



COMMITTEE ON FISHERIES

SUB-COMMITTEE ON FISH TRADE

Eighteenth Session

Written Correspondence Procedure: 8 April to 8 May 2022

Virtual Plenary sessions: 7, 8, 9 and 20 June 2022

IMPLEMENTATION OF ARTICLE 11 OF THE CODE OF CONDUCT FOR RESPONSIBLE FISHERIES: FEATURES, CHALLENGES AND INSIGHTS FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF FAO MEMBERS

Executive Summary

This paper provides a summary analysis of the implementation of Article 11 of the 1995 FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF) and its related instruments by Members. The summary covers the period since the last report, presented at the 17th Session of the FAO Sub-Committee on Fish Trade (COFI:FT), held in Vigo, Spain, from 25–29 November 2019.

Suggested action by the Sub-Committee

- Note the revised questionnaire that has been developed, and advise on any potential improvements;
- Note the analysis of trends in the implementation of Article 11 of the CCRF and its related instruments;
- Note the challenges in the implementation of Article 11 of the CCRF as reported by Members, and advise on how to address the gaps and constraints identified in various areas; and
- Provide guidance on how to continue to enhance the implementation of Article 11 of the CCRF.

INTRODUCTION

1. The FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF), adopted by the FAO Conference in 1995, seeks to facilitate change and adjustment within the fisheries sector to ensure the long-term conservation and sustainable management of aquatic resources and ecosystems¹. Article 11 of the CCRF relates to post-harvest practices and trade².

2. Since 2012, FAO has monitored the implementation of Article 11 through a self-assessment questionnaire, completed and submitted biannually by Members via an online reporting system.

3. Pursuant to the recommendations of the FAO COFI Sub-Committee on Fish Trade (COFI:FT) at its 17th Session in 2019³, the COFI:FT Secretariat has worked on a revised version of this questionnaire to “refine the questions in order to obtain more specific responses from Members to facilitate analysis, future technical assistance and capacity building actions, and conduct further analysis of the open-ended responses to identify trends and inform the work of COFI and COFI:FT”.

4. The new questionnaire was launched in September 2021. Complete responses were received from 144 Members, including the European Union (EU) on behalf of its 27 Member States, representing 87 percent of Members.

STRUCTURE OF THE NEW QUESTIONNAIRE

5. The new version of the questionnaire for Article 11 aims to clarify the scope of questions, while improving the accuracy and reliability of the CCRF reporting system. Particular attention was paid to:

- updating and clarifying the questions;
- reformulating questions to prevent a response of “not applicable”; and
- reorganization and harmonization of the existing sections.

6. The new questionnaire was developed between October 2020 and July 2021, translated into five languages, and uploaded to the online platform. A guidance document was also produced and translated into five languages, with the aim of facilitating understanding and completion of the new questionnaire

7. The revised questionnaire (provided in Annex 1) is divided into four sections. Questions may be either closed- or open-ended, as in previous years. This combination of questions enables Members to report on two different levels: on the one hand, the extent to which they have implemented the provisions set out in Article 11, and, on the other hand, the challenges identified in its implementation.

8. For closed-ended questions, answers are given as a value between 1 and 5 (1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest). For open-ended questions, respondents are able to answer in their own words, using the text field provided.

9. The four sections are:

- Section I – Food safety and quality (15 closed questions, 1 open question).
- Section II – Post-harvest practices (9 closed questions, 2 open questions).
- Section III – Responsible international trade (5 closed questions, 1 open question).
- Section IV – Laws and regulations relating to fish trade (5 closed questions, 1 open question).

¹ [fao.org/3/v9878e/V9878E.pdf](https://www.fao.org/3/v9878e/V9878E.pdf).

² [fao.org/3/v9878e/v9878e.pdf#page=35](https://www.fao.org/3/v9878e/v9878e.pdf#page=35).

³ [fao.org/3/ca8665t/CA8665T.pdf](https://www.fao.org/3/ca8665t/CA8665T.pdf).

10. On 30 September 2021, Members were invited to participate in the 2021 edition of the questionnaire. Once registered, Members were able to access the new questionnaire online through a dedicated portal on the FAO domain using country-specific credentials.⁴

11. Members were offered assistance throughout the questionnaire process, via email and through online meetings, to help them effectively respond to the questionnaire.

