



联合国  
粮食及  
农业组织

Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations

Organisation des Nations  
Unies pour l'alimentation  
et l'agriculture

Продовольственная и  
сельскохозяйственная организация  
Объединенных Наций

Organización de las  
Naciones Unidas para la  
Alimentación y la Agricultura

منظمة  
الاغذية والزراعة  
للأمم المتحدة

E

## Third Meeting of the Parties to the 2009 FAO Agreement on Port State Measures

**31 May to 4 June 2021  
Brussels, Belgium<sup>1</sup>**

### **Results of the questionnaire for the review and assessment of the effectiveness of the PSMA**

#### **The Parties are invited to:**

- Review the progress made by Parties in the implementation of the PSMA as reported through the questionnaire;
- Provide guidance on ways to improve implementation and enhance the effectiveness of the Agreement;
- Advise on whether the questionnaire survey should be considered a one-time exercise or whether it should be carried out periodically;
- Provide guidance on how the questionnaire, its electronic platform or the analysis of the responses could be improved.

<sup>1</sup> To be held virtually.

## I. Introduction

1. At the second meeting of the Parties to the Agreement on Port State Measures to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing (PSMA), Parties adopted the questionnaire for the review and assessment of the effectiveness of the Agreement. The Parties agreed that the questionnaire should be open for response for a period of three months. The Parties noted that the questionnaire is an initial tool to be used in the process to monitor and review the effectiveness of the Agreement and may be amended and adapted according to the needs identified by the Parties.
2. The questionnaire was circulated to Parties by FAO on 1 December 2020, and was open for response until 28 February 2021<sup>2</sup>. (Statistical tables summarizing Parties' responses are available in the Appendix)

## II. Results of the responses to the questionnaire

### *Response Rates by Parties*

3. Eighty-two percent of Parties<sup>3</sup> to the PSMA submitted a response to the questionnaire (**Appendix, table 1**). At regional level, response rate was as follows: 75 percent of Parties in Africa; 90 percent of Parties in Asia; 100 percent of Parties in Europe; 81 percent of Parties in Latin America and the Caribbean; 75 percent of Parties in the Near East; 100 percent of Parties in North America; and 67 percent of Parties in the Southwest Pacific (**Table 2**).

### *Application of the PSMA (Article 3)*

4. The majority of Parties have reviewed their legislation in order to fulfil their obligations under the Agreement, whilst those that had not yet done so responded that they intend to do so (**Appendix, table 3**). From Parties who have reviewed their legislation, one-quarter did not require changes to their legislation. For Parties whose legislation required changes, in general, these changes have been partially made.
5. Where applicable, more than three-quarters of Parties are engaged in cooperation with neighbouring countries to prevent artisanal fisheries for subsistence engaging in IUU fishing, and all of these have measures in place to ensure that such activities do not contribute to IUU fishing (**Appendix, table 4**). More than half of Parties have procedures in place to determine whether fish on board container vessels, that had previously been landed, were not sourced from vessels conducting IUU fishing, and one-quarter of these Parties have had cases of container vessels found to be carrying fish previously landed that was sourced from IUU fishing activities. Finally, where applicable, more than half of Parties apply the Agreement to chartered vessels operating under their waters and jurisdiction, and more than three-quarters of these have measures in place to ensure that such vessels are subject to measures as effective as those applied to vessels flying their flag.

### *Integration and cooperation at national level (Article 5)*

6. In general, Parties have taken considerable measures for exchanging information and coordinating activities among relevant agencies at national level, whilst an average of seven agencies per State play a role in the implementation of the Agreement (**Table 5**). The agencies most commonly reported by Parties to play a role in implementing the Agreement are, in decreasing order: fisheries, port, customs, navy/coastguard, maritime, police and immigration.

<sup>2</sup> No analysis could be incurred on the question relating to Article 4 due to an IT related issue which affected this part of the questionnaire application. However, information relevant to the implementation of RFMO conservation and management measures related to port State measures can be found in PSMA/2021/5.

<sup>3</sup> The Russian Federation acceded to the PSMA on 10 March 2021 and therefore was not included in this analysis.

7. In general, Parties have taken considerable measures to integrate port State measures with other measures to combat IUU fishing, taking into account as appropriate, the FAO International Plan of Action to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate IUU Fishing (**Table 6**).

*Cooperation and exchange of information (Article 6)*

8. In order to promote the effectiveness of the Agreement, the majority of Parties cooperate and/or exchange information in relation to its objectives with FAO, under two-thirds do so frequently or always with other relevant States, and three-quarters do so frequently or always with regional fisheries management organizations (RFMO/As) (**Table 7**). Conversely, the majority of Parties do not, or only occasionally, cooperate and/or exchange information with other intergovernmental organizations and other entities.

*Designation of ports (Article 7)*

9. More than three-quarters of Parties reported to have designated ports under the Agreement, and a quarter of these Parties restrict landings to specific types of products (i.e. frozen, refrigerated, fresh) (**Table 8**). Just under three-quarters of Parties reported to have provided their list of designated ports to FAO, and in general, there is partially sufficient capacity to conduct inspections pursuant to the Agreement in these designated ports.

*Advance request for port entry (Article 8)*

10. The majority of Parties require an advance request for entry to port (AREP) (**Table 9**). The majority of AREPs contain as a minimum standard, the information contained within Annex A of the Agreement, and just over half of AREPs contain information beyond Annex A of the Agreement. The minimum required time for the AREP ranges from zero to a maximum of 168 hours, whilst the median is 48 hours. Just over half of Parties have situations where a different minimum required time for the AREP applies.

*Port entry, authorization or denial (Article 9)*

11. On average, Parties have four agencies involved in port entry, authorization or denial (**Table 10**). The agencies most commonly reported by Parties to play a role in port entry, authorization or denial are, in decreasing order: fisheries, port, customs, navy/coastguard and maritime.
12. After receiving an AREP, more than three-quarters of Parties determine whether the vessel was engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing in order to authorize or deny entry into port (**Table 11**). Of these, three-quarters have a standardized method for determining whether vessels requesting port entry have engaged in IUU fishing and, the same proportion have a standardized method which includes a risk assessment.
13. On average, Parties have four agencies which participate in both the process of determining whether to authorize port entry (**Table 12**) and to deny port entry (**Table 13**). The agencies that participate the most in these processes, across all Parties, are the same for authorizing and denying port entry and are (in order of highest to lowest ranking): fisheries, port, customs, navy/coastguard and maritime.
14. Almost three-quarters of Parties request cooperation from a vessel's flag State to determine whether to authorize entry into port, and slightly more than half of these only do so when risk assessment so determines (**Table 14**).
15. The majority of Parties use the following data/information sources, in order of ranking, to inform the decision to authorize or deny entry into port: fisheries licenses and authorizations, national records, RFMO/As, vessel monitoring systems (VMS), data/information from the flag State and compliance history (**Table 15**).
16. Three-quarters of Parties have measures in place to deny entry into port when sufficient proof is present that a vessel has engaged in IUU fishing (**Table 16**). Of these, almost half have denied a vessel entry into port due to having sufficient proof that the vessel had conducted IUU fishing or fishing activities in support of such activities.

17. In the case of denial of entry into port, over three-quarters of Parties communicate the decision to the flag State, close to two-thirds communicate the decision either frequently or always to the relevant coastal States and RFMO/As, and slightly more than one-third communicate the decision frequently or always to other relevant international organizations (**Table 17**).

*Force majeure (Article 10)*

18. The majority of Parties have provisions in place to allow entry into port in accordance with international law for reasons of force majeure or distress (**Table 18**).

*Use of ports (Article 11)*

19. On average, Parties have four agencies involved in enforcing procedures to authorize or deny use of ports (**Table 19**). The agencies most commonly reported by Parties to play a role in enforcing procedures to authorize or deny use of ports are, in decreasing order: fisheries, port, maritime, navy/coastguard and customs.
20. More than three-quarters of Parties have measures in place to deny use of port after a vessel has entered into port for each of the following scenarios: (i) the vessel does not have a valid and applicable authorization to engage in fishing and fishing activities required by its flag State; (ii) the vessel does not have a valid and applicable authorization to engage in fishing and fishing activities required by the coastal State in respect to areas under the national jurisdiction of that State; (iii) there is clear evidence that the fish on board was taken in contravention of applicable requirements of a coastal State in respect to areas under the national jurisdiction of that State; (iv) the flag State does not confirm within a reasonable period of time that the fish on board the vessel was taken in accordance with applicable requirements of a relevant RFMO; and (v) there are reasonable grounds to believe that the vessel was otherwise engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing (**Table 20**).
21. Approximately one-quarter of Parties have denied use of port to a vessel for each of the following reasons: (i) because the vessel did not have a valid and applicable authorization to engage in fishing and fishing activities required by its flag State; (ii) because the vessel did not have a valid and applicable authorization to engage in fishing and fishing activities required by the coastal State in respect to areas under the national jurisdiction of that State; (iii) because there was clear evidence that the fish on board was taken in contravention of applicable requirements of a coastal State in respect to areas under the national jurisdiction of that State; and (iv) the flag State did not confirm within a reasonable period of time that the fish on board the vessel was taken in accordance with applicable requirements of a relevant RFMO (**Table 21**). Just over a third of Parties have denied use of port to a vessel because there were reasonable grounds to believe that the vessel was otherwise engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing.
22. In the case of denial of use of port, over three-quarters of Parties communicate the decision to the flag State, half of Parties communicate the decision either frequently or always to the relevant coastal States, almost two-thirds communicate the decision either frequently or always to RFMO/As, and over one-third communicate the decision frequently or always to other relevant international organizations (**Table 22**).
23. More than three-quarters of Parties withdraw their denial use of port if there is sufficient proof that the grounds on which use was denied were inadequate or erroneous, or that such grounds no longer apply (**Table 23**). Of these, more than three-quarters promptly notify those to whom the notification was issued.

