Europe (5) (3)	100	100
	Latin America and the Caribbean (14) (9)	100	88.9
	Near East (5) (2)	80	50
	Northern America (2) (1)	100	100
	South West Pacific (8) (3)	87.5	100
	<b>Total (56) (36)</b>	<b>92.9</b>	<b>80.6</b>
Addressing the interests and rights of small-scale fishers	Africa (16) (12)	87.5	58.3
	Asia (6) (6)	83.3	83.3
	Europe (5) (3)	100	100
	Latin America and the Caribbean (14) (9)	100	77.8
	Near East (5) (2)	100	100
	Northern America (2) (1)	100	100
	South West Pacific (8) (3)	87.5	100
	<b>Total (56) (36)</b>	<b>92.9</b>	<b>77.8</b>
Prohibiting destructive fishing methods and practices	Africa (16) (12)	81.2	66.7
	Asia (6) (6)	66.7	83.3
	Europe (5) (3)	100	100
	Latin America and the Caribbean (14) (9)	92.9	88.9
	Near East (5) (2)	80	100
	Northern America (2) (1)	100	100
	South West Pacific (8) (3)	100	66.7
	<b>Total (56) (36)</b>	<b>87.5</b>	<b>80.6</b>
Using precautionary approaches which provide for conservative safety margins in decision making	Africa (16) (12)	87.5	66.7
	Asia (6) (6)	83.3	83.3
	Europe (5) (3)	100	66.7
	Latin America and the Caribbean (14) (9)	100	88.9
	Near East (5) (2)	100	50
	Northern America (2) (1)	100	100
	South West Pacific (8) (3)	75	66.7
	<b>Total (56) (36)</b>	<b>91.1</b>	<b>75</b>
Allowing depleted stocks to recover	Africa (16) (12)	93.8	66.7
	Asia (6) (6)	83.3	66.7
	Europe (5) (3)	100	100
	Latin America and the Caribbean (14) (9)	85.7	66.7
	Near East (5) (2)	80	100
	Northern America (2) (1)	100	100
	South West Pacific (8) (3)	100	66.7
	<b>Total (56) (36)</b>	<b>91.1</b>	<b>72.2</b>

Measures	Region (number of specified responses in brackets for both marine and inland fisheries)	Marine Fisheries Management Plans	Inland Fisheries Management Plans
Plans falling within (or constituting and integral part of) wider management plans of the coastal zone	Africa (16) (12)	87.5	58.3
	Asia (6) (6)	83.3	66.7
	Europe (5) (3)	80	100
	Latin America and the Caribbean (14) (9)	92.9	88.9
	Near East (5) (2)	40	50
	Northern America (2) (1)	100	100
	South West Pacific (8) (3)	100	100
	<b>Total (56) (36)</b>	<b>85.7</b>	<b>75</b>
Making use of stock specific target reference points	Africa (16) (12)	81.2	50
	Asia (6) (6)	83.3	66.7
	Europe (5) (3)	100	100
	Latin America and the Caribbean (14) (9)	85.7	66.7
	Near East (5) (2)	80	100
	Northern America (2) (1)	100	100
	South West Pacific (8) (3)	87.5	66.7
	<b>Total (56) (36)</b>	<b>85.7</b>	<b>66.7</b>
Providing for stakeholder participation in determining management decisions	Africa (16) (12)	81.2	50
	Asia (6) (6)	83.3	50
	Europe (5) (3)	80	66.7
	Latin America and the Caribbean (14) (9)	71.4	55.6
	Near East (5) (2)	40	100
	Northern America (2) (1)	100	100
	South West Pacific (8) (3)	75	66.7
	<b>Total (56) (36)</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>58.3</b>
Addressing biodiversity of aquatic habitats and ecosystems, including the identification of essential fish habitats	Africa (16) (12)	81.2	58.3
	Asia (6) (6)	83.3	66.7
	Europe (5) (3)	60	33.3
	Latin America and the Caribbean (14) (9)	64.3	44.4
	Near East (5) (2)	60	100
	Northern America (2) (1)	100	100
	South West Pacific (8) (3)	87.5	33.3
	<b>Total (56) (36)</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>55.6</b>
Addressing selectivity of fishing gear	Africa (16) (12)	56.2	33.3
	Asia (6) (6)	33.3	16.7
	Europe (5) (3)	100	100
	Latin America and the Caribbean (14) (9)	64.3	33.3
	Near East (5) (2)	40	0
	Northern America (2) (1)	100	100
	South West Pacific (8) (3)	75	33.3
	<b>Total (56) (36)</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>36.1</b>

Measures	Region (number of specified responses in brackets for both marine and inland fisheries)	Marine Fisheries Management Plans	Inland Fisheries Management Plans
Ensuring the level of fishing is commensurate with the state of fisheries resources	Africa (16) (12)	43.8	50
	Asia (6) (6)	16.7	33.3
	Europe (5) (3)	40	100
	Latin America and the Caribbean (14) (9)	14.3	33.3
	Near East (5) (2)	20	0
	Northern America (2) (1)	0	0
	South West Pacific (8) (3)	37.5	33.3
	<b>Total (56) (36)</b>	<b>28.6</b>	<b>41.7</b>

**TABLE 11**  
**Implementation of the EAF (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Have started to implement EAF	For those countries that have started to implement EAF, the following apply:		
		Ecological, socio-economic and governance objectives established	Key issues to be addressed by management actions identified	Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms established
Africa (25)	76	76	76	60
Asia (10)	90	90	90	70
Europe (8)	62.5	62.5	62.5	62.5
Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	76.5	70.6	64.7	58.8
Near East (11)	63.6	54.5	54.5	36.4
Northern America (2)	100	100	100	100
South West Pacific (9)	77.8	77.8	77.8	66.7
<b>Total (82) and averages</b>	<b>75.6</b>	<b>73.2</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>59.8</b>

**TABLE 12**  
**Stock specific target reference points (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries having developed stock specific target reference points	Sum of stocks for which stock (or resource/multi-species) specific target reference points have been developed	For those countries that have developed such specific target reference points:	
			Have they been exceeded?	Are they being approached?
Africa (22)	50	43	40	60
Asia (8)	50	98	75	50
Europe (8)	37.5	115	66.7	66.7
Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	82.4	159	50	78.6
Near East (10)	50	48	40	60
Northern America (2)	100	145	100	100
South West Pacific (9)	66.7	569	50	83.3
<b>Total (76) and averages</b>	<b>59.5</b>	<b>1177</b>	<b>52.3</b>	<b>70.5</b>

Note: the second data column does not contain percentages, but true values, and the bottom line of the column renders the total number of stocks for which target reference points have been developed.



**TABLE 13**  
**Indicators other than stock-specific target reference points used for managing stocks (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Catch and effort indicators	Ecosystem indicators	Socio-economic indicators	Validated stakeholder knowledge	Others
	(73.3%)	(23.3%)	(56.7%)	(43.3%)	(23.3%)
Africa (10)	80	20	60	40	20
Asia (4)	75	25	75	50	0
Europe (5)	60	60	20	60	40
Latin America and the Caribbean (3)	100	33.3	66.7	100	33.3
Near East (5)	60	0	60	20	0
Northern America (0)	-	-	-	-	-
South West Pacific (3)	66.7	0	66.7	0	66.7

Note: this table specifically refers to countries that have not developed stock-specific target reference points (see previous table).