12. The information provided by Members through the questionnaire is used to assess the progress, challenges and extent of implementation of Article 11. Responses are treated as strictly confidential, and only presented at an aggregate level (either global or regional) so as not to undermine confidentiality. FAO will also use the results to identify possible areas of support for post-harvest practices and trade, to the benefit of Members.

MEMBER'S RESPONSE RATE, QUESTIONNAIRE COMPLETION RATE AND PLATFORM IMPROVEMENTS

13. The high response rate to the questionnaire indicates the continued engagement of Members in the process.

COFI:FT Session	Responding Members⁵	Response rate
13th Session - 2012	16 Members	22% of Members
14th Session - 2014	89 Members	60% of Members
15th Session - 2016	116 Members	73% of Members
16th Session - 2017	124 Members	77% of Members
17th Session - 2019	141 Members	86% of Members
18th Session - 2022	144 Members	87% of Members

14. On average, Members answered 97 percent of the closed-ended questions, with the remaining 3 percent left blank. This is an improvement in terms of completeness when compared with the 2019 edition, where 92 percent of questions were answered – the remaining 8 percent of responses were given as “not applicable” (7 percent) or left blank (1 percent).

15. Members justified the 3 percent of unanswered questions in the most recent questionnaire in the following ways:

- The question was not applicable to a certain country or context.
- There is a lack of data or information at the national level.
- There was difficulty in coordinating responses between relevant departments or agencies.

16. The main difficulties encountered and reported by Members included:

- The questionnaire requires inputs from a vast number of relevant departments, agencies or institutions. Great efforts were needed to coordinate national responses.
- A significant number of staff at national ministries were working remotely, and many offices were on stand-by due to the COVID-19 pandemic. This hampered internal dialogue and coordination.

⁴ The online questionnaire was accessible through a dedicated portal (fao.org/fishery/code/codequest), using unique usernames and passwords, meeting the necessary confidentiality, security and usability requirements.

⁵ In each edition of the questionnaire the EU responds on behalf of its 27 Member States.

17. The online platform used to support the three CCRF questionnaires (for COFI, COFI:AQ and COFI:FT) was first developed in 2013. Since then, the system has been expanded and modified, with new sections and functionalities added. However, the platform is fast becoming obsolete due to the age of the software architecture in place. The COFI:FT Secretariat is working on the development of a new platform, together with the Secretariats of COFI and COFI:AQ, to increase the accuracy and reliability of the CCRF reporting system. The new system will retain the previous system's functionalities while offering more agile solutions, thereby facilitating changes and improvements to the respective questionnaires going forward. Alongside this change, the COFI:FT Secretariat is considering minor revisions to the questionnaire based on the feedback received, in order to further improve and clarify some questions and answering options.

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

18. The responses received were analysed in two ways:

- The raw data of responses received from Members was exported from the web-based system to Excel files. These were then analysed and aggregated (simple average) at the global and regional level. A detailed statistical analysis of responses to the closed-ended questions is available in COFI:FT/XVIII/2022/Inf.5 and should be read in conjunction with this document. Individual responses from Members are not published, in order to maintain confidentiality. For the calculation of regional aggregates, the following regional groups were created: Africa, Asia, the Caribbean, Europe, Latin America, the Near East, North America and the Southwest Pacific. Comparison of the results with those from previous editions of the questionnaire is not possible, as the questions have been revised.
- Answers to the open-ended questions were received in the six official languages of FAO.⁶ Responses were translated and summarized in order to highlight, as far as possible, areas where the implementation of Article 11 poses challenges for Members. A summary of responses to the open-ended questions is provided in the next section of this document.

OBSERVATIONS, CHALLENGES AND INSIGHTS RELATING TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF CCRF ARTICLE 11

19. Members recognize the enormous potential of the post-harvest fisheries and aquaculture sector to significantly enhance their social and economic development. Thus, Article 11 of the CCRF is reported as a powerful tool for countries and fish operators to ensure effective post-harvest practices and trade.

20. As reported by Members, the questionnaire not only highlights the progress and challenges of implementing Article 11 worldwide, but it also supports a continuous process of reflection at the country level on the central values and standards that the CCRF contains.

21. The adverse effects of COVID-19 on the fisheries and aquaculture sector were widely reported, manifesting in higher costs and major disruptions.

22. The following sections outline the features, challenges and insights related to the implementation of Article 11 of the CCRF, as reported by Members. They provide a wide range of information, helpful in understanding the factors that inhibit or enable growth in the post-harvest sector at the global, regional and national levels.