*Levels and priorities for inspection (Article 12)*

24. Two-thirds of Parties have a minimum level of inspection which they consider to be required to achieve the objectives of the Agreement (**Table 24**). Almost three-quarters of Parties inspect the number of vessels in their ports required to reach an annual level of inspection that is sufficient to achieve the objective of this Agreement, and more than three-quarters of these have attained the minimum level of inspections.

25. Where applicable, in determining which vessels to inspect, approximately three-quarters of Parties have measures in place to prioritise each of the following scenarios: (i) vessels denied entry or use of port in accordance with the Agreement; (ii) requests from other relevant Parties, States or RFMO/As requesting that a particular vessel be inspected, particularly where such requests are supported by evidence of IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing; (iii) other vessels with clear grounds for suspecting that they have engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing (**Table 25**). Approximately one-quarter of these Parties have inspected vessels due to information obtained on each of the above described scenarios (**Table 26**).

*Conduct of Inspections (Article 13)*

26. On average, Parties have five agencies involved in the conduct of inspections of a vessel (**Table 27**). The agencies most commonly reported by Parties to play a role in conducting inspections are, in decreasing order: fisheries, customs, port, maritime and navy/coastguard.
27. In general, there is high level of implementation of Parties' inspections procedures with respect to: (i) requiring inspectors, prior to an inspection, to present to the master of the vessel an appropriate document identifying the inspector as such; (ii) ensuring that their inspectors examine all relevant areas on board, the nets and any other gear, equipment, and any other document or record on board that is relevant to verifying compliance with relevant conservation and management measures; (iii) requiring the master of the vessel to give inspectors all necessary assistance and information, and to present relevant material and document as may be required, or certified copied there of; (iv) making all possible efforts to avoid unduly delaying the vessel to minimize interference and inconvenience, including any unnecessary presence of inspectors on board, and to avoid action that would adversely affect the quality of the fish on board; (v) making all possible efforts to facilitate communication with the master or senior crew members of the vessel, including where possible and where needed that the inspector is accompanied by an interpreter; and (vi) not interfering with the master's ability, in conformity with international law, to communicate with the authorities of the flag State (**Table 28**). In contrast, in general, there is only an average level of implementation of Parties' inspection procedures with respect to: (i) including the functions set forth in Annex B as a minimum standard; (ii) ensuring that inspections are carried out by properly qualified inspectors are authorised for this purpose, taking into account the guidelines set out in Annex E of the Agreement for the training of inspectors; and (iii) ensuring that inspections are conducted in a fair, transparent and non-discriminatory manner and would not constitute harassment of any vessel.

*Results of Inspections (Article 14)*

28. Most Parties include the information set out in Annex C of the Agreement as a minimum standard in the written report of the results of each inspection, and slightly less than half of these have written reports that go beyond the information set out in Annex C of the Agreement (**Table 29**).

*Transmittal of inspection results (Article 15)*

29. Approximately half of Parties transmit inspection results frequently or always to the flag State and RFMO/As, while two-thirds transmit inspection results frequently or always to those States for which there is evidence through inspection that the vessel has engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing within waters under their national jurisdiction (**Table 30**). In contrast, approximately one-third of Parties transmit inspection results to the State of which the vessel's master is a national, FAO and other relevant international organizations.

*Electronic exchange of information (Article 16)*

30. Most Parties have designated an authority that shall act as contact point for the exchange of information under the Agreement (**Table 31**). Just over a quarter of Parties have a fully operational national communication mechanism for direct electronic sharing of information relevant to the Agreement, another quarter of Parties have such a system under development or partially operational, while more than a third of Parties have no such system.
31. Slightly less than two-thirds of Parties use electronic information exchange mechanisms to communicate with a vessel's flag State, other port States or coastal States (**Table 32**). Slightly more than one-third of Parties use bilateral electronic information exchange mechanisms, and slightly more than half use regional electronic information exchange mechanisms. In a quarter of cases, the information transmitted through the information exchange mechanism is fully consistent with Annex D of the Agreement, while in half of cases, it is partially consistent, and in a quarter of cases, not at all.

*Training of inspectors (Article 17)*

32. Slightly over one-third of Parties have fully trained their inspectors, taking into consideration the guidelines for the training of inspectors set forth in Annex E of the Agreement, while almost half of Parties have partially trained them, and a small proportion not at all (**Table 33**). Just under two-thirds of Parties have had national inspectors participate in port State measures training courses conducted by other States or organizations, the majority of which were either conducted by FAO, RFMO/As or other Parties.

*Port State actions following inspection (Article 18)*

33. In the case of a port State action or denial use of port, over three-quarters of Parties communicate the decision to the flag State, approximately two-thirds communicate the decision either frequently or always to the relevant coastal States and RFMO/As, and just over one-third communicate the decision frequently or always to other international organizations (**Table 34**).
34. In cases following an inspection which finds that there are clear grounds to believe that a vessel has engaged in IUU fishing, slightly more than half of Parties have a process in place to deny the vessel the use of port fully consistent with the Agreement, while the rest have processes that are either only partially, or not at all consistent with the Agreement (**Table 35**). One-quarter of Parties have had cases where a vessel has been denied use of port following an inspection, where there were clear grounds for believing that the vessel had engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing.

*Information on recourse in a port State (Article 19)*

35. Approximately half of Parties have a process in place to maintain the relevant information on recourse available to the public, with regard to port State measures taken pursuant to each of Article 9, 11, 13 and 18 of the Agreement (**Table 36**). Just under two-thirds of Parties have a process in place to provide information on recourse to the owner, operator, master or representative of a vessel with regard to port State measures taken pursuant to each of Articles 9, 11, 13 and 18 of the Agreement (**Table 37**), whilst just under half of Parties have provided such information (**Table 38**). Almost two-thirds of Parties have measures in place to report the outcome of recourse to the flag State and the owner, operator, master or representative, as appropriate and almost one-third have reported such information (**Table 39**). In cases where other Parties, States or international organizations have been informed of the prior decision pursuant to Articles 9, 11, 13 or 18 of the Agreement, more than half of Parties have a process in place to inform them of any change in this decision, and more than one-third of Parties have informed them of any change in this decision.

*Role of flag States (Article 20)*

36. Almost all Parties: (i) require vessels entitled to fly their flag to cooperate with the port State in inspections carried out pursuant to the Agreement; and (ii) ensure that measures applied to vessels entitled to fly their flag are at least as effective in preventing, deterring, and eliminating IUU fishing and fishing related activities in support of such fishing as measures applied to vessels referred to in paragraph 1 of Article 3 of the Agreement (**Table 40**). Approximately three-quarters of Parties: (i) in accordance with Article 20 paragraph 2 of the Agreement, as appropriate, request port States to inspect their vessels or take other measures consistent with the Agreement; (ii) encourage vessels entitled to fly their flag to land, transship, package and process fish, and use other port services, in ports of States that are acting in accordance with, or in a manner consistent with the Agreement; (iii) in cases where, following port State inspection, the Party receives an inspection report indicating that there are clear grounds to believe that a vessel entitled to fly its flag has engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing, immediately and fully investigate the matter and, upon sufficient evidence, take enforcement action without delay in accordance with its laws and regulations; (iv) report to other Parties, relevant port States and, as appropriate, other relevant States, regional fisheries management organizations and FAO on actions it has taken in respect of vessels entitled to fly its flag that, as a result of port State measures taken pursuant to the Agreement, have been determined to have engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing.

*Requirements of developing States (Article 21)*

37. Over half of Parties have obtained external assistance on PSMA implementation (**Table 41**). FAO was most commonly cited as the source for such assistance, followed by other States, RFMO/As and other entities.

*Allocation of United Nations Code for Trade and Transport Locations (UN/LOCODE) to designated ports (supplementary question)*

38. Just over half of Parties' designated ports have been allocated a UN/LOCODE (**Table 42**).

## **APPENDIX**

### **Statistical analysis of responses by Parties to the 2021 questionnaire for the review and assessment of the effectiveness of the Agreement on Port State Measures**



## Abbreviations and Acronyms

Agreement	Agreement on Port State Measures to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing
AIS	automatic identification system
AREP	advanced request for entry into port
EEZ	exclusive economic zone
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
IGO	international governmental organization
IUU fishing	illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing
MCS	monitoring, control and surveillance
NGO	non-governmental organization
Parties	Parties to the Agreement
PSMs	port State measures
RFMO	regional fisheries management organization
SOP	standard operating procedure
VMS	vessel monitoring system

TABLE 1

*Parties submitting a response to the questionnaire for the review and assessment of the effectiveness of the Agreement*

FAO Region	PSMA Parties	2021
Africa	Cabo Verde	
	Côte d'Ivoire	√
	Gabon	√
	Gambia	√
	Ghana	√
	Guinea	√
	Kenya	√
	Liberia	√
	Madagascar	√
	Mauritania	
	Mauritius	√
	Mozambique	√
	Namibia	√
	Sao Tome and Principe	√
	Senegal	√
	Seychelles	
	Sierra Leone	
	Somalia	
	South Africa	√
	Togo	√
Asia	Bangladesh	√
	Cambodia	√
	Indonesia	√
	Japan	√
	Maldives	√
	Myanmar	√
	Philippines	√
	Republic of Korea	√
	Sri Lanka	
	Thailand	√
	Viet Nam	√
Europe	Albania	√
	Denmark*	√
	European Union	√
	France*	√
	Iceland	√
	Montenegro	√
	Norway	√
	Turkey	√
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	√

