

**REGIONAL STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES
BY FAO MEMBERS TO THE 2011 QUESTIONNAIRE ON
THE CODE OF CONDUCT FOR RESPONSIBLE
FISHERIES IMPLEMENTATION**

Note on Europe FAO region data

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TABLE 2
Comparative response rates by FAO regions (figures in %)

FAO region	Number of responding States* 2011	Percentage response by FAO region 2011	Percentage response by FAO region 2010
Africa	6	12.5	22.9
Asia	7	30.4	17.4
Europe	15	30	37.5
Latin America and the Caribbean	19	57.6	45.5
Near East	5	23.8	42.9
Northern America	2	100	100
South West Pacific	2	12.5	62.5
Total count and percentages	56	29	36.5

* Counting EU Members that submitted a filled questionnaire.

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

Objectives	Region (number of responses in brackets)	5	4	3	2	1	Not applicable
Establish principles for responsible fisheries considering all their relevant biological, technical, economic, social environmental and commercial aspects	Africa (6)	50	16.7	16.7	0	16.7	0
	Asia (7)	42.9	42.9	14.3	0	0	0
	Europe (4)	50	0	50	0	0	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	63.2	26.3	10.5	0	0	0
	Near East (5)	80	0	20	0	0	0
	Northern America (2)	50	50	0	0	0	0
	South West Pacific (2)	100	0	0	0	0	0
	Total (45)	60	22.2	15.6	0	2.2	0
Establish principles and criteria to implement policies for the conservation of fishery resources and fisheries management and development	Africa (6)	33.3	33.3	16.7	0	16.7	0
	Asia (7)	42.9	28.6	28.6	0	0	0
	Europe (4)	50	0	0	25	25	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	63.2	21.1	10.5	0	5.3	0
	Near East (5)	80	20	0	0	0	0
	Northern America (2)	100	0	0	0	0	0
	South West Pacific (2)	100	0	0	0	0	0
	Total (45)	60	20	11.1	2.2	6.7	0
Facilitate and promote cooperation in the conservation of fishery resources, fisheries management and development	Africa (6)	16.7	33.3	33.3	0	0	16.7
	Asia (7)	42.9	42.9	14.3	0	0	0
	Europe (4)	25	25	25	0	25	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	31.6	36.8	21.1	5.3	5.3	0
	Near East (5)	100	0	0	0	0	0
	Northern America (2)	100	0	0	0	0	0
	South West Pacific (2)	100	0	0	0	0	0
	Total (45)	44.4	28.9	17.8	2.2	4.4	2.2
Promote protection of living aquatic resources and their environments and coastal areas	Africa (6)	33.3	50	0	0	16.7	0
	Asia (7)	28.6	28.6	42.9	0	0	0
	Europe (4)	0	25	50	0	25	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	36.8	26.3	21.1	10.5	5.3	0
	Near East (5)	80	0	20	0	0	0
	Northern America (2)	100	0	0	0	0	0
	South West Pacific (2)	100	0	0	0	0	0
	Total (45)	42.2	24.4	22.2	4.4	6.7	0
Promote trade in fish and fishery products in conformity with relevant international rules	Africa (6)	16.7	33.3	33.3	0	16.7	0
	Asia (7)	71.4	14.3	14.3	0	0	0
	Europe (4)	0	0	75	0	25	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	31.6	26.3	31.6	5.3	5.3	0
	Near East (5)	60	20	20	0	0	0
	Northern America (2)	100	0	0	0	0	0
	South West Pacific (2)	100	0	0	0	0	0
	Total (45)	42.2	20	28.9	2.2	6.7	0