⁶ Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Spanish and Russian.

CURRENT CHALLENGES OR PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH FOOD SAFETY AND QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEMS FOR FISHERIES AND AQUACULTURE PRODUCTS

23. Across the board, Members reported ongoing efforts to comply with measures related to food safety and quality for fisheries and aquaculture products. This was particularly true in aquaculture, in the small-scale sector, and in relation to products intended for the domestic market, where there are important gaps that need to be addressed.
24. National food safety systems are reported as being particularly complex, as the majority of countries have multiple authorities, with overlapping mandates between these entities.
25. Several Members reported a lack of comprehensive and effective food safety and quality policies, protocols and appropriate legal frameworks. Even where food safety and quality assurance systems are in place, these are often not sufficiently developed, updated or systematically implemented, especially in relation to aquaculture production. In many cases, food safety and quality policies exist, but do not consider the specific nature of fisheries and aquaculture products. In addition, these are not addressed or are often regulated under broad categories such as “livestock” or “meat”. Legal instruments for food safety control and inspection are often not fully aligned with international requirements.
26. The enforcement of food safety and quality assurance systems is reported as a major challenge. There are often limited numbers of trained inspectors, a lack of resources and a multiplicity of actors to be monitored.
27. There is a lack of investment plans and adequate financial assistance to support the implementation of food safety and quality assurance systems, including appropriate post-harvest facilities, equipment and extension services. This is especially true for micro, small, and medium enterprises. The capacity of the private sector is still limited in many countries.
28. Due to inadequate testing capabilities and few accredited laboratories, a lack of national surveillance and monitoring plans was reported. These limit opportunities to identify emerging food safety hazards, which in turn has negative implications for consumer protection.
29. Additional issues reported include improper post-harvest handling, poor hygiene at all stages of the food supply chain, improper storage and a lack of food safety measures in processing and preparation operations. Furthermore, financial constraints and inadequate infrastructure impede proper cold chain management at all stages of the supply chain. The highly perishable nature of fisheries and aquaculture products makes food safety and quality assurance particularly challenging.
30. The fisheries and aquaculture sector in many countries is dominated by artisanal, micro- and small-scale operators, which often leads to a lack of organized structures for the proper handling and marketing of fisheries and aquaculture products.
31. Fish landing sites are often widely dispersed geographically. This makes it difficult to ensure food safety control and the provision of services critical to preserving food safety and quality, such as cold chain facilities at landing sites. Unpaved transportation routes, the scarcity of potable water and distance from main markets further limits effective safety procedures and management systems.
32. Members indicated that there are often no national standards that address all stages of post-harvest practices, notably with respect to the domestic supply of locally caught fish. Similarly, meeting international standards requires investment, and small-scale operators often have limited access to financial support. Many Members reported a lack of equivalence in trade partners’ food safety and quality certification systems.

33. Some Members reported difficulties in implementing Codex Alimentarius standards. Other Members identified limitations in the Codex Alimentarius texts and standards, noting incomplete coverage of aquatic species and types of residue from veterinary drugs in use in aquaculture.
34. The implementation of a HACCP plan was reported as being too expensive and difficult to comply with, especially for small operators.
35. There is insufficient awareness of food safety and quality requirements among value chain actors. There are often no awareness programmes or training activities for good hygiene practices, food safety and quality assurance, among other standards.
36. Most Members reported traceability issues. Moreover, the requirements, standards and capabilities varied between countries and contexts in terms of methodology and type of information collected. Traceability systems are often not fully developed, or focus only on export requirements. Some countries lack electronic traceability systems, and so food business operators use manual recording and documentation. The need for national traceability plans has been highlighted, together with the need for comprehensive national information systems involving government, industry and other stakeholders.
37. Food safety and quality assurance systems appear to be more present in marine capture and mariculture systems in comparison with freshwater aquaculture and inland fisheries.
38. Insufficient attention is paid to the abuse of antibiotics, medicines and unauthorized substances in aquaculture production, which is still reported as the leading cause of non-compliance of aquaculture products with the food safety requirements of both domestic and international markets. Antimicrobial resistance (AMR) remains one of the main concerns in aquaculture. Residue monitoring plans are costly and there is a lack of resources to finance them, especially for small processors. Similarly, many Members reported gaps in their fishery laws with respect to biosafety in aquaculture, including controls on feed, feed additives and veterinary drugs.