FAO Region	PSMA Parties	2021
Latin America and the Caribbean	Bahamas	√
	Barbados	
	Chile	√
	Costa Rica	√
	Cuba	
	Dominica	√
	Ecuador	√
	Grenada	
	Guyana	√
	Nicaragua	√
	Panama	√
	Peru	√
	Saint Kitts and Nevis	√
	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	√
	Trinidad and Tobago	√
	Uruguay	√
Near East	Djibouti	√
	Libya	√
	Oman	
	Sudan	√
North America	Canada	√
	United States of America	√
Southwest Pacific	Australia	√
	Fiji	√
	New Zealand	√
	Palau	
	Tonga	√
	Vanuatu	
Sum of counts		<b>55</b>

\*Compiled with regard to the implementation of the Agreement in respect to their overseas territories

## TABLE 2

*Comparative response rates by FAO Regions*

FAO Region	Number of responding Parties	Response rate from total number of Parties in FAO region (%)
<b>Africa</b>	15	75.00
<b>Asia</b>	9	90.00
<b>Europe</b>	9	100.00
<b>Latin America and the Caribbean</b>	13	81.25
<b>Near East</b>	3	75.00
<b>Northern America</b>	2	100.00
<b>Southwest Pacific</b>	4	66.67
<b>Total count and percentages</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>82.09</b>

TABLE 3

*Legislation – applicability to fulfil obligations under the Agreement (Article 3)*

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties having reviewed their legislation to determine whether it allows their country to fulfil its obligations under the Agreement (have not done so but intend to review) (%)	Parties which did not require changes to their legislation (%)*	Parties who required changes, average extent to which these were implemented**
<b>Africa (15)</b>	86.67 (100.00)	38.46	3.88
<b>Asia (9)</b>	100.00	33.33	4.00
<b>Europe (9)</b>	100.00	33.33	4.17
<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	84.62 (100.00)	18.18	3.63
<b>Near East (3)</b>	66.67 (100.00)	00.00	2.50
<b>Northern America (2)</b>	100.00	00.00	5.00
<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	100.00	50.00	4.50
<b>Total (55) and averages</b>	<b>90.91 (100.00)</b>	<b>26.09</b>	<b>3.9</b>

\*From those who have reviewed their legislation

\*\*From those where changes were required. Average of responses, range from "1" being "Not at all" to "5" being "Fully".

TABLE 4

*Processes related to artisanal fisheries, containers and chartering (Article 3) (%)*

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Artisanal fisheries		Containers		Chartering	
	Where applicable, Parties engaged in cooperation with neighbouring countries to prevent artisanal fisheries for subsistence engaging in IUU fishing*	Parties having measures in place to ensure that such activities do not contribute to IUU fishing**	Parties with procedure in place to identify if fish on board container vessels, that had previously been landed, were not sourced from vessels conducting IUU fishing	Parties reporting cases of container vessel found to be carrying fish, previously landed, which was sourced from IUU fishing activities**	Where applicable, Parties who apply Agreement to chartered vessels operating under their waters and jurisdiction***	Parties having measures in place to ensure that such vessels are subject to measures as effective as those applied to vessels flying their flag**
<b>Africa (15)</b>	78.57	100.00	73.33	9.09	71.43	88.89
<b>Asia (9)</b>	100.00	100.00	77.78	57.14	33.33	100.00
<b>Europe (9)</b>	57.14	100.00	55.56	20.00	40.00	100.00
<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	75.00	100.00	38.46	20.00	54.55	66.67
<b>Near East (3)</b>	100.00	100.00	66.67	0.00	66.67	100.00
<b>Northern America (2)</b>	100.00	100.00	50.00	100.00	100.00	50.00
<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	66.67	100.00	100.00	25.00	100.00	100.00
<b>Total (55) and averages</b>	<b>78.72</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>63.64</b>	<b>25.71</b>	<b>60.47</b>	<b>84.00</b>

\*8 Parties reported that this question as not applicable

\*\*From those who responded positively to the previous question

\*\*\* 12 Parties reported that this question as not applicable

TABLE 5

*Inter-agency coordination for the implementation of the Agreement  
(Article 5) (%)*

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Extent of information exchange and inter-agency coordination in the implementation of this Agreement (Average number of agencies playing a role)	Ranking - agencies playing a role in the implementation of the Agreement				
		Fisheries	Port authority	Customs	Navy / Coast Guard	Maritime
Africa (15)	3.93 (7.6)	93.33	100.00	93.33	86.67	93.33
Asia (8)	4.11 (7.0)	100.00	100.00	100.00	87.50	37.50
Europe (9)	4.44 (5.1)	88.89	88.89	66.67	44.44	33.33
Latin America and the Caribbean (13)	3.62 (7.2)	100.00	84.62	84.62	100.00	84.62
Near East (3)	2.00 (6.0)	100.00	100.00	33.33	100.00	66.67
Northern America (2)	4.50 (2.0)	100.00	50.00	0.00	50.00	0.00
Southwest Pacific (4)	4.00 (6.8)	100.00	75.00	100.00	50.00	75.00
<b>Total (54) and averages</b>	<b>3.92 (6.6)</b>	<b>96.30</b>	<b>90.74</b>	<b>81.48</b>	<b>79.63</b>	<b>66.67</b>

**Note:** The tabulated agencies embody a cumulative 63.79 percent of all agencies reported to play a role in the Agreement. Other reported agencies were [Police: 62.96%], [Immigration: 61.11%], [Veterinary / Quarantine: 51.85%], [Health: 50.00%], and [Others: 14.81%].

TABLE 6

*Integration of PSMs with other measures to combat IUU fishing (Article 5)*

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Extent to which Parties have taken measures to integrate PSMs with other measures to combat IUU fishing, taking into account as appropriate the FAO International Plan of Action to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate IUU Fishing*
Africa (15)	3.60
Asia (9)	4.44
Europe (9)	4.33
Latin America and the Caribbean (13)	3.46
Near East (3)	1.67
Northern America (2)	5.00
Southwest Pacific (4)	4.25
<b>Total (55) and averages</b>	<b>3.82</b>

\*Average of responses, range from "1" being "Not at all" to "5" being "Fully".

TABLE 7

*Cooperation and exchange of information to promote the effective implementation of the Agreement, in relation to its objective (Article 6) (%)*

Entity	Region (number of respondents in brackets)	In order to promote the effective implementation of the Agreement, in relation to its objective				
		Parties cooperating and/or exchanging information	Extent to which Parties cooperating and/or exchanging information			
			No	Occasionally	Frequently	Always
Other relevant States	Africa (15)	-	0.00	26.67	40.00	33.33
	Asia (9)	-	11.11	22.22	22.22	33.33
	Europe (9)	-	0.00	33.33	11.11	55.56
	Latin America and the Caribbean (13)	-	15.38	38.46	15.38	23.08
	Near East (3)	-	33.33	66.67	0.00	0.00
	Northern America (2)	-	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
	Southwest Pacific (4)	-	0.00	25.00	25.00	50.00
	Total (55) and averages	-	<b>7.27</b>	<b>30.91</b>	<b>25.45</b>	<b>32.73</b>
Relevant RFMO / A(s)	Africa (15)	-	0.00	33.33	26.67	40.00
	Asia (9)	-	0.00	44.44	11.11	44.44
	Europe (9)	-	0.00	0.00	22.22	77.78
	Latin America and the Caribbean (13)	-	7.69	7.69	23.08	61.54
	Near East (3)	-	33.33	33.33	0.00	33.33
	Northern America (2)	-	0.00	50.00	0.00	50.00
	Southwest Pacific (4)	-	0.00	0.00	25.00	75.00
	Total (55) and averages	-	<b>00.00</b>	<b>21.82</b>	<b>20.00</b>	<b>54.55</b>
FAO	Africa (14)	71.43	-	-	-	-
	Asia (9)	100.00	-	-	-	-
	Europe (9)	77.78	-	-	-	-
	Latin America and the Caribbean (13)	100.00	-	-	-	-
	Near East (3)	100.00	-	-	-	-
	Northern America (2)	50.00	-	-	-	-
	Southwest Pacific (4)	75.00	-	-	-	-
	Total (54) and averages	<b>85.19</b>	-	-	-	-
Other IGOs	Africa (13)	-	<b>30.77</b>	23.08	30.77	15.38
	Asia (9)	-	0.00	66.67	22.22	11.11
	Europe (7)	-	42.86	42.86	0.00	14.29
	Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	-	25.00	41.67	25.00	8.33
	Near East (3)	-	33.33	66.67	0.00	0.00
	Northern America (2)	-	50.00	50.00	0.00	0.00
	Southwest Pacific (4)	-	25.00	0.00	25.00	50.00
	Total (50) and averages	-	<b>26.00</b>	<b>40.00</b>	<b>20.00</b>	<b>14.00</b>

Entity	Region (number of respondents in brackets)	In order to promote the effective implementation of the Agreement, in relation to its objective				
		Parties cooperating and/or exchanging information	Extent to which Parties cooperating and/or exchanging information			
			No	Occasionally	Frequently	Always
Other	Africa (12)	41.67	-	-	-	-
	Asia (8)	37.50	-	-	-	-
	Europe (7)	14.29	-	-	-	-
	Latin America and the Caribbean (13)	30.77	-	-	-	-
	Near East (3)	0.00	-	-	-	-
	Northern America (2)	0.00	-	-	-	-
	Southwest Pacific (4)	75.00	-	-	-	-
	Total (49) and averages	32.65	-	-	-	-

TABLE 8

*Designation of ports (Article 7)*

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties that have designated ports under the Agreement (%)	Parties reporting that designated ports restrict landings to specific types of products? (i.e. frozen, refrigerated, fresh) (%)*	Parties reporting to have provided to the FAO their list of designated ports (%)	Extent to which sufficient capacity to conduct inspections pursuant to the Agreement is present in designated ports**
Africa (15)	80.00	16.67	73.33	3.47
Asia (9)	87.50	28.57	75.00	3.67
Europe (9)	88.89	62.50	77.78	3.78
Latin America and the Caribbean (13)	69.23	11.11	61.54	3.00
Near East (3)	66.67	50.00	66.67	2.33
Northern America (2)	100.00	50.00	100.00	5.00
Southwest Pacific (4)	75.00	0.00	75.00	4.75
Total (55) and averages	79.63	27.91	72.22	3.53

\*From those that have designated ports

\*\*Average of responses, range from "1" being "Not at all" to "5" being "Fully".