Legend to table headers: the percentage value indicated below each indicator represents the overall percentage of countries that reported to use it for stock management.

**TABLE 14**  
**Action taken when stock specific target reference points are exceeded (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Carrying out more research	Limiting fishing effort	Strengthening MCS	Closing fishery	Effecting capacity adjustments
	(91.3%)	(87%)	(87%)	(73.9%)	(65.2%)
Africa (22)	100	75	100	75	50
Asia (8)	100	66.7	100	66.7	66.7
Europe (8)	100	100	100	100	100
Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	85.7	100	85.7	57.1	85.7
Near East (10)	100	100	50	100	50
Northern America (2)	50	100	100	50	50
South West Pacific (9)	100	66.7	66.7	100	33.3

Legend to table headers: the percentage value indicated below each action represents the overall percentage of countries that reported to use it for countering the exceeding of stock-specific target reference points. 21.7% of countries reported to use other actions than those reported in the table to mitigate impacts.

**TABLE 15**  
**Steps taken to ensure fishing operations within the EEZ comply with licence provisions (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries reporting to have taken steps (92.5%)	Strengthening MCS system	Deterrent penalties and sanctions	Existence of a vessel register	Link between registration and licensing authorities	Mandatory national landing of catch and/or prohibition to transship at sea
		(77%)	(56.8%)	(33.8%)	(32.4%)	(29.7%)
Africa (24)	95.8	73.9	69.6	21.7	34.8	26.1
Asia (10)	90	88.9	33.3	88.9	44.4	11.1
Europe (8)	75	83.3	50	16.7	0	0
Latin America and the Caribbean (16)	93.8	86.7	40	33.3	26.7	53.3
Near East (11)	90.9	30	70	40	50	60
Northern America (2)	100	100	50	0	0	0
South West Pacific (9)	100	100	66.7	22.2	33.3	11.1

Note: except for the first data column, percentage values in the headers render global figures only for the pool of countries that reported to ensure fishing operations within the EEZ comply with licence provisions.

Legend to table headers: the percentage value indicated below each measure represents the overall percentage of countries that reported to apply the same measure. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 79.8% of all reported measures. Other reported measures include (by descending order of importance) [Mandatory logbook and reporting system], [Strengthening Port State Measures], [NPOA-IUU development and implementation].

**TABLE 16**  
**Steps taken to ensure fishing operations outside national jurisdiction are reported, monitored and carried out in a responsible manner (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries reporting to have taken steps (64.6%)	Mandatory authorization to operate beyond EEZ	Mandatory logbooks and reporting system	Enhanced MCS measures	Ratification of relevant international instruments	Cooperation with third countries and/or with RFMOs
		(66.7%)	(37.3%)	(35.3%)	(33.3%)	(33.3%)
Africa (24)	62.5	53.3	40	33.3	33.3	46.7
Asia (10)	60	83.3	33.3	50	50	50
Europe (7)	57.1	75	25	50	25	50
Latin America and the Caribbean (16)	68.8	63.6	18.2	54.5	27.3	27.3
Near East (11)	54.5	83.3	50	0	16.7	33.3
Northern America (2)	100	100	0	0	100	0
South West Pacific (9)	77.8	57.1	71.4	28.6	28.6	0

Note: except for the first data column, percentage values in the headers render global figures only for the pool of countries that reported to ensure fishing operations outside national jurisdiction are monitored and responsible.

Legend to table headers: the percentage value indicated below each measure represents the overall percentage of countries that reported to use the same as an enforcement measure. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 70.9 percent of all mechanisms reported. Other reported measures include (by descending order of importance) [Enforcing compliance with laws of other States, and RFMO decisions], [Onboard observer programme], [Deterrent penalties and sanctions], [NPOA and RPOA-IUU development and implementation], [Pre-licensing inspection and brief].

**TABLE 17**  
**Management of bycatch and discards (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries where bycatches and discards occur in major fisheries	Formally monitor bycatch and discards	Bycatch and discards are found to be unsustainable	Management measures to minimize bycatch and discards are in place	These measures do also address the following:	
					Protection of juveniles	Ghost fishing
Africa (23)	52.2	47.8	83.3	75	58.3	50
Asia (10)	50	70	80	60	60	60
Europe (8)	62.5	62.5	60	60	60	40
Latin America and the Caribbean (16)	68.8	56.2	36.4	36.4	36.4	27.3
Near East (10)	60	30	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3
Northern America (2)	100	100	50	50	50	50
South West Pacific (9)	88.9	77.8	37.5	37.5	37.5	25
<b>Total (78) and averages</b>	<b>62.8</b>	<b>56.4</b>	<b>55.1</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>46.9</b>	<b>38.8</b>

**TABLE 18**  
**VMS implementation (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Has VMS been implemented? (for countries not having implemented VMS as yet, percentage planning to do so in brackets)			Countries not yet having implemented VMS, but using an external VMS center to monitor foreign fishing vessels in their EEZ*
	Yes	No	Partially	
Africa (24)	29.2 (90)	41.7	29.2	30
Asia (10)	10 (0)	20	70	0
Europe (8)	12.5 (0)	37.5	50	0
Latin America and the Caribbean (16)	12.5 (75)	25	62.5	0
Near East (11)	0 (80)	45.5	54.5	20
Northern America (2)	50 (-)	0	50	-
South West Pacific (9)	66.7 (-)	0	33.3	-
<b>Total (80) and averages</b>	<b>22.5 (66.7)</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>16.7</b>

Note: the last column (marked \*) and the percentage values it contains only refer to countries that have answered "no" to the main question (VMS implemented?).

**TABLE 19**  
**Countries that have developed policy, legal and institutional frameworks (including the most basic) for the development of responsible aquaculture (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries where aquaculture development occurs	Policy framework			Legal framework			Institutional framework		
		Largely complete and enabling	Partial	None or largely insufficient	Largely complete and enabling	Partial	None or largely insufficient	Largely complete and enabling	Partial	None or largely insufficient
Africa (25)	96	41.7	54.2	4.2	16.7	62.5	20.8	50	45.8	4.2
Asia (10)	100	50	40	10	50	40	10	50	50	0
Europe (8)	75	66.7	33.3	0	66.7	33.3	0	66.7	33.3	0
Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	100	29.4	64.7	5.9	35.3	64.7	0	35.3	58.8	5.9
Near East (11)	90.9	22.2	44.4	33.3	50	40	10	55.6	33.3	11.1
Northern America (2)	100	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0
South West Pacific (9)	100	44.4	33.3	22.2	22.2	33.3	44.4	33.3	33.3	33.3
<b>Total (82) and averages</b>	<b>95.1</b>	<b>41.6</b>	<b>48.1</b>	<b>10.4</b>	<b>35.9</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>14.1</b>	<b>48.1</b>	<b>44.2</b>	<b>7.8</b>

Note: except for the first data column, percentage values apply only to the pool of respondents where aquaculture development does occur.