MAJOR CHALLENGES ASSOCIATED WITH POST-HARVEST ACTIVITIES

39. Members highlighted the role of post-harvest activities as fundamental to the development of sustainable fisheries management and the creation of better livelihoods, with their consequent social, economic and environmental dimensions. The main challenges reported in the post-harvest sector include low levels of fish consumption, a lack of financial and human resources, inadequate infrastructure along the fisheries and aquaculture value chain, inadequate fisheries and aquaculture management and practices, the unsustainable exploitation of marine resources, difficulties accessing new markets, a high level of fish loss and waste, limited data and research, a lack of national policies that take into account the specific nature of fisheries and aquaculture products, and difficulties in implementing and enforcing such policies when they exist.
40. The fisheries and aquaculture sector provides employment and supports livelihoods, yet there is a need to address poor working conditions and labour shortages.
41. Some Members reported a decrease in fish consumption due to high prices and changes in consumption patterns.
42. The majority of Members stressed that training and capacity building for fishery officers in post-harvest activities is needed to improve handling and sustainable practices in the sector. Training is most needed in proper fish handling, inspection, packaging, technology, transportation and conservation practices. This is particularly pertinent for artisanal and small-scale fisheries.
43. Members highlighted a lack of adequate infrastructure and facilities that would enable them to add value to fisheries and aquaculture products.

44. A lack of technology is a challenge that most Members face, with implications for the proper handling of fisheries and aquaculture products, value addition and the reduction of food loss and waste. The latter applies in particular to affordable and reliable technology for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), small-scale operators and fishing communities. Another challenge that was highlighted was the difficulty in establishing waste-free, energy-saving and innovative technologies for the transportation and processing of aquatic biological resources, including the construction of coastal processing plants.

45. The full traceability of fisheries and aquaculture products along the value chain is still not guaranteed. Traceability systems, catch documentation schemes and other strategies to verify the provenance of fish products must be strengthened in order to help prevent illegal, unreported, and unregulated (IUU) fishing. The main challenge lies in small-scale and artisanal fisheries.

46. Most members emphasised that the assessment and reduction of food loss and waste along the fish value chain was a major challenge. Effective public policy to regulate the supply chain could reduce this. A significant amount of bycatch and discards is still reported in both the small-scale and industrial fisheries sectors. With this in mind, Members stressed the need to develop and implement effective methods to reduce bycatch and discards.

47. Several Members reported a lack of data and limited information systems. Improving the latter could help boost institutional capacity and support the decision-making process.

48. Several Members noted difficulties in accessing financial resources to promote and implement programmes and projects in the post-harvest sector.

49. Many Members reported inadequate national legislation and policies – or sometimes their complete absence – to promote responsible and sustainable fisheries and aquaculture management.

50. Another issue that was highlighted is the need to create a positive image for commercial aquaculture products.

MAJOR CHALLENGES FACED WHEN EXPORTING OR IMPORTING FISHERIES AND AQUACULTURE PRODUCTS

51. Access to international markets was cited by Members as a main challenge. This especially applies to small-scale operators and fishing communities in remote areas. This is caused by the stringent policies for fisheries and aquaculture products importing countries impose – particularly for aquaculture products – as well as other non-tariff measures and regulations, which are constantly changing.

52. The trade of fisheries and aquaculture products derived from IUU is still a concern, for which stronger coordination between customs and national authorities will be required. Controls, inspections and global traceability systems are recognized as key to preventing the illegal harvest of fisheries and aquaculture products. Many Members reported a lack of capacity to monitor and control their borders, as well as limited legislation and administrative arrangements to monitor the legality of fish and fishery products. They also stressed the lack of trained technical personnel.

53. As noted by many Members, more laboratories and related equipment are needed to meet import and export requirements and ensure the quality of fisheries and aquaculture products. Improving compliance with international health and safety standards remains a challenge. Members highlighted the high costs of testing all the parameters required for export, particularly to markets in more developed countries. Moreover, import requirements in some countries have become more difficult to comply with due to the strengthening of non-tariff measures.

54. One of the most significant challenges is meeting international quality requirements for fisheries and aquaculture products. Many Members noted the stringency of the various standards and requirements, which makes accessing new markets challenging.

55. Some Members outlined the challenges posed by sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) requirements, regional trade protocols and the implementation of requirements of the World Trade Organization (WTO) for trade facilitation.