TABLE 9

*Advance request for port entry (Article 8)*

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties that require an advance request for port entry (AREP) (%)	From those which require an AREP:					Parties reporting situations where a different minimum time is required for AREP (%)
		AREP contains, as a minimum standard, the information contained within Annex A of the Agreement (%)	Information contained within AREP goes beyond Annex A of the Agreement (%)*	General minimum required time for the AREP			
				Min	Max	Median	
Africa (15)	93.33	78.57	35.72	1	72	48	64.29
Asia (9)	100.00	100.00	50.00	7	168	48	50.00
Europe (9)	88.89	100.00	50.00	0	72	24	62.50
Latin America and the Caribbean (13)	100.00	76.92	61.54	0	96	48	38.46
Near East (3)	66.67	100.00	100.00	2	24	13	50.00
Northern America (2)	100.00	100.00	100.00	72	96	84	100.00
Southwest Pacific (4)	100.00	100.00	75.00	72	168	72	50.00
Total (55) and averages	94.44	88.24	54.90	0	168	48	54.90

\*From those that responded that AREP contains, as a minimum standard, the information contained within Annex A of the Agreement

TABLE 10

*Agencies involved in port entry, authorisation or denial (Article 9)*

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Average number of agencies playing a role	Ranking - agencies playing a role in the authorisation or the denial of entry into port				
		Fisheries	Port authority	Customs	Navy / Coast Guard	Maritime
<b>Africa (15)</b>	4.13	92.86	85.71	61.54	53.85	54.55
<b>Asia (9)</b>	2.89	75.00	75.00	42.86	14.29	14.29
<b>Europe (9)</b>	2.78	87.50	77.78	42.86	28.57	14.29
<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	5.23	84.62	84.62	69.23	61.54	61.54
<b>Near East (3)</b>	7.00	100.00	100.00	66.67	100.00	66.67
<b>Northern America (2)</b>	3.50	100.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	0.00
<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	7.75	100.00	75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00
<b>Total (55) and averages</b>	<b>4.36</b>	<b>88.46</b>	<b>81.13</b>	<b>59.18</b>	<b>51.02</b>	<b>44.68</b>

Note: The tabulated agencies embody a cumulative 69.71 percent of all agencies reported to play a role in the authorisation or the denial of entry into port. Other reported agencies were [Immigration: 38.30%], [Health: 36.17%], [Police: 31.91%], [Veterinary/Quarantine: 29.17%], and [others: 20.00%].



TABLE 11

*Risk assessment (Article 9) (%)*

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties determining whether a vessel has engaged in IUU fishing after receiving an AREP prior to authorising or denying entry into port	Parties with a standardised method for determining whether vessels requesting port entry have engaged in IUU fishing*	Parties reporting that standardised method includes a risk assessment*
Africa (15)	80.00	75.00	77.78
Asia (9)	100.00	77.78	71.43
Europe (9)	88.89	75.00	66.67
Latin America and the Caribbean (13)	69.23	66.67	50.00
Near East (3)	100.00	33.33	100.00
Northern America (2)	100.00	100.00	100.00
Southwest Pacific (4)	100.00	100.00	100.00
<b>Total (55) and averages</b>	<b>84.45</b>	<b>74.47</b>	<b>74.29</b>

\*From those reporting positively to the previous question

TABLE 12

*Agencies participating in process determining whether to authorise port entry (Article 9)*

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Average number of agencies participating in process	Ranking - agencies participating in process determining whether to authorise port entry				
		Fisheries	Port authority	Customs	Navy / Coast Guard	Maritime
Africa (15)	3.14	86.67	66.67	33.33	33.33	40.00
Asia (9)	4.00	77.78	66.67	44.44	44.44	44.44
Europe (9)	3.00	77.78	55.56	44.44	22.22	22.22
Latin America and the Caribbean (13)	3.92	84.62	76.92	46.15	46.15	46.15
Near East (3)	7.00	100.00	100.00	66.67	100.00	66.67
Northern America (2)	2.00	100.00	50.00	0.00	50.00	0.00
Southwest Pacific (4)	5.50	100.00	50.00	75.00	50.00	50.00
<b>Total (55) and averages</b>	<b>3.80</b>	<b>85.45</b>	<b>67.27</b>	<b>43.64</b>	<b>41.82</b>	<b>40.00</b>

Note: The tabulated agencies embody a cumulative 72.51 percent of all agencies reported to participate in process determining whether to deny port entry. Other reported agencies were [Health: 27.27%], [Immigration: 27.27%], [Police: 20.00%], [Veterinary / Quarantine: 18.18%], and [Others: 12.73%].

TABLE 13

*Agencies participating in process of determining whether to deny port entry (Article 9)*

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Average number of agencies participating in process	Ranking - agencies participating in process of determining whether to deny port entry				
		Fisheries	Port authority	Customs	Navy / Coast Guard	Maritime
Africa (15)	3.20	80.00	66.67	46.67	33.33	46.67
Asia (9)	3.44	88.89	66.67	44.44	33.33	33.33
Europe (9)	2.67	77.78	55.56	33.33	22.22	22.22
Latin America and the Caribbean (13)	4.31	92.31	76.92	46.15	46.15	46.15
Near East (3)	7.33	100.00	100.00	66.67	100.00	66.67
Northern America (2)	3.50	100.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	0.00
Southwest Pacific (4)	5.50	100.00	50.00	75.00	50.00	50.00
Total (55) and averages	3.82	87.27	67.27	47.27	40.00	40.00

**Note:** The tabulated agencies embody a cumulative 73.81 percent of all agencies reported to participate in process determining whether to deny port entry. Other reported agencies were [Health: 27.27%], [Immigration: 27.27%], [Police: 16.36%], [Veterinary / Quarantine: 14.55%], and [Others: 14.55%]

TABLE 14

*Request for cooperation to determine whether to authorise entry into port (Article 9) (%)*

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties that request cooperation of a vessel's flag State to determine whether to authorise entry into port	Parties that request cooperation of a vessel's flag State to determine whether to authorise entry into port only when risk assessment so determines*
Africa (14)	64.29	88.89
Asia (8)	37.50	66.67
Europe (8)	87.50	42.86
Latin America and the Caribbean (13)	84.62	36.36
Near East (3)	100.00	33.33
Northern America (2)	100.00	100.00
Southwest Pacific (4)	75.00	66.67
Total (52) and averages	73.08	57.89

\*From those reporting positively to the previous question

TABLE 15

*Data / information sources used to inform the decision to authorise or deny entry into port (Article 9)*

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Ranking - Data / information sources used					
	Fisheries licenses and authorizations	National records	RFMOAs	VMS	Data / information from the flag State	Compliance history
<b>Africa (14)</b>	80.00	80.00	73.33	73.33	66.67	73.33
<b>Asia (8)</b>	77.78	77.78	77.78	55.56	66.67	66.67
<b>Europe (8)</b>	66.67	44.44	44.44	66.67	44.44	44.44
<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	84.62	84.62	69.23	69.23	84.62	61.23
<b>Near East (3)</b>	100.00	100.00	66.67	66.67	100.00	66.67
<b>Northern America (2)</b>	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	50.00	100.00
<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	100.00	100.00	100.00	75.00	75.00	100.00
<b>Total (52) and averages</b>	<b>81.82</b>	<b>78.18</b>	<b>70.91</b>	<b>69.09</b>	<b>69.09</b>	<b>67.27</b>

**Note:** The tabulated agencies embody a cumulative 60.15 percent of all reported data / information sources used to inform the decision to authorise or deny entry into port. Other reported data / information sources were [AIS: 65.45%], [Electronic logbook: 52.73%], [Data / information from other relevant States (coastal and port State): 52.73%], [Other regional or international vessel records: 49.09%], and [Global Record of Fishing Vessels, Refrigerated Transport Vessels and Supply Vessels: 45.45%].

TABLE 16

*Measures to deny entry into port when sufficient proof is present that a vessel has engaged in IUU fishing (Article 9) (%)*

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties with measures in place to deny entry into port when sufficient proof is present that a vessel has engaged in IUU fishing	Parties that have denied a vessel entry into port due to having sufficient proof that the vessel had conducted IUU fishing*
<b>Africa (15)</b>	53.33	75.00
<b>Asia (9)</b>	88.89	50.00
<b>Europe (9)</b>	77.78	57.14
<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	84.64	27.27
<b>Near East (3)</b>	100.00	66.67
<b>Northern America (2)</b>	100.00	0.00
<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	100.00	15.00
<b>Total (55) and averages</b>	<b>78.18</b>	<b>46.51</b>

\*From those reporting to have such measure in place

TABLE 17

*Communication to relevant entities in the case of denial of entry into port  
(Article 9) (%)*