**TABLE 20**  
**Public and civil society elements that have developed or adopted a code or instrument of best practices for aquaculture in accordance with the Code of Conduct (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Government	Producers	Suppliers	Manufacturers	Others
	(74.4%)	(55.1%)	(32.1%)	(30.8%)	(41%)
Africa (24)	70.8	41.7	29.2	29.2	41.7
Asia (10)	100	90	80	80	80
Europe (6)	50	66.7	50	50	50
Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	82.4	58.8	23.5	17.6	29.4
Near East (10)	80	30	10	10	40
Northern America (2)	50	100	0	0	0
South West Pacific (9)	55.6	55.6	22.2	22.2	22.2

**TABLE 21**  
**Implementation rates of three core procedures for aquaculture, in accordance with the Code of Conduct (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Environmental assessments of aquaculture operations	Monitoring of aquaculture operations	Minimizing harmful effects of alien species introductions
	(71.8%)	(79.5%)	(79.5%)
Africa (24)	58.3	66.7	75
Asia (10)	100	100	100
Europe (6)	66.7	83.3	66.7
Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	82.4	94.1	94.1
Near East (10)	70	70	70
Northern America (2)	100	100	100
South West Pacific (9)	55.6	66.7	55.6

**TABLE 22**  
Effectiveness of three core procedures for aquaculture, in accordance with the Code of Conduct (figures in %)

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Environmental assessments of aquaculture operations			Monitoring of aquaculture operations			Minimizing harmful effects of alien species introductions		
	Highly effective	Improvements needed	Largely ineffective	Highly effective	Improvements needed	Largely ineffective	Highly effective	Improvements needed	Largely ineffective
Africa (24)	15.4	84.6	0	13.3	86.7	0	40	60	0
Asia (10)	20	80	0	20	80	0	40	60	0
Europe (6)	100	0	0	60	40	0	100	0	0
Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	0	100	0	12.5	81.2	6.2	31.2	68.8	0
Near East (10)	0	100	0	14.3	85.7	0	28.6	71.4	0
Northern America (2)	50	50	0	100	0	0	100	0	0
South West Pacific (9)	20	80	0	16.7	83.3	0	40	60	0
<b>Total (78) and averages</b>	<b>18.2</b>	<b>81.8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>21.3</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>42.4</b>	<b>57.6</b>	<b>0</b>

Note: the percentage values indicated in the table represent the fraction of all countries having put a particular mechanism in place (see table 21).

**TABLE 23**  
Identified needs for improvement in three critical domains of aquaculture operations  
(by descending order of importance)

Rank	Environmental assessments of aquaculture operations	Monitoring of aquaculture operations	Minimizing harmful effects of alien species introductions
1	Strengthen institutional technical capacity (equipment and HR) (86.7%)	Strengthen institutional technical capacity (equipment and HR) (89.6%)	Strengthen institutional technical capacity (equipment and HR) (88.2%)
2	Improve legal framework (82.2%)	Develop an aquaculture production database (85.4%)	Strengthen institutional collaboration (82.4%)
3	Improve periodicity and/or coverage of assessment (68.9%)	Improve legal framework (79.2%)	Improve legal framework (79.4%)
4	Introduce a certification scheme of operators (64.4%)	Improve periodicity and/or coverage of monitoring (72.9%)	Carry out more research (79.4%)
5	Widen scope of assessment (62.2%)	Widen scope of monitoring (70.8%)	Develop contingency plans (79.4%)
6	Lower costs of assessments (51.1%)	Lower costs of monitoring (50%)	Raise awareness (76.5%)
7	Other (20%)	Other (14.6%)	Improve periodicity and/or coverage of inspections (73.5%)
8			Improve monitoring of released species (73.5%)
9			Other (23.5%)

Note: The percentage value indicated after each tabulated need represents the fraction of all countries having put a particular mechanism in place and which still needs improvement (see table 22).

**TABLE 24**  
**Measures taken to promote responsible aquaculture practices in support of rural communities, producer organisations and fish farmers (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries having taken measures in this sense (87.8%)	Designing and implementing extension programmes	Institutional strengthening	Assisting farmers to organize into producer associations	Creating an enabling investment climate	Facilitating access to credit and grant facilities
		(51.4%)	(48.6%)	(44.4%)	(33.3%)	(31.9%)
Africa (25)	88	59.1	59.1	68.2	54.5	18.2
Asia (10)	100	70	20	0	20	70
Europe (8)	50	0	25	25	50	25
Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	94.1	43.8	68.8	37.5	18.8	37.5
Near East (11)	81.8	44.4	22.2	66.7	22.2	33.3
Northern America (2)	100	50	50	0	50	0
South West Pacific (9)	100	55.6	55.6	44.4	22.2	22.2

Note: with the exception of the first data column, the percentage values in the headers render global figures only for the pool of countries that reported to have taken measures in this direction.

Legend to table headers: the percentage value indicated below each measure represents the overall percentage of responding countries that reported to use it as a support mechanism. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 74.4% of all mechanisms reported. Other reported measures include (by descending order of importance)[Binding stakeholders into aquaculture planning processes], [Improving access to feed supplements and other inputs], [Improving access to markets and market information], [Rehabilitating degraded ecosystems], [Improving access to land and titles].

**TABLE 25**  
**Countries that have developed policy, legal and institutional frameworks (including the most basic) for integrated coastal zone management (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries with a coastline	Policy framework			Legal framework			Institutional framework		
		Largely complete and enabling	Partial	None or largely insufficient	Largely complete and enabling	Partial	None or largely insufficient	Largely complete and enabling	Partial	None or largely insufficient
Africa (23)	82.6	36.8	36.8	26.3	42.1	36.8	21.1	31.6	52.6	15.8
Asia (10)	90	22.2	77.8	0	33.3	66.7	0	22.2	66.7	11.1
Europe (21)	71.4	60	40	0	66.7	33.3	0	66.7	33.3	0
Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	100	35.3	58.8	5.9	11.8	76.5	11.8	5.9	94.1	0
Near East (11)	100	0	72.7	27.3	10	60	30	33.3	33.3	33.3
Northern America (2)	100	50	50	0	50	50	0	50	50	0
South West Pacific (9)	100	22.2	66.7	11.1	11.1	77.8	11.1	22.2	66.7	11.1
<b>Total (93) and averages</b>	<b>88.2</b>	<b>32.9</b>	<b>54.9</b>	<b>12.2</b>	<b>32.1</b>	<b>55.6</b>	<b>12.3</b>	<b>31.2</b>	<b>58.7</b>	<b>10</b>

Note: except for the first data column, percentage values apply only to the pool of respondents that have a coastline.