Objectives	Region (number of responses in brackets)	5	4	3	2	1	Not applicable
Promote research on fisheries as well as on associated ecosystems and relevant environmental factors	Africa (6)	0	50	33.3	0	16.7	0
	Asia (7)	28.6	14.3	42.9	0	14.3	0
	Europe (4)	25	0	25	25	25	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	36.8	21.1	21.1	5.3	10.5	5.3
	Near East (5)	80	20	0	0	0	0
	Northern America (2)	100	0	0	0	0	0
	South West Pacific (2)	100	0	0	0	0	0
	Total (45)	40	20	22.2	4.4	11.1	2.2
Serve as an instrument of reference to improve legal and institutional framework for appropriate management measures	Africa (6)	16.7	50	16.7	0	16.7	0
	Asia (7)	14.3	57.1	28.6	0	0	0
	Europe (4)	25	25	0	0	50	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	52.6	10.5	31.6	0	5.3	0
	Near East (5)	40	60	0	0	0	0
	Northern America (2)	50	50	0	0	0	0
	South West Pacific (2)	50	50	0	0	0	0
	Total (45)	37.8	33.3	20	0	8.9	0
Promote the contribution of fisheries to food security and food quality giving priority to the nutritional needs of local communities	Africa (6)	16.7	50	16.7	0	16.7	0
	Asia (7)	28.6	42.9	28.6	0	0	0
	Europe (4)	25	0	0	25	50	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	42.1	31.6	15.8	5.3	5.3	0
	Near East (5)	80	20	0	0	0	0
	Northern America (2)	50	50	0	0	0	0
	South West Pacific (2)	0	0	100	0	0	0
	Total (45)	37.8	31.1	17.8	4.4	8.9	0
Provide guidance to formulate and implement international agreements and other legal instruments	Africa (6)	0	33.3	50	0	0	16.7
	Asia (7)	28.6	42.9	28.6	0	0	0
	Europe (4)	0	25	25	25	25	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	47.4	15.8	26.3	5.3	5.3	0
	Near East (5)	60	40	0	0	0	0
	Northern America (2)	50	50	0	0	0	0
	South West Pacific (2)	50	50	0	0	0	0
	Total (45)	35.6	28.9	24.4	4.4	4.4	2.2
Provide standards of conduct for all involved in the fisheries sector	Africa (6)	16.7	50	16.7	0	16.7	0
	Asia (7)	14.3	42.9	42.9	0	0	0
	Europe (4)	0	25	50	25	0	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	47.4	15.8	26.3	5.3	5.3	0
	Near East (5)	40	20	40	0	0	0
	Northern America (2)	50	50	0	0	0	0
	South West Pacific (2)	0	50	0	50	0	0
	Total (45)	31.1	28.9	28.9	6.7	4.4	0

TABLE 4

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

Theme	Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Top priority	Priority	Low priority	Not applicable
Fisheries management	Africa (6)	66.7	33.3	0	0
	Asia (7)	85.7	0	14.3	0
	Europe (4)	75	0	25	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	68.4	21.1	10.5	0
	Near East (5)	60	40	0	0
	Northern America (2)	100	0	0	0
	South West Pacific (2)	100	0	0	0
	Total (45)	73.3	17.8	8.9	0

Theme	Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Top priority	Priority	Low priority	Not applicable
Aquaculture development	Africa (6)	66.7	0	16.7	16.7
	Asia (7)	85.7	14.3	0	0
	Europe (4)	50	50	0	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	42.1	47.4	10.5	0
	Near East (5)	80	20	0	0
	Northern America (2)	0	100	0	0
	South West Pacific (2)	50	50	0	0
	Total (45)	55.6	35.6	6.7	2.2
Fisheries research	Africa (6)	33.3	33.3	33.3	0
	Asia (7)	42.9	42.9	14.3	0
	Europe (4)	50	25	25	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	36.8	42.1	21.1	0
	Near East (5)	60	0	20	20
	Northern America (2)	100	0	0	0
	South West Pacific (2)	100	0	0	0
	Total (45)	46.7	31.1	20	2.2
Post-harvest practices	Africa (6)	50	33.3	16.7	0
	Asia (7)	71.4	28.6	0	0
	Europe (4)	0	100	0	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	36.8	47.4	15.8	0
	Near East (5)	40	20	40	0
	Northern America (2)	100	0	0	0
	South West Pacific (2)	50	50	0	0
	Total (45)	44.4	42.2	13.3	0
Fishing operations	Africa (6)	33.3	50	16.7	0
	Asia (7)	71.4	28.6	0	0
	Europe (4)	0	75	25	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	31.6	63.2	5.3	0
	Near East (5)	60	20	20	0
	Northern America (2)	100	0	0	0
	South West Pacific (2)	50	50	0	0
	Total (45)	42.2	48.9	8.9	0
Trade	Africa (6)	0	66.7	33.3	0
	Asia (7)	57.1	42.9	0	0
	Europe (4)	25	50	25	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	21.1	63.2	15.8	0
	Near East (5)	60	20	20	0
	Northern America (2)	50	50	0	0
	South West Pacific (2)	50	50	0	0
	Total (45)	31.1	53.3	15.6	0
Integration of fisheries into coastal and basin area management	Africa (6)	16.7	66.7	16.7	0
	Asia (7)	28.6	28.6	28.6	14.3
	Europe (4)	0	100	0	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	31.6	26.3	36.8	5.3
	Near East (5)	40	0	60	0
	Northern America (2)	100	0	0	0
	South West Pacific (2)	0	100	0	0
	Total (45)	28.9	37.8	28.9	4.4
Inland fisheries development	Africa (6)	50	0	33.3	16.7
	Asia (7)	28.6	57.1	14.3	0
	Europe (4)	0	0	75	25
	Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	5.3	36.8	42.1	15.8
	Near East (5)	20	40	0	40
	Northern America (2)	0	100	0	0
	South West Pacific (2)	0	0	100	0
	Total (45)	15.6	33.3	35.6	15.6