Entity	Region (number of respondents in brackets)	In the case of a denial of port entry				
		Decision communicated	Extent to which the decision is communicated:			
			No	Occasionally	Frequently	Always
Flag State	Africa (11)	72.73	-	-	-	-
	Asia (8)	87.50	-	-	-	-
	Europe (8)	87.50	-	-	-	-
	Latin America and the Caribbean (13)	69.23	-	-	-	-
	Near East (3)	100.00	-	-	-	-
	Northern America (1)	100.00	-	-	-	-
	Southwest Pacific (4)	100.00	-	-	-	-
	<b>Total (48) and averages</b>	<b>81.25</b>	-	-	-	-
Relevant coastal States	Africa (14)	-	21.43	7.14	7.14	57.14
	Asia (8)	-	12.50	25.00	12.50	50.00
	Europe (8)	-	12.50	12.50	37.50	37.50
	Latin America and the Caribbean (13)	-	38.46	7.69	7.69	46.15
	Near East (3)	-	0.00	33.33	0.00	66.67
	Northern America (1)	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
	Southwest Pacific (4)	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
	<b>Total (51) and averages</b>	-	<b>19.61</b>	<b>11.76</b>	<b>11.76</b>	<b>54.90</b>
Relevant RFMO/A(s)	Africa (13)	-	23.08	30.77	7.69	38.46
	Asia (8)	-	0.00	37.50	12.50	50.00
	Europe (8)	-	12.50	12.50	12.50	62.50
	Latin America and the Caribbean (13)	-	30.77	23.08	0.00	46.15
	Near East (3)	-	33.33	0.00	66.67	0.00
	Northern America (1)	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
	Southwest Pacific (4)	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
	<b>Total (50) and averages</b>	-	<b>18.00</b>	<b>22.00</b>	<b>10.00</b>	<b>50.00</b>
Other relevant international organizations	Africa (13)	-	38.46	15.38	23.08	23.08
	Asia (8)	-	37.50	12.50	0.00	50.00
	Europe (8)	-	62.50	37.50	0.00	0.00
	Latin America and the Caribbean (13)	-	46.15	15.38	0.00	30.44
	Near East (3)	-	33.33	33.33	33.33	0.00
	Northern America (1)	-	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
	Southwest Pacific (4)	-	0.00	25.00	25.00	50.00
	<b>Total (50) and averages</b>	-	<b>40.00</b>	<b>20.00</b>	<b>12.00</b>	<b>26.00</b>

TABLE 18

*Force Majeure (Article 10) (%)*

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties with provisions in place to allow entry into port in accordance with international law for reasons of force majeure or distress
<b>Africa (15)</b>	80.00
<b>Asia (8)</b>	87.50
<b>Europe (9)</b>	100.00
<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	100.00
<b>Near East (3)</b>	100.00
<b>Northern America (2)</b>	100.00
<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	100.00
<b>Total (54) and averages</b>	<b>92.59</b>

TABLE 19

*Agencies involved in enforcing procedures to authorise or deny of use of ports (Article 11) (%)*

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Average number of agencies participating in process	Ranking - agencies involved in enforcing procedures to authorise or deny of use of ports				
		Fisheries	Port authority	Maritime	Navy & Coast Guard	Customs
<b>Africa (15)</b>	4.13	86.67	80.00	53.33	46.67	40.00
<b>Asia (8)</b>	3.75	87.50	75.00	50.00	37.50	50.00
<b>Europe (9)</b>	3.00	66.67	66.67	33.33	22.22	33.33
<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	4.92	69.23	92.31	69.23	61.54	61.54
<b>Near East (3)</b>	7.00	100.00	100.00	66.67	100.00	66.67
<b>Northern America (2)</b>	2.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	0.00
<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	6.75	100.00	75.00	75.00	50.00	50.00
<b>Total (54) and averages</b>	<b>4.35</b>	<b>81.48</b>	<b>77.78</b>	<b>53.70</b>	<b>48.15</b>	<b>46.30</b>

**Note:** The tabulated agencies embody a cumulative 71.06 percent of all agencies reported to be involved in enforcing procedures to authorise or deny of use of ports. Other reported agencies were [Health: 29.63%], [Immigration: 27.78%], [Police: 24.07%], [Veterinary / Quarantine: 24.07%], and [Others: 20.37%].

TABLE 20

*Measures in place to deny use of port (Article 11) (%)*

Situation	Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Once a vessel has entered its ports, Parties with measures in place to deny use of port if:
The vessel does not have a valid and applicable authorisation to engage in fishing and fishing related activities required by its flag State	Africa (15)	80.00
	Asia (8)	100.00
	Europe (8)	87.50
	Latin America and the Caribbean (13)	84.62
	Near East (3)	100.00
	Northern America (2)	100.00
	Southwest Pacific (4)	100.00
	Total (53) and averages	<b>88.68</b>
The vessel does not have a valid and applicable authorisation to engage in fishing and fishing related activities required by the coastal State in respect to areas under the national jurisdiction of that State	Africa (15)	66.67
	Asia (8)	100.00
	Europe (8)	87.50
	Latin America and the Caribbean (13)	76.92
	Near East (3)	100.00
	Northern America (2)	100.00
	Southwest Pacific (4)	100.00
	Total (53) and averages	<b>83.02</b>
There is clear evidence that the fish on board was taken in contravention of applicable requirements of a coastal State in respect to areas under the national jurisdiction of that State	Africa (15)	80.00
	Asia (8)	100.00
	Europe (8)	75.00
	Latin America and the Caribbean (13)	92.31
	Near East (3)	100.00
	Northern America (2)	100.00
	Southwest Pacific (4)	100.00
	Total (53) and averages	<b>88.68</b>
The flag State does not confirm within a reasonable period of time that the fish on board the vessel was taken in accordance with applicable requirements of a relevant RFMO	Africa (15)	73.33
	Asia (8)	100.00
	Europe (8)	75.00
	Latin America and the Caribbean (13)	69.23
	Near East (3)	100.00
	Northern America (2)	100.00
	Southwest Pacific (4)	100.00
	Total (53) and averages	<b>81.13</b>
There is reasonable grounds to believe that the vessel was otherwise engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing	Africa (15)	86.67
	Asia (8)	100.00
	Europe (8)	75.00
	Latin America and the Caribbean (13)	76.92
	Near East (3)	66.67
	Northern America (2)	100.00
	Southwest Pacific (4)	100.00
	Total (53) and averages	<b>84.91</b>

TABLE 21

*Cases of denial of use of port (Article 11) (%)*

Situation	Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties who have denied use of port due to:
The vessel does not have a valid and applicable authorisation to engage in fishing and fishing related activities required by its flag State	<b>Africa (14)</b>	28.57
	<b>Asia (8)</b>	25.00
	<b>Europe (8)</b>	12.50
	<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	15.38
	<b>Near East (3)</b>	100.00
	<b>Northern America (2)</b>	0.00
	<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	25.00
	<b>Total (52) and averages</b>	25.00
The vessel does not have a valid and applicable authorisation to engage in fishing and fishing related activities required by the coastal State in respect to areas under the national jurisdiction of that State	<b>Africa (14)</b>	28.57
	<b>Asia (8)</b>	12.50
	<b>Europe (8)</b>	0.00
	<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	7.69
	<b>Near East (3)</b>	100.00
	<b>Northern America (2)</b>	0.00
	<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	25.00
	<b>Total (52) and averages</b>	19.23
There is clear evidence that the fish on board was taken in contravention of applicable requirements of a coastal State in respect to areas under the national jurisdiction of that State	<b>Africa (14)</b>	28.57
	<b>Asia (8)</b>	25.00
	<b>Europe (8)</b>	0.00
	<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	0.00
	<b>Near East (3)</b>	100.00
	<b>Northern America (2)</b>	0.00
	<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	25.00
	<b>Total (52) and averages</b>	19.23
The flag State does not confirm within a reasonable period of time that the fish on board the vessel was taken in accordance with applicable requirements of a relevant RFMO	<b>Africa (14)</b>	14.29
	<b>Asia (8)</b>	12.50
	<b>Europe (8)</b>	25.00
	<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	0.00
	<b>Near East (3)</b>	100.00
	<b>Northern America (2)</b>	0.00
	<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	25.00
	<b>Total (52) and averages</b>	17.31
There is reasonable grounds to believe that the vessel was otherwise engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing	<b>Africa (14)</b>	42.86
	<b>Asia (8)</b>	25.00
	<b>Europe (8)</b>	12.50
	<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	38.46
	<b>Near East (3)</b>	66.67
	<b>Northern America (2)</b>	0.00
	<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	50.00
	<b>Total (52) and averages</b>	34.62

TABLE 22

*Communication to relevant entities in the case of denial of use of port  
(Article 11) (%)*

Entity	Region (number of respondents in brackets)	In the case of a denial of use of port				
		Decision communicated	Extent to which the decision is communicated:			
			No	Occasionally	Frequently	Always
Flag State	Africa (14)	78.57	-	-	-	-
	Asia (8)	87.50	-	-	-	-
	Europe (8)	100.00	-	-	-	-
	Latin America and the Caribbean (13)	69.23	-	-	-	-
	Near East (3)	100.00	-	-	-	-
	Northern America (1)	100.00	-	-	-	-
	Southwest Pacific (4)	75.00	-	-	-	-
	Total (51) and averages	82.35	-	-	-	-
Relevant coastal States when appropriate	Africa (15)	-	26.67	13.33	20.00	40.00
	Asia (8)	-	12.50	12.50	25.00	50.00
	Europe (8)	-	25.00	37.50	12.50	25.00
	Latin America and the Caribbean (13)	-	38.46	30.77	0.00	30.77
	Near East (3)	-	66.67	33.33	0.00	0.00
	Northern America (1)	-	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
	Southwest Pacific (4)	-	25.00	0.00	0.00	75.00
	Total (52) and averages	-	28.85	21.15	13.46	36.54
Relevant RFMO/A(s) when appropriate	Africa (14)	-	21.43	7.14	14.29	57.14
	Asia (8)	-	12.50	25.00	12.50	50.00
	Europe (8)	-	12.50	12.50	12.50	62.50
	Latin America and the Caribbean (13)	-	30.77	15.38	7.69	46.15
	Near East (3)	-	33.33	66.67	0.00	0.00
	Northern America (1)	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
	Southwest Pacific (4)	-	25.00	0.00	0.00	75.00
	Total (52) and averages	-	21.57	15.69	9.80	52.94
Other relevant international organizations	Africa (14)	-	35.71	21.43	14.29	28.57
	Asia (8)	-	12.50	25.00	12.50	50.00
	Europe (8)	-	62.50	37.50	0.00	0.00
	Latin America and the Caribbean (13)	-	53.85	15.38	0.00	30.77
	Near East (3)	-	33.33	0.00	66.67	0.00
	Northern America (1)	-	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
	Southwest Pacific (4)	-	25.00	0.00	0.00	75.00
	Total (51) and averages	-	39.22	19.61	11.76	29.41