**TABLE 26**  
**Conflicts within the fisheries sector, and between fisheries and other sectors (figures in %)**

Type of conflict between	Region (number of responses in brackets)	Nature of conflict					Conflict resolution mechanisms in place
		Not applicable	Strong	Moderate	Light	None	
Gear types operating in the coastal area	Africa (24)	25	16.7	37.5	16.7	4.2	58.3
	Asia (10)	20	20	40	20	0	70
	Europe (21)	28.6	9.5	23.8	23.8	14.3	57.1
	Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	0	23.5	64.7	5.9	5.9	76.5
	Near East (11)	9.1	18.2	36.4	9.1	27.3	81.8
	Northern America (2)	0	0	100	0	0	100
	South West Pacific (9)	0	22.2	0	77.8	0	100
	<b>Total (94)</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>37.2</b>	<b>21.3</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>70.2</b>
Coastal fisheries and industrial fisheries	Africa (24)	25	29.2	20.8	12.5	12.5	70.8
	Asia (10)	20	40	20	20	0	60
	Europe (21)	28.6	9.5	23.8	23.8	14.3	57.1
	Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	17.6	23.5	35.3	5.9	17.6	52.9
	Near East (11)	27.3	0	18.2	18.2	36.4	54.5
	Northern America (2)	0	0	50	50	0	100
	South West Pacific (9)	0	0	55.6	44.4	0	77.8
	<b>Total (94)</b>	<b>21.3</b>	<b>18.1</b>	<b>27.7</b>	<b>19.1</b>	<b>13.8</b>	<b>62.8</b>
Coastal fisheries and coastal aquaculture	Africa (24)	41.7	0	12.5	12.5	33.3	37.5
	Asia (10)	40	0	20	30	10	50
	Europe (21)	28.6	0	0	38.1	33.3	42.9
	Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	17.6	0	11.8	23.5	47.1	41.2
	Near East (11)	9.1	0	9.1	18.2	63.6	63.6
	Northern America (2)	0	0	50	50	0	100
	South West Pacific (9)	0	11.1	11.1	33.3	44.4	55.6
	<b>Total (94)</b>	<b>25.5</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>10.6</b>	<b>25.5</b>	<b>37.2</b>	<b>46.8</b>
Fisheries and recreational development	Africa (24)	20.8	8.3	25	20.8	25	41.7
	Asia (10)	30	0	10	40	20	60
	Europe (21)	28.6	14.3	4.8	23.8	28.6	57.1
	Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	0	11.8	52.9	23.5	11.8	64.7
	Near East (11)	0	18.2	9.1	27.3	36.4	36.4
	Northern America (2)	0	0	100	0	0	100
	South West Pacific (9)	0	11.1	33.3	22.2	33.3	55.6
	<b>Total (94)</b>	<b>14.9</b>	<b>10.6</b>	<b>24.5</b>	<b>24.5</b>	<b>24.5</b>	<b>53.2</b>
Fisheries and port development	Africa (24)	16.7	12.5	20.8	8.3	41.7	50
	Asia (10)	30	10	20	30	10	60
	Europe (21)	28.6	4.8	4.8	28.6	33.3	52.4
	Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	5.9	0	23.5	23.5	47.1	23.5
	Near East (11)	0	9.1	18.2	36.4	27.3	45.5
	Northern America (2)	0	0	50	50	0	100
	South West Pacific (9)	0	0	33.3	33.3	33.3	55.6
	<b>Total (94)</b>	<b>14.9</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>19.1</b>	<b>24.5</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>47.9</b>

Type of conflict between	Region (number of responses in brackets)	Nature of conflict					Conflict resolution mechanisms in place
		Not applicable	Strong	Moderate	Light	None	
Fisheries and mineral extraction activities	Africa (24)	20.8	16.7	16.7	16.7	29.2	37.5
	Asia (10)	20	20	20	20	20	60
	Europe (21)	33.3	4.8	4.8	14.3	42.9	33.3
	Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	17.6	5.9	29.4	23.5	23.5	35.3
	Near East (11)	18.2	0	27.3	9.1	36.4	36.4
	Northern America (2)	0	0	50	50	0	100
	South West Pacific (9)	0	0	22.2	11.1	66.7	55.6
	<b>Total (94)</b>	<b>20.2</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>19.1</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>41.5</b>

**TABLE 27**

**FAO Members and effective food safety and quality assurance system for fish and fisheries products (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Food safety and quality assurance system		
	Largely complete and enabling	Partial	None or largely insufficient
Africa (25)	64	36	0
Asia (10)	90	10	0
Europe (8)	75	25	0
Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	64.7	35.3	0
Near East (11)	63.6	36.4	0
Northern America (2)	100	0	0
South West Pacific (9)	77.8	22.2	0
<b>Total (82) and averages</b>	<b>70.7</b>	<b>29.3</b>	<b>0</b>

**TABLE 28**

**Most effective measures taken by Government to promote the reduction of post-harvest losses in fish processing, distribution and marketing (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries reporting post-harvest losses as a problem (96.3%)	No measure taken (5.1%)	Food-safety regulations, Codes, SOPs, and/or HACCP	Creating competent authority/regulatory body	Enhanced monitoring, control and inspections	Providing/improving infrastructure	Promoting by-product utilization value addition
			(57.7%)	(51.3%)	(41%)	(34.6%)	(28.2%)
Africa (24)	100	4.2	45.8	66.7	29.2	37.5	20.8
Asia (10)	100	0	70	20	60	30	20
Europe (8)	75	0	100	66.7	33.3	0	50
Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	100	0	58.8	52.9	70.6	41.2	52.9
Near East (11)	90.9	30	20	30	10	50	10
Northern America (2)	100	0	100	50	50	0	0
South West Pacific (9)	100	0	77.8	55.6	33.3	33.3	22.2

Note: with the exception of the first data column, percentage values in the headers render global figures only for the pool of countries that reported post-harvest losses as a problem area.

Legend to table headers: the percentage value indicated below each measure represents the overall percentage of responding countries that reported to have implemented it. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 89.7% of all mechanisms reported. Other reported measures include (by descending order of importance) [Funding Research and Development], [Encouraging founding of professional organizations], [Providing financial incentives].



**TABLE 29**  
**Most effective measures taken by Government to promote the improved use of bycatch in fish processing, distribution and marketing (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries reporting that bycatch problems do exist in their fisheries (84%)	No measure taken (13.2%)	Awareness raising and training/ dialogue with processors	Mandatory landing of bycatch in given fisheries	Strengthening relationship between producers, processors and distributors	Improvement of handling infrastructures and conservation facilities	Fostering adoption of new processing techniques and technology
			(51.5%)	(39.7%)	(33.8%)	(27.9%)	(22.1%)
Africa (24)	87.5	14.3	57.1	33.3	33.3	38.1	28.6
Asia (10)	100	0	60	50	20	40	20
Europe (8)	62.5	0	20	60	20	40	40
Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	82.4	7.1	35.7	42.9	35.7	14.3	35.7
Near East (11)	81.8	55.6	44.4	11.1	33.3	22.2	0
Northern America (2)	100	0	100	50	100	0	0
South West Pacific (9)	77.8	0	71.4	57.1	42.9	14.3	0

Note: with the exception of the first data column, percentage values in the headers render global figures only for the pool of countries that reported the existence of bycatch problems.

Legend to table headers: the percentage value indicated below each measure represents the overall percentage of responding countries that reported to have implemented it. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 75.8% of all mechanisms reported. Other reported measures include (by descending order of importance). [Funding Research and Development programmes and/or pilot projects], [Assist processors accessing new markets], [Force operators to sell all bycatch locally], [Encourage immediate onboard processing], [Providing financial incentives for bycatch related commercial activities].

**TABLE 30**  
**FAO Members that can identify the origin of fish and fisheries products (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Processors	Consumers
Africa (24) (24)	83.3	37.5
Asia (10) (10)	80	30
Europe (8) (8)	87.5	87.5
Latin America and the Caribbean (17) (17)	82.4	17.6
Near East (11) (10)	81.8	10
Northern America (2) (2)	100	50
South West Pacific (9) (9)	100	44.4
<b>Total (81) ( 80) and averages</b>	<b>85.2</b>	<b>35</b>

Note: the first bracketed number following the FAO region indicates the number of answers to the question summarized in the first column while the number, in the second bracket indicates the number of answers summarized in the second column.