56. In some countries, data collection for fisheries and aquaculture products is not systemized and may be collected periodically or as necessary. This makes it challenging to collect and access trade data, with negative implications for preventing illegal operations.

57. Members highlighted a number of challenges due to the COVID-19 pandemic. These included lengthened waiting times to get approvals for import and export, delays in transporting products internationally, limited flights, escalating freight costs, and unnecessary COVID-19 tests on fisheries and aquaculture products for human consumption. Members stressed the fact that there is no evidence that the virus can spread through food or packaging, and therefore no connection to food safety for human consumption within CODEX or WTO.

58. Harmonized standards and certification requirements are needed in order to facilitate international trade of fisheries and aquaculture products.

CURRENT GAPS IN THE NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK GOVERNING FISHERIES AND AQUACULTURE PRODUCTS, WHICH RESULT IN CHALLENGES, INEFFICIENCIES OR PREVENT ACCESS TO CERTAIN MARKETS

59. Many Members reported that the existing national laws, policies and regulations governing fisheries and aquaculture are outdated or incomplete. With this in mind, many Members highlighted that aquaculture should be taken into consideration when developing a national legislative framework. They also stressed the importance of harmonizing national laws and regulations with global practices and aligning with international standards.

60. At the same time, Members reported that having a national legislative framework in place does not necessarily translate into well-grounded practices at the operational level. The lack of financial and human resources to implement policies and regulations has, in many cases, impeded the development of the fisheries and aquaculture sector. It should be noted that the need for a coherent and organized application of laws, regulations and policies has been emphasized by Members.

61. Many Members recognized that practices such as establishing a monitoring, control and surveillance mechanism, together with effective traceability systems, enhancing scientific research and combating IUU fishing, should all be incorporated into their national legislative framework.

62. Some Members called for more transparency during policy design.

63. Some Members reported that small-scale fisheries are excluded from national legislative frameworks.

64. Many Members called for continuous technical support when developing their national framework governing fisheries and aquaculture, and capacity building in different areas such as certification, customs clearance and quarantine requirements.

65. A lack of coordination and collaboration between line agencies governing fisheries and aquaculture domestically has been reported, which has created barriers in the implementation of policies and regulations.

66. As reported by many Members, the legal language employed in the legislative framework is not always clear, simple and easy to understand.

MAJOR ACHIEVEMENTS AND SUCCESS STORIES ASSOCIATED WITH POST-HARVEST ACTIVITIES

67. This new open-ended question provided a range of very interesting responses.

68. Members reported on national programmes, activities and success stories associated with post-harvest activities. The initiatives highlighted engagement with local communities, revitalization of the fisheries and aquaculture sector, the creation of value addition, reduced food losses and waste, outreach to stakeholders and consumers, and promotion of public-private partnerships to develop fishery management plans in collaboration with local stakeholders. A selection of the main achievements is summarized below:

Improved technologies:

- Programmes developed to support improved technology for the modernization of the fishing fleet (engines, fishing gear and improved storage conditions on board), for the purposes of value addition, automation (thereby making processing actions more selective and precise) and to reduce the environmental impact of operations (energy and water-saving systems).
- Climate-resilient and sustainable aquaculture technologies have been developed to support sustainable production and minimize the food loss of aquaculture products (real-time water quality monitoring systems to monitor water conditions and alert the farmers).

Reduction of fish losses:

- Innovative projects have been carried out for the valorization, utilization or transformation of fish waste into: fish feed, fish oil, flour, meal, fish paste, sauces, ice cream emulsions, biofertilizers, construction materials (from shells) and pet food. Mussel shells are also being used for reef restoration activities and as bio-stimulants. Fish skins, which would usually be discarded, are being used in the beauty product value chain (creams, treatments). Offcut pieces (heads, bones and trimmings left after processing into fillets) are being used to make powders and soups. The biorefinery industry from fisheries and aquaculture product waste is expanding, as is the industrial production of gelatin (from fish skins).
- One Member launched a Food Resource Valorization Award to recognize the efforts of companies that adopt food waste valorization solutions and raise awareness of the concept.
- The following activities have been implemented to help fishers catch the fish they target and eliminate unwanted catches: transformation of gillnet to subsurface gillnetting; use of more selective fishing techniques and gears; use of inshore acoustic deterrent devices to reduce dolphin and porpoise bycatch; changes in the shape of hooks to reduce mortality in turtles; and changes in the constructive and operational aspects of trawl-type fishing gears. Other bycatch reduction innovations include: prohibiting bottom trawling, trammel nets and nylon monofilament gillnets; imposing definite specifications for kingfish fishing nets, set longlines and net gears; and using turtle excluder devices (TEDs) in shrimp fisheries.
- Food waste minimization guidebooks were published for food retail establishments, supermarkets and food manufacturing establishments to reduce food waste across the supply chain.
- Zero waste plans were implemented, outlining a commitment that all businesses should recycle a proportion of all waste, generally around 70 percent.