TABLE 23

*Withdrawal of denial of use of port (Article 11) (%)*

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties that withdraw its denial of the use of its port, if there is sufficient proof that the grounds on which use was denied were inadequate or erroneous or that such grounds no longer apply	Parties that promptly notify those to whom the notification was issued*
<b>Africa (15)</b>	73.33	72.73
<b>Asia (8)</b>	87.50	100.00
<b>Europe (9)</b>	100.00	87.50
<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	84.62	72.73
<b>Near East (3)</b>	100.00	66.67
<b>Northern America (2)</b>	100.00	100.00
<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	50.00	100.00
<b>Total (54) and averages</b>	<b>82.69</b>	<b>81.40</b>

\*From those reporting that they withdraw denial of use of its port in cases as specified in the previous question

TABLE 24

*Minimum level of inspection required to achieve objectives of the Agreement (Article 12) (%)*

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties with a minimum level of inspection which they consider to be required to achieve the objectives of this Agreement	Parties that inspect the number of vessels in its ports required to reach an annual level of inspection that is sufficient to achieve the objective of this Agreement	Has this minimum level of inspection been attained*
<b>Africa (14)</b>	71.43	78.57	81.82
<b>Asia (8)</b>	62.50	62.50	100.00
<b>Europe (9)</b>	88.89	88.89	62.50
<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	53.85	53.85	100.00
<b>Near East (3)</b>	66.67	66.67	100.00
<b>Northern America (2)</b>	50.00	100.00	100.00
<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	100.00	100.00	100.00
<b>Total (53) and averages</b>	<b>69.81</b>	<b>73.58</b>	<b>84.62</b>

\*From those reporting positively to the previous question

TABLE 25

*Measures in place to prioritise inspections in port (Article 12) (%)*

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	In determining which vessels to inspect, Parties with measures in place to prioritise*:		
	Vessels denied entry or use of port in accordance with this Agreement	Request from other relevant Parties, States or RFMO/A requesting that a particular vessel be inspected, particularly where such requests are supported by evidence of IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing	Other vessels with clear grounds for suspecting that they have engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing
<b>Africa (14)</b>	58.33	58.33	66.67
<b>Asia (8)</b>	87.50	87.50	87.50
<b>Europe (8)</b>	100.00	85.71	87.50
<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	60.00	60.00	60.00
<b>Near East (3)</b>	100.00	66.67	66.67
<b>Northern America (2)</b>	100.00	100.00	100.00
<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	100.00	100.00	100.00
<b>Total (52) and averages</b>	<b>78.72</b>	<b>73.91</b>	<b>76.60</b>

\*From those who considered these questions applicable

TABLE 26

*Inspection in port undertaken due to specific information obtained (Article 12) (%)*

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties with cases where a vessel has been inspected due to information obtained on*:		
	Vessels denied entry or use of port in accordance with this Agreement	Request from other relevant Parties, States or RFMO/A requesting that a particular vessel be inspected, particularly where such requests are supported by evidence of IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing	Other vessels with clear grounds for suspecting that they have engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing
<b>Africa (13)</b>	2308	46.15	23.08
<b>Asia (8)</b>	25.00	12.50	25.00
<b>Europe (8)</b>	25.00	12.50	37.50
<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	7.69	15.38	7.69
<b>Near East (3)</b>	66.67	66.67	3.33
<b>Northern America (2)</b>	0.00	50.00	50.00
<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	50.00	75.00	75.00
<b>Total (51) and averages</b>	<b>23.53</b>	<b>31.37</b>	<b>27.45</b>

\*From those who considered these questions applicable

TABLE 27

*Agencies involved in conducting inspections in port (Article 13) (%)*

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Average number of agencies participating in process	Ranking - agencies will conduct the inspection of the vessel?				
		Fisheries	Customs	Port authority	Maritime	Navy / Coast Guard
<b>Africa (14)</b>	4.79	100.00	57.14	64.29	50.00	35.71
<b>Asia (8)</b>	5.75	100.00	75.00	75.00	62.50	50.00
<b>Europe (8)</b>	3.63	87.50	37.50	50.00	37.50	37.50
<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	4.69	100.00	53.85	38.46	46.15	53.85
<b>Near East (3)</b>	7.33	100.00	66.67	100.00	100.00	100.00
<b>Northern America (2)</b>	3.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	50.00
<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	5.75	100.00	50.00	50.00	75.00	50.00
<b>Total (52) and averages</b>	<b>4.88</b>	<b>98.08</b>	<b>57.69</b>	<b>55.77</b>	<b>51.92</b>	<b>48.08</b>

**Note:** The tabulated agencies embody a cumulative 63.78 percent of all agencies reported to be involved in enforcing procedures to authorise or deny of use of ports. Other reported agencies were [Immigration: 44.23%], [Health: 42.31%], [Veterinary/Quarantine: 40.38%], [Police: 28.85%], and [Others: 21.15%].

TABLE 28

*Inspection procedures (Article 13) (%)*

Situation	Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties who's inspection procedures:
include the functions set forth in Annex B as a minimum standard	<b>Africa (14)</b>	3.64
	<b>Asia (8)</b>	4.50
	<b>Europe (8)</b>	4.63
	<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	3.54
	<b>Near East (3)</b>	2.33
	<b>Northern America (2)</b>	5.00
	<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	4.50
	<b>Total (52) and averages</b>	<b>3.94</b>
ensure that inspections are carried out by properly qualified inspectors are authorised for this purpose, taking into account the guidelines set out in Annex E of the Agreement for the training of inspectors	<b>Africa (13)</b>	4.00
	<b>Asia (8)</b>	4.38
	<b>Europe (8)</b>	4.63
	<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	3.15
	<b>Near East (3)</b>	3.00
	<b>Northern America (2)</b>	5.00
	<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	4.25
	<b>Total (51) and averages</b>	<b>3.94</b>
require inspectors, prior to an inspection, to present to the master of the vessel an appropriate document identifying the inspector as such	<b>Africa (14)</b>	4.21
	<b>Asia (8)</b>	4.63
	<b>Europe (8)</b>	4.63
	<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	4.15
	<b>Near East (3)</b>	1.33
	<b>Northern America (2)</b>	5.00
	<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	4.75
	<b>Total (52) and averages</b>	<b>4.23</b>
ensure that its inspectors examine all relevant areas on board, the nets and any other gear, equipment, and any other document or record on board that is relevant to verifying compliance with relevant conservation and management measures	<b>Africa (14)</b>	4.36
	<b>Asia (8)</b>	4.75
	<b>Europe (8)</b>	4.38
	<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	3.69
	<b>Near East (3)</b>	1.67
	<b>Northern America (2)</b>	5.00
	<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	4.50
	<b>Total (52) and averages</b>	<b>4.13</b>
require the master of the vessel to give inspectors all necessary assistance and information, and to present relevant material and document as may be required, or certified copied there of	<b>Africa (14)</b>	4.21
	<b>Asia (8)</b>	4.63
	<b>Europe (8)</b>	4.13
	<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	4.38
	<b>Near East (3)</b>	1.33
	<b>Northern America (2)</b>	5.00
	<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	4.75
	<b>Total (52) and averages</b>	<b>4.21</b>
in case of appropriate arrangements, invite the flag State of the vessel to participate in the inspection	<b>Africa (14)</b>	3.29
	<b>Asia (8)</b>	2.75
	<b>Europe (8)</b>	4.13
	<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	2.46
	<b>Near East (3)</b>	2.33
	<b>Northern America (2)</b>	4.50
	<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	3.50
	<b>Total (52) and averages</b>	<b>3.13</b>

Situation	Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties who's inspection procedures:
make all possible efforts to avoid unduly delaying the vessel to minimize interference and inconvenience, including any unnecessary presence of inspectors on board, and to avoid action that would adversely affect the quality of the fish on board	<b>Africa (14)</b>	4.50
	<b>Asia (8)</b>	3.75
	<b>Europe (8)</b>	4.63
	<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	4.31
	<b>Near East (3)</b>	1.00
	<b>Northern America (2)</b>	5.00
	<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	4.25
	<b>Total (52) and averages</b>	<b>4.15</b>
make all possible efforts to facilitate communication with the master or senior crew members of the vessel, including where possible and where needed that the inspector is accompanied by an interpreter	<b>Africa (14)</b>	4.14
	<b>Asia (8)</b>	4.25
	<b>Europe (8)</b>	4.5
	<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	3.85
	<b>Near East (3)</b>	2.67
	<b>Northern America (2)</b>	4.00
	<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	4.50
	<b>Total (52) and averages</b>	<b>4.08</b>
ensure that inspections are conducted in a fair, transparent and non-discriminatory manner and would not constitute harassment of any vessel	<b>Africa (14)</b>	4.64
	<b>Asia (8)</b>	4.75
	<b>Europe (8)</b>	4.63
	<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	4.62
	<b>Near East (3)</b>	2.33
	<b>Northern America (2)</b>	5.00
	<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	4.75
	<b>Total (52) and averages</b>	<b>4.54</b>
not interfere with the master's ability, in conformity with international law, to communicate with the authorities of the flag State	<b>Africa (9)</b>	5.00
	<b>Asia (8)</b>	4.13
	<b>Europe (7)</b>	4.57
	<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	4.69
	<b>Near East (2)</b>	2.50
	<b>Northern America (2)</b>	5.00
	<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	4.50
	<b>Total (45) and averages</b>	<b>4.53</b>