**TABLE 31**  
**Measures taken by Government to eliminate processing and trading in illegally harvested fisheries resources**  
**(figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries reporting this issue as a problem (93.8%)	No measure taken (11.8%)	Enhanced fisheries control and inspections	Implementing NPOA-IUU and/or NPOA-Sharks	Tougher sanctions	Enhanced customs and border controls	Implementing product traceability systems
			(55.3%)	(36.8%)	(32.9%)	(30.3%)	(25%)
Africa (24)	91.7	9.1	54.5	45.5	36.4	27.3	31.8
Asia (10)	100	10	30	40	10	30	20
Europe (8)	87.5	0	57.1	14.3	42.9	71.4	71.4
Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	94.1	6.3	68.8	50	50	18.8	12.5
Near East (11)	90.9	30	40	20	20	50	0
Northern America (2)	100	0	50	100	50	0	0
South West Pacific (9)	100	22.2	77.8	11.1	22.2	11.1	33.3

Note: with the exception of the first data column, percentage values in the headers render global figures only for the pool of countries that reported processing and trading of illegally harvested resources as a problem area.

Legend to table headers: the percentage value indicated below each measure represents the overall percentage of responding countries that reported to have implemented it. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 80% of all mechanisms reported. Other reported measures include (by descending order of importance). [Awareness raising and training], [Trade restrictions for certain products], [Import restrictions for non-certified products], [Limiting the selling of fish], [Limiting sourcing to licensed operators], [Other].

**TABLE 32**  
**State of stock assessment in FAO Member countries**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Number of stocks for which reliable estimates are available	Fraction of key national stocks for which stock assessments are available
Africa (11)	195	21-30%
Asia (9)	203	21-30%
Europe (6)	228	81-90%
Latin America and the Caribbean (16)	153	51-60%
Near East (8)	142	31-40%
Northern America (2)	299	71-80%
South West Pacific (9)	608	51-60%
<b>Total (62) and averages</b>	<b>1828</b>	<b>41-50%</b>

**TABLE 33**  
**State of fisheries research in FAO Member countries (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Timely, complete and reliable statistics on catch and fishing effort are collected	Sufficient qualified personnel exist to generate data in support of sustainable fisheries management
Africa (25) (25)	64	44
Asia (10) (10)	90	60
Europe (8) (8)	75	75
Latin America and the Caribbean (17) (17)	64.7	52.9
Near East (11) (11)	63.6	45.5
Northern America (2) (2)	100	100
South West Pacific (9) (9)	77.8	55.6
<b>Total (82) (82) and averages</b>	<b>70.7</b>	<b>53.7</b>

Note: the 2 numbers in brackets refer to the number of responses for timely, complete and reliable statistics, and for sufficient qualified personnel respectively.

**TABLE 34**  
**Subject area requirements for additional qualified personnel (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Fish biology and stock assessment	Fisheries statistics and sampling	Socio-economic analysis	Inspectors and observers (MCS)	Fisheries economics
	(73.7%)	(73.7%)	(31.6%)	(26.3%)	(26.3%)
Africa (25)	85.7	78.6	21.4	35.7	28.6
Asia (10)	100	75	25	50	0
Europe (8)	0	0	0	0	0
Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	75	62.5	37.5	12.5	50
Near East (11)	66.7	83.3	50	16.7	16.7
Northern America (2)	-	-	-	-	-
South West Pacific (9)	50	100	50	25	25

Note: percentage values in this table only apply to those nations where qualified human resources are reported to be insufficient (see previous table).

Legend to table headers: the percentage value indicated below each measure represents the overall percentage of countries that reported to apply the same measure. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 86.3% of all reported measures. Other reported measures include (by descending order of importance) [Post-harvest technology and processing], [Gear technology], [Environmental/ecosystem appraisal].

**TABLE 35**  
**Data sources for the development of fishery management plans in FAO Members (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	In-port/ landing site sampling surveys	Routine data collection (logbooks, landings, vessel and licence registers)	Historical data	Socio-economic surveys	Processing, market and trade statistics
	(85.2%)	(84%)	(71.6%)	(67.9%)	(66.7%)
Africa (24)	79.2	83.3	62.5	79.2	62.5
Asia (10)	80	80	60	70	80
Europe (8)	62.5	87.5	87.5	25	75
Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	94.1	94.1	94.1	76.5	88.2
Near East (11)	90.9	72.7	45.5	36.4	36.4
Northern America (2)	100	100	100	100	50
South West Pacific (9)	100	77.8	77.8	88.9	55.6

Note: The five tabulated data sources represent a cumulative 47.5 percent of all reported sources. Other important data sources included (in descending order)[FAO and/or RFMO statistics], [On-board sampling from commercial vessels], [Research vessel surveys], [Surveillance/VMS/inspection (MCS) data], [Discard and/or bycatch monitoring], [Comparative data from similar fisheries/ecosystems], [Frame surveys], [Mark/recapture surveys], [Underwater visual census/aerial abundance surveys].

**TABLE 36**  
**Key data gaps in managing fisheries resources (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries reporting that management efforts are undermined by data gaps (93.9%)	Stock status data	Catch data (small-scale to industrial)	Ecosystem data	Effort data (small-scale to industrial)	IUU fishing and/or MCS data
		(42.9%)	(37.7%)	(37.7%)	(36.4%)	(31.2%)
Africa (25)	92	52.2	39.1	26.1	34.8	43.5
Asia (10)	90	55.6	22.2	44.4	11.1	33.3
Europe (8)	87.5	28.6	0	42.9	42.9	14.3
Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	100	29.4	35.3	52.9	29.4	23.5
Near East (11)	100	36.4	54.5	18.2	54.5	36.4
Northern America (2)	100	100	50	100	0	0
South West Pacific (9)	88.9	37.5	62.5	37.5	62.5	25

Note: except for the first data column, percentage values in this table only apply to those nations where data gaps are reported to undermine management efforts.

Legend to table headers: the five tabulated data gaps represent a cumulative 65.3% of all reported sources. Other important lacking data sources included (in descending order) [Not landed data], [Socio-economic data], [Technical fleet capacity data (small-scale to industrial)], [Capacity utilization data (small-scale to industrial)], [Landed data], [Market/trade/export data], [Historical/long term data series].

**TABLE 37**  
**Routine monitoring of the state of the marine environment (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries reporting to routinely monitor the state of the marine environment	Countries performing routine monitoring of:		
		Oceanographic parameters (chemo-physical and biological data)	Coastal parameters (chemo-physical and biological data)	Coastal and offshore habitats
Africa (24)	41.7	100	80	60
Asia (10)	70	71.4	85.7	71.4
Europe (8)	62.5	100	100	80
Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	64.7	54.5	72.7	72.7
Near East (11)	63.6	71.4	57.1	57.1
Northern America (2)	100	100	100	50
South West Pacific (9)	44.4	50	50	100
<b>Total (81) and averages</b>	<b>56.8</b>	<b>76.1</b>	<b>76.1</b>	<b>69.6</b>

Note: except for the first data column, percentage values in this table only apply to those nations where routine monitoring of the marine environment occurs.