Value addition:

- Processing underutilized fish species and low-value reef fish using improved techniques adapted to local contexts – e.g. filleting, smoking, drying, salting, frying and corning – to help minimize fish spoilage and add value.

Traceability:

- Mandatory catch landing at designated landing sites, as well as logbooks and reporting systems.
- Enforcement of restricted fishing days.

Handling and improved practices:

- Modernization of fishing harbours and the construction of fish landing centres or raised platforms for key landing wharves along the rural coastline. These platforms are used to clean and sort the fish rather than doing so on the ground.
- Introduction of a certification programme for small-scale fish processing facilities.
- Supplying solar freezers to fisher associations and communities to assist in the preservation of fish for a longer period before it is transported to the market.

Small-scale:

- Provision of technical assistance, equipment, financial services and training (in value addition, handling and use of improved technologies) for artisanal and small-scale fisheries, particularly women and youth, which will help them expand their business.
- Massive rural electrification programme rolled out by the government, which means more small-scale fishers and traders can freeze and store their fish catches.

Public–private partnerships:

- Establish public-private partnerships along the value chain to enhance production, reduce losses and support exports.
- Encourage the participation of professional associations and academic and research institutions in the decision-making process and development of programmes in the post-harvest sector.

USE OF THE RESULTS AND FAO WORK

69. Members are always encouraged to seek support through national and regional FAO offices worldwide for the development of their fisheries and aquaculture post-harvest sectors.

70. Over the last two years, FAO has supported the implementation of CCRF Article 11 in a variety of ways, including through its Regular Programme and donor-funded activities. Specific activities include: the organization of international, regional and national workshops to disseminate and deepen the understanding of the CCRF; the development of technical guidelines, studies and publications to facilitate the CCRF's implementation; and associated capacity building, training and technical support (please refer to COFI:FT/XVIII/2022/Inf.7).

CONCLUSION

71. Fisheries and aquaculture provide a vital source of food, employment, recreation, trade, and economic well-being for people throughout the world; their benefits must continue for the wellbeing of present and future generations.

72. The FAO CCRF establishes relevant general principles for responsible and sustainable fisheries and aquaculture activities. More specifically, CCRF Article 11 is a reference point for national and international efforts to improve post-harvest practices and trade in order to continue generating social, economic and environmental benefits.

ANNEX 1 – NEW QUESTIONNAIRE

FAO Questionnaire on the Implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries - Implementation of article 11: Post-harvest Practices and Trade
--

1. Food safety and quality

1	To what extent do the following statements apply in relation to the food safety and quality aspects of fisheries and aquaculture products in your country?	1 / 2 / 3 / 4 / 5
1.1	A national policy on food safety and quality exists, has been implemented and includes fisheries and aquaculture products	
1.2	Legislation and/or regulations in support of a food safety and quality system exist, are effectively enforced, and include fisheries and aquaculture products	
1.3	There is a national body that sets food standards, which also covers fisheries and aquaculture products	
1.4	National food safety and quality standards exist for fisheries and aquaculture products	
1.5	National food safety and quality standards are in line with Codex Alimentarius standards	
1.6	There is active country participation in Codex Alimentarius committees	
1.7	National food safety and quality standards for fisheries and aquaculture products are equally enforced for both domestic and international markets	
1.8	A government authority (or multiple authorities) in charge of food safety and associated consumer protection issues exists (or exist), and is (are) fully operational, covering fisheries and aquaculture products	
1.9	Food inspection services are carried out for fisheries and aquaculture products intended for the domestic market	
1.10	Food inspection services are carried out for fisheries and aquaculture products intended for international markets	
1.11	Accredited public or private laboratory services for the analysis of fisheries and aquaculture products are accessible locally or overseas and are duly used	
1.12	A national marine and inland water environmental monitoring plan exists, is fully operational, and covers food safety hazards (physical, chemical and microbiological)	
1.13	For fisheries and aquaculture products intended for the domestic market, food business operators have HACCP-based food safety management systems	
1.14	For fisheries and aquaculture products intended for international markets, food business operators have HACCP-based food safety management systems	
1.15	Traceability systems exist and allow the withdrawal and recall of fisheries and aquaculture products to protect consumer health	
1.16	<p>Please identify the current challenges or problems associated with food safety and quality assurance systems for fisheries and aquaculture products in your country:</p> <p><i>(open text)</i></p>	