TABLE 29

*Extent of content in inspection reports (Article 14) (%)*

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties that, as a minimum standard, include the information set out in Annex C of the Agreement in the written report of the results of each inspection	Parties who's written reports go beyond the information set out in Annex C*
<b>Africa (14)</b>	78.57	45.45
<b>Asia (8)</b>	100.00	37.50
<b>Europe (9)</b>	88.89	37.50
<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	61.54	37.50
<b>Near East (3)</b>	33.33	100.00
<b>Northern America (2)</b>	100.00	100.00
<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	100.00	50.00
<b>Total (53) and averages</b>	<b>79.25</b>	<b>45.24</b>

\*From those reporting that they include the information set out in Annex C of the Agreement in their written report as specified in the previous question

TABLE 30

*Transmittal of inspection results (Article 15) (%)*

Entity	Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Transmitting of inspection results				
		Results transmitted	Extent to which the results are transmitted:			
			No	Occasionally	Frequently	Always
Flag State	Africa (14)	-	50.00	28.57	0.00	21.43
	Asia (8)	-	12.50	12.50	0.00	75.00
	Europe (8)	-	0.00	25.00	12.50	62.50
	Latin America and the Caribbean (13)	-	30.77	23.08	7.69	38.46
	Near East (3)	-	0.00	66.67	0.00	33.33
	Northern America (2)	-	0.00	0.00	50.00	50.00
	Southwest Pacific (4)	-	0.00	50.00	0.00	50.00
	Total (52) and averages	-	23.08	26.92	5.77	44.23
Those States for which there is evidence through inspection that the vessel has engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing within waters under their national jurisdiction	Africa (13)	-	23.08	7.69	30.77	38.46
	Asia (8)	-	25.00	0.00	0.00	75.00
	Europe (8)	-	0.00	25.00	12.50	62.50
	Latin America and the Caribbean (13)	-	38.46	7.69	15.38	38.46
	Near East (3)	-	0.00	100.00	.00	0.00
	Northern America (2)	-	0.00	0.00	50.00	50.00
	Southwest Pacific (4)	-	0.00	25.00	0.00	75.00
	Total (51) and averages	-	19.61	15.69	15.69	49.02
The State of which the vessel's master is a national	Africa (13)	7.69	-	-	-	-
	Asia (8)	75.00	-	-	-	-
	Europe (8)	50.00	-	-	-	-
	Latin America and the Caribbean (13)	30.77	-	-	-	-
	Near East (3)	33.33	-	-	-	-
	Northern America (2)	0.00	-	-	-	-
	Southwest Pacific (4)	50.00	-	-	-	-
	Total (51) and averages	35.29	-	-	-	-
RFMO/A(s)	Africa (13)	-	30.77	23.08	7.69	38.46
	Asia (8)	-	12.50	37.50	25.00	25.00
	Europe (8)	-	0.00	25.00	12.50	62.50
	Latin America and the Caribbean (13)	-	38.46	7.69	7.69	46.15
	Near East (3)	-	33.33	33.33	33.33	0.00
	Northern America (2)	-	0.00	50.00	0.00	50.00
	Southwest Pacific (4)	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
	Total (51) and averages	-	21.57	21.57	1.76	45.10
FAO	Africa (13)	23.08	-	-	-	-
	Asia (8)	37.50	-	-	-	-
	Europe (8)	37.50	-	-	-	-
	Latin America and the Caribbean (13)	46.15	-	-	-	-
	Near East (3)	33.33	-	-	-	-
	Northern America (2)	0.00	-	-	-	-
	Southwest Pacific (4)	50.00	-	-	-	-
	Total (51) and averages	35.29	-	-	-	-

Entity	Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Transmitting of inspection results				
		Results transmitted	Extent to which the results are transmitted:			
			No	Occasionally	Frequently	Always
Other relevant international organizations	Africa (13)	46.15	-	-	-	-
	Asia (8)	37.50	-	-	-	-
	Europe (8)	25.00	-	-	-	-
	Latin America and the Caribbean (13)	30.77	-	-	-	-
	Near East (3)	66.67	-	-	-	-
	Northern America (2)	0.00	-	-	-	-
	Southwest Pacific (4)	75.00	-	-	-	-
	<b>Total (51) and averages</b>	<b>39.22</b>	-	-	-	-

TABLE 31

*Designated authority as contact point for exchange of information and national communication mechanism relevant to the Agreement (Article 16) (%)*

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties that have designated an authority that shall act as contact point for the exchange of information under this Agreement	Presence and status of national communication mechanism that allows for direct electronic sharing of information relevant to this agreement			
		None	Under development	Partially operational	Fully operational
Africa (15)	80.00	66.67	0.00	6.67	26.67
Asia (9)	88.89	33.33	11.11	55.56	0.00
Europe (9)	88.89	33.33	11.11	0.00	55.56
Latin America and the Caribbean (13)	76.92	38.46	15.38	15.38	30.77
Near East (3)	66.67	33.33	33.33	33.33	0.00
Northern America (2)	100.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	50.00
Southwest Pacific (4)	100.00	25.00	0.00	25.00	50.00
<b>Total (55) and averages</b>	<b>83.64</b>	<b>41.82</b>	<b>9.09</b>	<b>20.00</b>	<b>29.09</b>

TABLE 32

*Use of electronic information exchange mechanism for communication (Article 16) (%)*

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties that use electronic information exchange mechanisms to communicate with a vessel's flag State, other port or coastal States	Types of electronic information mechanisms used by Parties		Extent to which information transmitted through information exchange mechanisms is consistent with Annex D of the Agreement		
		Bilateral electronic information exchange mechanisms	Regional electronic information exchange mechanisms	Not at all	Partially	Fully
<b>Africa (15)</b>	66.67	20.00	53.33	20.00	53.33	26.67
<b>Asia (9)</b>	55.56	66.67	66.67	16.67	66.67	16.67
<b>Europe (8)</b>	62.50	62.50	75.00	0.00	37.50	62.50
<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	61.54	15.38	23.08	46.15	38.46	15.38
<b>Near East (3)</b>	0.00	33.33	66.67	33.33	33.33	33.33
<b>Northern America (2)</b>	50.00	50.00	100.00	50.00	50.00	0.00
<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	75.00	75.00	75.00	0.00	75.00	25.00
<b>Total (54) and averages</b>	59.26	38.89	55.56	23.53	49.02	27.45

TABLE 33

*Training of inspectors (Article 17) (%)*

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Extent to which Parties have trained its inspectors, taking into consideration the guidelines for the training of inspectors set forth in Annex E of the Agreement			Parties where national inspectors participated in PSM training courses conducted by other States / organisations	From those who have, courses conducted by:*				
	Not at all	Partially	Fully		Other Parties	Non- Parties	FAO	RFMO/A(s)	Other
<b>Africa (14)</b>	0.00	64.29	35.71	78.57	63.64	18.18	63.64	81.82	63.64
<b>Asia (9)</b>	33.33	44.44	22.22	55.56	40.00	40.00	80.00	40.00	40.00
<b>Europe (9)</b>	22.22	11.11	66.67	11.11	100.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	25.00
<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	15.38	69.23	15.38	69.23	22.22	0.00	77.78	0.00	11.11
<b>Near East (3)</b>	33.33	66.67	0.00	33.33	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00
<b>Northern America (2)</b>	0.00	0.00	100.00	50.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00
<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	0.00	25.00	75.00	50.00	50.00	10.00	50.00	100.00	0.00
<b>Total (54) and averages</b>	14.81	48.15	37.04	61.11	51.52	15.15	63.64	48.48	36.36

\*From those who reported that their national inspectors participated in PSM training courses conducted by other States / organisations



TABLE 34

*Communication of port State action following inspection (Article 18) (%)*

Entity	Region (number of respondents in brackets)	In the case of a port State action / denial of use of port				
		Decision communicated	Extent to which the decision is communicated:			
			No	Occasionally	Frequently	Always
<b>Flag State*</b>	<b>Africa (14)</b>	69.23	-	-	-	-
	<b>Asia (9)</b>	100.00	-	-	-	-
	<b>Europe (9)</b>	87.50	-	-	-	-
	<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	66.67	-	-	-	-
	<b>Near East (3)</b>	100.00	-	-	-	-
	<b>Northern America (2)</b>	100.00	-	-	-	-
	<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	100.00	-	-	-	-
	<b>Total (54) and averages</b>	<b>81.63</b>	-	-	-	-
<b>Relevant coastal States</b>	<b>Africa (13)</b>	-	23.08	7.69	23.08	46.15
	<b>Asia (8)</b>	-	0.00	25.00	25.00	50.00
	<b>Europe (8)</b>	-	12.50	12.50	25.00	50.00
	<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	-	46.15	15.38	7.69	30.77
	<b>Near East (3)</b>	-	33.33	66.67	0.00	0.00
	<b>Northern America (2)</b>	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
	<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
	<b>Total (51) and averages</b>	-	<b>21.57</b>	<b>15.69</b>	<b>15.69</b>	<b>47.06</b>
<b>Relevant RFMO/A(s)</b>	<b>Africa (13)</b>	-	15.38	15.38	23.08	46.15
	<b>Asia (8)</b>	-	25.00	12.50	12.50	50.00
	<b>Europe (8)</b>	-	0.00	12.50	12.50	75.00
	<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	-	38.46	7.69	0.00	53.85
	<b>Near East (3)</b>	-	33.33	33.33	33.33	0.00
	<b>Northern America (2)</b>	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
	<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
	<b>Total (51) and averages</b>	-	<b>19.61</b>	<b>11.76</b>	<b>11.76</b>	<b>56.86</b>
<b>Other international organizations</b>	<b>Africa (11)</b>	-	<b>45.45</b>	9.09	27.27	18.18
	<b>Asia (8)</b>	-	25.00	25.00	12.50	37.50
	<b>Europe (8)</b>	-	62.50	12.50	0.00	25.00
	<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	-	76.92	0.00	0.00	23.08
	<b>Near East (3)</b>	-	33.33	33.33	0.00	33.33
	<b>Northern America (2)</b>	-	50.00	0.00	0.00	50.00
	<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	-	0.00	25.00	25.00	50.00
	<b>Total (49) and averages</b>	-	<b>48.98</b>	<b>12.24</b>	<b>10.20</b>	<b>28.57</b>

\*From those who considered these questions applicable; 4 Parties reported that this question was not applicable and were not considered within this row.