**TABLE 38**  
**Research and programmes to address the impact of climate changes on fisheries (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Formal research to assess/predict impact of climate change in fisheries	Formal programs to address climate change in fisheries*
Africa (24)	41.7	100
Asia (10)	70	71.4
Europe (8)	62.5	100
Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	64.7	54.5
Near East (11)	63.6	71.4
Northern America (2)	100	100
South West Pacific (9)	44.4	50
<b>Total (81) and averages</b>	<b>56.8</b>	<b>76.1</b>

Note: figures in the second column (marked \*) only relate to countries which answered positively in the first column.

**TABLE 39**  
**Summary information relating to the status of national IPOA-Capacity implementation (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries having developed and started to implement an NPOA-Capacity	Countries having launched the preliminary fishing capacity assessment	Status of the assessment*		Countries not yet started, but planning to commence the assessment **	Countries implementing management measures to adjust capacity *
			Ongoing	Finished		
Africa (25)	40	24	70	20	20	16
Asia (10)	80	70	75	25	50	40
Europe (8)	62.5	50	60	40	0	12.5
Latin America and the Caribbean (16)	50	31.2	100	0	75	12.5
Near East (11)	27.3	27.3	100	0	25	27.3
Northern America (2)	100	100	0	100	-	50
South West Pacific (9)	44.4	44.4	75	25	20	33.3
<b>Total (81) and averages</b>	<b>49.4</b>	<b>38.3</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>22.5</b>	<b>31.7</b>	<b>22.2</b>

Note: figures in the two columns marked (\*) only refer to countries having launched the preliminary assessment. Figures in the column marked (\*\*) only refer to the group of countries that has not yet launched the preliminary assessment.

**TABLE 40**  
**IPOA-Capacity: Methods used to measure capacity (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Using key fleet and vessel characteristics	Using potential catch to be harvested by fleet	Using potential fishing effort generated by fleet	Using more complex approaches (DEA, bioeconomic analysis...)	Other
	(77.5%)	(62.5%)	(57.5%)	(30%)	(17.5%)
Africa (25)	90	70	70	40	30
Asia (10)	87.5	75	50	0	0
Europe (8)	80	40	20	40	20
Latin America and the Caribbean (16)	75	75	75	37.5	12.5
Near East (11)	66.7	33.3	66.7	0	33.3
Northern America (2)	0	50	0	100	0
South West Pacific (9)	75	50	75	25	25

Note: the tabulated data cover a cumulative 100 percent of reported methods. Percentages in this table only relate to countries that have launched the preliminary capacity assessment (see previous table).

**TABLE 41**  
**IPOA-Capacity: Measuring fishing capacity on the high seas (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries flagging and/or authorizing fishing vessels to fish on the high seas	Supplying a record of such vessels to FAO? *	Not supplying a record, but intending to do so in future **
Africa (22)	40.9	88.9	100
Asia (10)	60	66.7	50
Europe (18)	61.1	72.7	66.7
Latin America and the Caribbean (16)	62.5	80	100
Near East (11)	27.3	66.7	100
Northern America (2)	100	50	100
South West Pacific (8)	75	50	66.7
<b>Total (87) and averages</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>72.3</b>	<b>76.9</b>

Note: figures in the column marked (\*) only refer to countries flagging and/or authorizing vessels to fish on the high seas. Figures in the column marked (\*\*) only refer to the group of countries to which the question is applicable.

**TABLE 42**  
**IPOA-Capacity: Steps taken to prevent the further build-up of overcapacity (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries where fishing overcapacity is recognized as a problem (74.1%)	None	Putting in place limited entry regimes	Freeze on current total number of licences/vessels	Monitoring and research into fishing overcapacity	NPOA-Capacity development and implementation	Capacity "self-adjusting" quota system
		(10%)	(55%)	(41.7%)	(28.3%)	(18.3%)	(15%)
Africa (25)	84	14.3	38.1	33.3	33.3	23.8	0
Asia (10)	80	0	75	50	37.5	25	0
Europe (8)	62.5	0	60	40	20	0	20
Latin America and the Caribbean (16)	75	0	66.7	50	33.3	8.3	50
Near East (11)	81.8	22.2	44.4	55.6	11.1	11.1	0
Northern America (2)	50	0	100	0	0	100	0
South West Pacific (9)	44.4	25	75	25	25	25	50

Note: with the exception of the first data column, percentage values in the headers render global figures only for the pool of countries that recognized fishing overcapacity as a problem area.

Legend to table headers: the percentage value indicated below each measure represents the overall percentage of responding countries that reported to use it as a mitigation mechanism. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 74.8% of all mechanisms reported. Other reported measures include (by descending order of importance) [Increasing licence, registration and/or transshipment fees], [Freeze on capacity-related technical elements], [Other], [Freeze on new acquisitions/investments], [Elimination of subsidies and/or tax incentives].

**TABLE 43**  
**IPOA Capacity: Steps taken to reduce fishing overcapacity (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	None	Promotion of alternative income generating activities	Public buy-back and decommissioning schemes	Capacity "self-adjusting" quota system	Monitoring and research into fishing overcapacity	NPOA-Capacity development and implementation
	(13.3%)	(23.3%)	(20%)	(18.3%)	(18.3%)	(16.7%)
Africa (21)	19	33.3	4.8	4.8	14.3	19
Asia (8)	0	25	37.5	12.5	25	37.5
Europe (5)	0	0	60	40	0	0
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	8.3	41.7	16.7	41.7	33.3	0
Near East (9)	22.2	0	11.1	0	11.1	11.1
Northern America (1)	0	0	100	0	0	100
South West Pacific (4)	25	0	25	50	25	25

Legend to table headers: The percentage value indicated below each measure represents the overall percentage of responding countries that reported to use it as a mitigation mechanism. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 65.9 percent of all mechanisms reported. Other reported measures include (by descending order of importance)[Capacity-oriented vessel replacement rules], [Freeze on new acquisitions/investments], [Transfer of capacity and/or vessel reconversion schemes], [Elimination of subsidies and/or tax incentives].

**TABLE 44**  
**IPOA-Capacity: Steps taken to prevent further negative impacts of existing fishing overcapacity on stocks (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	None	Limitation on number of fishing days	Technical restrictions on vessels and gear	Spatial closures	Seasonal closures of particular fisheries	Recovery schemes/ closures of given fisheries
	(3.3%)	(55%)	(41.7%)	(28.3%)	(18.3%)	(11.7%)
Africa (21)	9.5	38.1	33.3	33.3	23.8	4.8
Asia (8)	0	75	50	37.5	25	0
Europe (5)	0	60	40	20	0	20
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	0	66.7	50	33.3	8.3	16.7
Near East (9)	0	44.4	55.6	11.1	11.1	33.3
Northern America (1)	0	100	0	0	100	0
South West Pacific (4)	0	75	25	25	25	0

Note: percentage values in this table only apply to those nations where fishing overcapacity is recognized as a problem (see table 42).

Legend to table headers: the percentage value indicated below each measure represents the overall percentage of responding countries that reported to use it as a mitigation mechanism. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 95.9% of all mechanisms reported. Other reported measures include (by descending order of importance)[Conservative/precautionary TACs and quotas].