2. Post-harvest

2	To what extent do the following statements apply to the fisheries and aquaculture post-harvest activities in your country?	1 / 2 / 3 / 4 / 5
2.1	Fish loss and waste assessments are carried out on a regular basis and follow an established methodology	
2.2	Fish loss and waste have been reduced in all associated fisheries and aquaculture value chains	
2.3	Enhanced awareness and the utilization of bycatch and discards, have contributed to reducing fish loss and waste in all associated fisheries and aquaculture value chains	
2.4	The promotion of value addition in fisheries and aquaculture is an integral part of national policies	
2.5	National policies monitor and minimize the negative impact of post-harvest fisheries and aquaculture activities on the environment	
2.6	National policies promote human consumption of fisheries and aquaculture products	
2.7	Improvements in post-harvest activities have contributed positively to enhanced market access for fisheries and aquaculture products	
2.8	Post-harvest research and development has contributed to economic, social, environmental or nutritional benefits across associated fisheries and aquaculture value chains	
2.9	National policies promote responsible fish utilization and have led to improved livelihoods by taking into account social and gender issues	
2.10	Please identify the major achievements and success stories associated with post-harvest activities in your country (these might include: fish loss and waste reduction, bycatch utilization, discard reduction, the adoption of improved technology or technologies, improved post-harvest practices, environmental impacts, social benefits, value addition, better water and energy use, fish consumption changes, improved livelihoods etc.):	
	<i>(open text)</i>	
2.11	Please identify the major challenges or problems associated with post-harvest activities in your country (these might include: fish loss and waste reduction, bycatch utilization, discard reduction, the adoption of improved technology or technologies, improved post-harvest practices, environmental impacts, social benefits, value addition, better water and energy use, fish consumption changes, improved livelihoods etc.):	
	<i>(open text)</i>	

3. International trade

3	To what extent do the following statements regarding the international trade of fisheries and aquaculture products apply in your country?	1 / 2 / 3 / 4 / 5
3.1	National measures address the legality of exported or imported fisheries and aquaculture products	
3.2	Specific Trade Concerns (STCs) from the World Trade Organization (WTO) are utilized as a market analysis tool	
3.3	Effective benefits for the exports of fisheries and aquaculture products are obtained from plurilateral, bilateral or unilateral trade preferences	
3.4	Conditional market access, involving the supply of services or products, is not present in any instrument with third countries, such as trade agreements, fisheries access agreements, or arrangements.	
3.5	Statistics on the international trade of fisheries and aquaculture products are collected, disseminated and reported on time to the relevant national and international institutions.	
3.6	Please identify the major challenges faced by your country when exporting or importing fisheries and aquaculture products: (open text)	

4. Laws and regulations

4	To what extent do the following statements apply to the fisheries and aquaculture legal framework governing international trade, post-harvest and food safety and quality issues in your country?	1 / 2 / 3 / 4 / 5
4.1	The national laws and regulations governing fisheries and aquaculture are developed by following clear, transparent and relevant administrative processes	
4.2	The national laws, regulations and administrative processes applicable to fisheries and aquaculture products are clear and easily understood, and are publicly available online	
4.3	National laws and regulations are developed through an active consultation process, involving diverse and relevant stakeholders with a legitimate interest in the subject matter. The consultation process encompasses notification of proposed regulations and drafts and allows for comments/inputs throughout the process	
4.4	Changes to national laws and regulations relevant to the trade of fish are notified, where applicable, to the WTO, interested States and other relevant international organizations and include, where appropriate, adequate transition periods	
4.5	The national laws, regulations and administrative processes applicable to fisheries and aquaculture products avoid duplications or redundancies, and ensure coherent and consistent implementation in the case of the involvement of multiple agencies or bodies	
4.6	Please identify current gaps in the national legislative framework governing fisheries and aquaculture products in your country that result in challenges, inefficiencies or prevent access to certain markets: (open text)	