TABLE 35

*Denial of use of port following an inspection (Article 18) (%)*

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	In cases following an inspection that there is clear ground that a vessel has engaged in IUU fishing. Parties with a process in place to deny the vessel the use of its port, in a manner consistent with this Agreement, including Article 4			Parties with cases where vessels have been denied use of port following an inspection, where there are clear grounds for believing that a vessel has engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing
	Not at all	Partially	Fully	
<b>Africa (13)</b>	23.08	15.38	61.54	30.77
<b>Asia (7)</b>	14.29	28.57	57.14	25.00
<b>Europe (8)</b>	12.50	12.50	75.00	25.00
<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	30.77	23.08	46.15	7.69
<b>Near East (3)</b>	33.33	66.67	0.00	66.67
<b>Northern America (2)</b>	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	0.00	25.00	75.00	50.00
<b>Total (50) and averages</b>	<b>20.00</b>	<b>22.00</b>	<b>58.00</b>	<b>25.49</b>

TABLE 36

*Process for information on recourse to the public (Article 19) (%)*

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties with a process in place to maintain the relevant information on recourse available to the public in accordance with the Agreement, with regard to PSMs taken pursuant to:			
	Article 9 - Port entry, authorization and denial	Article 11 - Use of ports	Article 13 - Conduct of inspections	Article 18 - Port State action following inspection
<b>Africa (14)</b>	42.86	42.86	42.86	42.86
<b>Asia (7)</b>	57.14	57.14	57.14	57.14
<b>Europe (9)</b>	44.44	44.44	44.44	44.44
<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	46.15	33.46	30.77	23.08
<b>Near East (3)</b>	33.33	33.33	33.33	33.33
<b>Northern America (2)</b>	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00
<b>Total (52) and averages</b>	<b>50.00</b>	<b>48.08</b>	<b>46.15</b>	<b>44.23</b>

TABLE 37

*Process for providing information on recourse (Article 19) (%)*

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties that have a process in place to report the outcome of any such recourse to the flag State and the owner, operator, master or representative, as appropriate:			
	Article 9 - Port entry, authorization and denial	Article 11 - Use of ports	Article 13 - Conduct of inspections	Article 18 - Port State action following inspection
<b>Africa (14)</b>	57.15	57.14	57.14	57.14
<b>Asia (8)</b>	62.50	62.50	62.50	62.50
<b>Europe (8)</b>	87.50	87.50	87.50	87.50
<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	53.85	46.15	46.15	38.46
<b>Near East (3)</b>	33.33	33.33	33.33	0.00
<b>Northern America (2)</b>	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
<b>Total (52) and averages</b>	<b>65.38</b>	<b>63.46</b>	<b>63.46</b>	<b>59.62</b>

TABLE 38

*Information provided on recourse (Article 19) (%)*

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties that have provided information on recourse to the owner, operator, master or representative of a vessel with regard to PSMs taken pursuant to:			
	Article 9 - Port entry, authorization and denial	Article 11 - Use of ports	Article 13 - Conduct of inspections	Article 18 - Port State action following inspection
<b>Africa (14)</b>	28.57	28.57	28.57	21.43
<b>Asia (8)</b>	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00
<b>Europe (8)</b>	87.50	87.50	87.50	87.50
<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	30.77	23.08	23.08	23.08
<b>Near East (3)</b>	33.33	33.33	33.33	33.33
<b>Northern America (2)</b>	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00
<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
<b>Total (52) and averages</b>	<b>48.08</b>	<b>46.15</b>	<b>46.15</b>	<b>44.23</b>

TABLE 39

*Outcome of resource (Article 19) (%)*

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties that have measures in place to report the outcome of recourse to the flag State and the owner, operator, master or representative, as appropriate	Parties that have reported the outcome of recourse to the flag State and the owner, operator, master or representative, as appropriate	In cases where other Parties, States or international organisations have been informed of the prior decision pursuant to Articles 9, 11, 13 or 18:	
			Parties that have a process in place to inform them of any change in this decision	Parties that have informed them of any change in this decision*
<b>Africa (13)</b>	46.15	23.08	38.46	30.00
<b>Asia (8)</b>	62.50	12.50	62.50	14.29
<b>Europe (8)</b>	62.50	37.50	50.00	100.00
<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	69.23	15.38	53.85	27.27
<b>Near East (3)</b>	33.33	33.33	33.33	33.33
<b>Northern America (2)</b>	100.00	50.00	100.00	0.00
<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
<b>Total (51) and averages</b>	<b>62.75</b>	<b>29.41</b>	<b>54.90</b>	<b>41.67</b>

\*of those where the question applied; 11 Parties reported that this question was not applicable and were not considered within this column.

TABLE 40

*Role of flag State (Article 20) (%)*

	Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties that, in their capacity as flag States:
Require the vessels entitled to fly its flag to cooperate with the port State in inspections carried out pursuant to this Agreement	<b>Africa (14)</b>	92.86
	<b>Asia (9)</b>	100.00
	<b>Europe (9)</b>	77.78
	<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	92.31
	<b>Near East (3)</b>	100.00
	<b>Northern America (2)</b>	100.00
	<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	100.00
	<b>Total (54) and averages</b>	<b>92.59</b>
In accordance with Article 20 paragraph 2 of the Agreement, as appropriate, request that State to inspect the vessel or to take other measures consistent with this Agreement*	<b>Africa (14)</b>	64.29
	<b>Asia (9)</b>	77.78
	<b>Europe (8)</b>	87.50
	<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (12)</b>	58.33
	<b>Near East (3)</b>	66.67
	<b>Northern America (2)</b>	100.00
	<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	100.00
	<b>Total (52) and averages</b>	<b>73.08</b>
Encourage vessels entitled to fly its flag to land, tranship, package and process fish, and use other port services, in ports of States that are acting in accordance with, or in a manner consistent with the Agreement	<b>Africa (14)</b>	71.43
	<b>Asia (9)</b>	100.00
	<b>Europe (8)</b>	75.00
	<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	61.54
	<b>Near East (3)</b>	100.00
	<b>Northern America (2)</b>	100.00
	<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	100.00
	<b>Total (53) and averages</b>	<b>79.25</b>

	Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties that, in their capacity as flag States:
In cases where, following port State inspection, the Party receives an inspection report indicating that there are clear grounds to believe that a vessel entitled to fly its flag has engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing, immediately and fully investigate the matter and, upon sufficient evidence, take enforcement action without delay in accordance with its laws and regulations	<b>Africa (14)</b>	71.43
	<b>Asia (8)</b>	100.00
	<b>Europe (8)</b>	100.00
	<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	61.54
	<b>Near East (3)</b>	100.00
	<b>Northern America (2)</b>	100.00
	<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	100.00
	<b>Total (52) and averages</b>	<b>82.69</b>
Report to other Parties, relevant port States and, as appropriate, other relevant States, regional fisheries management organizations and FAO on actions it has taken in respect of vessels entitled to fly its flag that, as a result of port State measures taken pursuant to this Agreement, have been determined to have engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing	<b>Africa (14)</b>	<b>71.43</b>
	<b>Asia (9)</b>	100.00
	<b>Europe (8)</b>	100.00
	<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	61.54
	<b>Near East (3)</b>	66.67
	<b>Northern America (2)</b>	100.00
	<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	100.00
	<b>Total (53) and averages</b>	<b>81.13</b>
Ensure that measures applied to vessels entitled to fly its flag are at least as effective in preventing, deterring, and eliminating IUU fishing and fishing related activities in support of such fishing as measures applied to vessels referred to in paragraph 1 of Article 3	<b>Africa (14)</b>	<b>100.00</b>
	<b>Asia (8)</b>	100.00
	<b>Europe (8)</b>	87.50
	<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	84.62
	<b>Near East (3)</b>	100.00
	<b>Northern America (2)</b>	100.00
	<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	100.00
	<b>Total (52) and averages</b>	<b>94.23</b>

\*One Party reported that this question was not applicable and were not considered within this row.

## TABLE 41

### *Requirements of developing States (Article 21) (%)*

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties that have obtained external assistance on PSMA implementation*	Actors providing external assistance			
		Other States	FAO	RFMO/A(s)	Other
<b>Africa (13)</b>	64,29	33,33	69,23	61,54	33,33
<b>Asia (9)</b>	71,43	62,50	66,67	37,50	25,00
<b>Europe (8)</b>	12,50	12,50	0,00	12,50	12,50
<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	84,62	41,67	100,00	25,00	50,00
<b>Near East (3)</b>	33,33	33,33	33,33	33,33	0,00
<b>Northern America (2)</b>	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	50,00	50,00	25,00	50,00	25,00
<b>Total (52) and averages</b>	<b>56,86</b>	<b>37,50</b>	<b>58,82</b>	<b>36,73</b>	<b>29,17</b>

\*3 Parties reported that this question was not applicable and were not considered within this column.

TABLE 42

*Allocation of UN/LOCODE for designated ports under the Agreement*

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties who's designated ports have been allocated a UN/LOCODE
<b>Africa (14)</b>	71.43
<b>Asia (8)</b>	50.00
<b>Europe (9)</b>	88.89
<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (13)</b>	38.46
<b>Near East (3)</b>	33.33
<b>Northern America (2)</b>	0.00
<b>Southwest Pacific (4)</b>	50.00
<b>Total (53) and averages</b>	<b>56.60</b>