**TABLE 45**  
Summary information relating to the status of national IPOA Sharks implementation (figures in %)

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries where sharks are caught (target or bycatch)	Assessment of shark stocks to determine the need for a shark plan			NPOA-Sharks	
		Assessment conducted	Assessment concluded that an NPOA-Sharks is needed *	Assessment not conducted, but planning to **	NPOA-Sharks is in place ***	Intention to develop an NPOA-Sharks ***
Africa (23)	47.8	36.4	100	71.4	100	-
Asia (10)	70	100	100	-	71.4	100
Europe (8)	25	100	50	-	100	-
Latin America and the Caribbean (16)	68.8	72.7	87.5	100	85.7	100
Near East (11)	36.4	25	100	100	0	100
Northern America (2)	100	100	100	-	100	-
South West Pacific (8)	100	87.5	85.7	100	50	100
<b>Total (78) and averages</b>	<b>57.7</b>	<b>68.9</b>	<b>90.3</b>	<b>85.7</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>100</b>

Note: 57.7 of responding FAO Members indicated that sharks were caught in waters under their jurisdiction, or caught by national fishing units on the high seas, as target species, or as bycatch. Percentage values in this table only refer to that pool of nations. Figures in the column marked (\*) only refer to the group of countries that have conducted an assessment. Figures in the column marked (\*\*) only refer to the group of countries which have not yet conducted an assessment (31.1%). Figures in the columns marked (\*\*\*) only refer to the group of countries that concluded that a plan was needed.

**TABLE 46**  
Summary information relating to the status of national IPOA-Seabirds implementation (figures in %)

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries where longline fishing was conducted in waters under their jurisdiction	Assessment of longline, trawl and/or gillnet fisheries to determine the need for a seabird plan			NPOA-Seabirds	
		Assessment conducted	Assessment concluded that an NPOA-Seabirds is needed *	Assessment not conducted, but planning to **	NPOA-Seabirds is in place ***	Intention to develop an NPOA-Seabirds ***
Africa (22)	90.9	15	100	58.8	100	-
Asia (10)	100	40	75	50	66.7	100
Europe (8)	62.5	60	66.7	50	100	-
Latin America and the Caribbean (16)	87.5	42.9	66.7	87.5	100	-
Near East (11)	81.8	0	-	44.4	-	-
Northern America (2)	100	100	100	-	100	-
South West Pacific (8)	87.5	85.7	50	0	33.3	100
<b>Total (77) and averages</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>35.8</b>	<b>70.8</b>	<b>58.1</b>	<b>82.4</b>	<b>100</b>

Note: 87% of responding FAO Members indicated that longline fishing was conducted in waters under their jurisdiction, or by national fishing units on the high seas or in waters of third States. Percentage values in this table only refer to that pool of nations. Figures in the column marked (\*) only refer to the group of countries that have conducted an assessment. Figures in the column marked (\*\*) only refer to the group of countries that has not yet conducted an assessment (64.2%). Figures in the columns marked (\*\*\*) only refer to the group of countries that concluded that a plan was needed.



**TABLE 47**  
**IPOA Seabirds: Mitigation measures applied to longline fisheries (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries involved in longline fisheries (65%)	None	Legal Framework	Observer programme	Technical measures (lures)	Seabird Avoidance Plan	Mandatory release of birds
		(38.5%)	(38.5%)	(34.6%)	(30.8%)	(11.5%)	(11.5%)
Africa (24)	70.8	58.8	23.5	11.8	5.9	23.5	23.5
Asia (10)	60	16.7	50	33.3	66.7	16.7	0
Europe (8)	50	25	50	50	75	0	0
Latin America and the Caribbean (16)	56.3	33.3	44.4	55.6	44.4	0	0
Near East (11)	81.8	44.4	44.4	22.2	0	0	22.2
Northern America (2)	100	0	100	50	100	50	0
South West Pacific (9)	55.6	20	20	80	40	0	0

Note: with the exception of the first data column, percentage values in the headers render global figures only for the pool of countries that reported to be involved in longline fishing.

Legend to table headers: the percentage value indicated below each measure represents the overall percentage of responding countries that reported to use it as a mitigation mechanism. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 83.5% of all mechanisms reported. Other reported measures include (by descending order of importance) [Deploying sets at night], [Spatial measures], [Mandatory workshops/codes of practice], [Strategic discarding of refuse/removing hooks].

**TABLE 48**  
**IPOA Seabirds: Mitigation measures applied to trawl and/or gillnet fisheries (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries involved in trawl and/or gillnet fisheries (59.7%)	None	Legal framework improvement	Observer programme	Bird scaring devices	Seabird Avoidance Plan	Preliminary research
		(52.2%)	(34.8)	(32.6%)	(15.2%)	(10.9%)	(10.9%)
Africa (22)	72.7	62.5	25	25	18.8	12.5	6.3
Asia (10)	60	66.7	33.3	33.3	16.7	0	0
Europe (8)	50	50	25	25	25	0	0
Latin America and the Caribbean (16)	37.5	66.7	33.3	50	0	0	16.7
Near East (10)	70	42.9	57.1	14.3	0	14.3	14.3
Northern America (2)	100	0	50	0	50	50	50
South West Pacific (9)	55.6	20	40	80	20	20	20

Note: with the exception of the first data column, percentage values in the headers render global figures only for the pool of countries that reported to be involved in trawl and/or gillnet fishing.

Legend to table headers: the percentage value indicated below each measure represents the overall percentage of responding countries that reported to use it as a mitigation mechanism. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 81.4% of all mechanisms reported. Other reported measures include (by descending order of importance) [Spatial measures], [Mandatory workshops/codes of practice], [Fishing at night], [Strategic discarding of refuse], [Other].

**TABLE 49**  
**Summary information relating to the status of national IPOA–IUU implementation (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries where IUU fishing is perceived as a problem	Drafting and implementing an NPOA-IUU		
		Countries having drafted an NPOA-IUU *	Countries having started to formally implemented their NPOA-IUU **	Countries intending to draft an NPOA-IUU *
Africa (22)	95.5	76.2	81.2	100
Asia (10)	90	66.7	100	100
Europe (8)	62.5	80	100	100
Latin America and the Caribbean (16)	93.8	66.7	70	100
Near East (10)	80	62.5	60	100
Northern America (2)	100	100	100	-
South West Pacific (8)	100	75	83.3	100
<b>Total (76) and averages</b>	<b>89.5</b>	<b>72.1</b>	<b>81.6</b>	<b>100</b>

Note: figures in the column marked (\*) only refer to the group of countries that perceive IUU fishing as a problem. Figures in the column marked (\*\*) only refer to the group of countries that has drafted an NPOA-IUU

**TABLE 50**  
**IPOA-IUU: Measures taken to prevent, deter and eliminate IUU fishing (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries where IUU fishing is perceived as a problem* (93.8%)	None	Legal framework improvement	Improved coastal State controls and MCS	Improved port State control measures	Bilateral and regional collaboration	Improved flag State controls
		(2.7%)	(70.7%)	(68%)	(26.7%)	(25.3%)	(18.7%)
Africa (24)	100	4.2	75	75	37.5	37.5	4.2
Asia (10)	100	10	50	60	10	30	40
Europe (8)	87.5	0	71.4	42.9	14.3	14.3	28.6
Latin America and the Caribbean (16)	75	0	83.3	83.3	25	16.7	8.3
Near East (11)	100	0	81.8	54.5	27.3	9.1	9.1
Northern America (2)	100	0	50	50	50	0	100
South West Pacific (9)	100	0	55.6	77.8	22.2	33.3	33.3

Note: \* this question was asked to all FAO Members, independently of answers listed in the previous table. Percentage values in the following columns only apply to countries where IUU fishing has been recognized as a problem.

Legend to table headers: the percentage value indicated below each measure represents the overall percentage of responding countries that reported to use it as a mitigation mechanism. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 84.4% of all mechanisms reported. Other reported measures include (by descending order of importance) [Developing and implementing NPOA-IUU], [Market-related measures], [Control over nationals], [Research].

**TABLE 51**  
**FAO Strategy-STF (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries aware of the Strategy-STF	Plans and programs are being implemented for the Strategy-STF	Component parts of such programmes include:		
			Activities to improve data collection	Activities to improve data analysis	Activities to improve data dissemination
Africa (24)	75	77.8	100	100	100
Asia (10)	80	87.5	100	100	100
Europe (8)	50	75	100	100	100
Latin America and the Caribbean (16)	81.2	84.6	100	100	90.9
Near East (11)	81.8	55.6	100	100	60
Northern America (2)	100	50	100	100	100
South West Pacific (9)	33.3	66.7	100	100	100
<b>Total (80) and averages</b>	<b>71.2</b>	<b>75.4</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>93</b>

Note: With the exception of the first data column, percentage values in the headers render global figures only for the pool of countries aware of the Strategy-STF.

**TABLE 52**  
**FAO Strategy-StA (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries aware of the Strategy-StA	Plans and programs are being implemented for the Strategy-StA	Component parts of such programmes include:		
			Activities to improve data collection	Activities to improve data analysis	Activities to improve data dissemination
Africa (24)	69.6	81.2	100	100	100
Asia (10)	80	75	100	100	100
Europe (8)	37.5	100	100	100	100
Latin America and the Caribbean (16)	68.8	72.7	100	100	100
Near East (11)	75	50	100	100	100
Northern America (2)	100	100	100	100	100
South West Pacific (9)	44.4	50	100	100	100
<b>Total (80) and averages</b>	<b>65.8</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

Note: with the exception of the first data column, percentage values in the headers render global figures only for the pool of countries aware of the Strategy-StA.

**TABLE 53**  
**Ratification, accession or acceptance of the 1993 FAO Compliance Agreement the 1995 UN Fish Stocks Agreement and the 2009 Agreement on Port State Measures by FAO Members (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	1993 FAO Compliance Agreement		1995 UN Fish Stocks Agreement		2009 Agreement on Port State Measures	
	Party to the Agreement	Intention to become a Party	Party to the Agreement	Intention to become a Party	Party to the Agreement	Intention to become a Party
Africa (23)	60.9	33.3	65.2	37.5	56.5	50
Asia (10)	30	16.7	50	20	20	50
Europe (8)	37.5	25	50	0	37.5	60
Latin America and the Caribbean (16)	43.8	11.1	31.2	9.1	31.2	18.2
Near East (11)	18.2	0	36.4	0	9.1	22.2
Northern America (2)	100	-	100	-	0	100
South West Pacific (9)	66.7	66.7	88.9	100	44.4	80
<b>Total (79) and averages</b>	<b>46.8</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>54.4</b>	<b>18.2</b>	<b>35.4</b>	<b>44</b>

**TABLE 54**  
**Constraints reported by FAO Members to the implementation of the Code of Conduct (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries reporting to face some constraints in implementing the Code (86.6%)	Insufficient budgetary resources	Insufficient human resources	Incomplete policy and/or legal frameworks	Inadequate scientific research, statistics and information access	Lack of awareness and information about the Code
		(57.7%)	(42.3%)	(35.2%)	(31%)	(26.8%)
Africa (25)	96	75	37.5	33.3	29.2	37.5
Asia (10)	80	12.5	37.5	37.5	25	12.5
Europe (8)	37.5	33.3	33.3	33.3	66.7	0
Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	100	64.7	52.9	35.3	17.6	23.5
Near East (11)	90.9	40	60	30	60	30
Northern America (2)	100	100	0	0	0	0
South West Pacific (9)	77.8	57.1	28.6	57.1	28.6	28.6

Note: with the exception of the first data column, percentage values in the headers render global figures only for the pool of countries facing constraints in implementing the Code.

Legend to table headers: the percentage value indicated below each constraint represents the overall percentage of responding countries that reported it. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 69.5% of all constraints reported. Other reported measures include (by descending order of importance) [Difficult socio-economic climate], [Institutional weaknesses], [Insufficient capacities of primary actors], [Overcapacity and overcapitalization in key fisheries], [Insufficient/inadequate MCS arrangements].

**TABLE 55**  
**Solutions proposed by FAO Members to overcome constraints in the implementation of the Code of Conduct (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Access to more budgetary means	More training and awareness raising	Access to more human resources	Align policy and/or legal frameworks with the Code	Improve research, statistics, and access to information	Improve institutional structures and collaboration
	(56.3%)	(38%)	(35.2%)	(33.8%)	(28.2%)	(25.4%)
Africa (24)	75	37.5	29.2	37.5	29.2	20.8
Asia (8)	12.5	25	37.5	25	37.5	25
Europe (3)	0	0	33.3	33.3	66.7	66.7
Latin America and the Caribbean (17)	70.6	35.3	41.2	35.3	0	35.3
Near East (10)	40	70	50	40	40	0
Northern America (2)	50	100	0	0	0	50
South West Pacific (7)	57.1	14.3	28.6	28.6	57.1	28.6

Note: percentage values in this table only apply to those nations who reported to face constraints in implementing the Code (see previous table).

Legend to table headers: the percentage value indicated below each solution represents the overall percentage of responding countries that reported it. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 69% of all solutions reported. Other reported measures include (by descending order of importance) [Strengthen capacity and role of primary stakeholders], [Improve socio-economic situation of fishing and/or aquaculture sector(s)], [Improve MCS arrangements], [Improve analysis and management planning processes].

**TABLE 56**  
**Global distribution and availability of the Technical Guidelines in Fisheries Administrations (figures in %)**

	<b>Technical Guidelines to the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries</b>	<b>Global distribution and availability</b>
1	Fishing Operations	70.4
1.1	Vessel Monitoring Systems	59.2
2	Precautionary Approach to Capture Fisheries and Species Introductions	66.2
3	Integration of Fisheries into Coastal Area Management	63.4
4	Fisheries Management	80.3
4.1	Conservation and Management of Sharks	66.2
4.2	Ecosystem approach to Fisheries	83.1
4.2.1	Best Practices in Ecosystem Modelling for Informing an Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries	54.9
4.3	Managing Fishing Capacity	63.4
5	Aquaculture Development	73.2
5.1	Good Aquaculture Feed Manufacturing Practice	49.3
5.2	Health Management for Responsible Movement of Live Aquatic Animals	43.7
5.3	Genetic Resource Mnaagement	39.4
6	Inland Fisheries	57.7
6.1	Rehabilitation of Inland Waters for Fisheries	38
7	Responsible Fish Utilization	63.4
8	Indicators for Sustainable Development of Marine Capture Fisheries	54.9
9	Implementation of the International Plan of Action to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing	73.2
10	Increasing the contribution of small-scale fisheries to poverty alleviation and food security	56.3
11	Responsible Fish Trade	54.9
12	Information and Knowledge Sharing	40.8