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Have a fisheries policy	Yes	No	Partially	Planning to align policy with the Code**
		Policy consistent with the Code*			
Africa (5)	100	40	0	60	0
Asia (7)	100	57.1	0	42.9	0
Europe (4)	100	50	0	50	0
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	84.2	62.5	12.5	25	100
Near East (5)	100	40	40	20	100
Northern America (2)	100	100	0	0	0
South West Pacific (2)	100	100	0	0	0
Total (44) and averages	93.2	58.5	9.8	31.7	100

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

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Yes	No	Partially	Planning to align law with the Code*
	Fisheries law consistent with the Code			
Africa (6)	33.3	0	66.7	–
Asia (7)	57.1	0	42.9	–
Europe (4)	50	0	50	–
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	57.9	5.3	36.8	100
Near East (5)	40	20	40	100
Northern America (2)	100	0	0	–
South West Pacific (2)	100	0	0	–
Total (45) and averages	55.6	4.4	40	100

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

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	before 1970	between 1970 and 1975	between 1976 and 1980	between 1981 and 1985	between 1986 and 1990	between 1991 and 1995	between 1996 and 2000	between 2001 and 2005	between 2006 and 2010	after 2010
Africa (6)	16.7	0	16.7	16.7	0	16.7	33.3	0	0	0
Asia (7)	42.9	0	14.3	0	14.3	0	0	28.6	0	0
Europe (4)	25	25	0	0	0	25	0	25	0	0
Latin America and the Caribbean (18)	5.6	0	0	5.6	11.1	16.7	11.1	22.2	22.2	5.6
Near East (4)	0	0	0	25	25	0	50	0	0	0
Northern America (2)	50	0	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South West Pacific (2)	50	0	0	0	0	0	50	0	0	0
Total (43)	18.6	2.3	7	7	9.3	11.6	16.3	16.3	9.3	2.3

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Meetings, workshops and seminars	Publishing and distributing Code documents	Developing guidelines and codes based upon the Code	Training of administration staff	Translating Code, or parts thereof
Africa (6)	40	20	60	20	20
Asia (7)	71.4	14.3	14.3	85.7	14.3
Europe (4)	0	75	50	50	25
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	50	55.6	33.3	5.6	5.6
Near East (5)	50	50	50	0	50
Northern America (2)	100	50	0	0	0
South West Pacific (2)	0	100	0	0	0
Total (45) and averages	48.7	46.2	33.3	25.6	12.8

Note: other important lacking data sources included (in descending order) [Advertising Code through media], [NGO work, and other project activities], [other].

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries with no management plans (in %)	Number of plans developed (count)		Percentage of plans currently implemented	
		Marine	Inland	Marine	Inland
Africa (6)	0	11	12	63.6	16.7
Asia (6)	0	18	6	55.6	100
Europe (4)	0	27	2	96.3	100
Latin America and the Caribbean (18)	5.6	114	11	87.7	100
Near East (5)	0	14	4	100	100
Northern America (2)	0	351	60	99.1	100
South West Pacific (1)	0	112	10	100	100
Total (42) and averages	2.4	647	105	95.4	90.5

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

Measures	Region (number of specified responses in brackets for both marine and inland fisheries)	Marine fisheries management plans	Inland fisheries management plans
Addressing the interests and rights of small-scale fishers	Africa (4) (3)	100	66.7
	Asia (4) (3)	100	100
	Europe (2) (2)	100	50
	Latin America and the Caribbean (14) (8)	100	75
	Near East (3) (1)	100	100
	Northern America (2) (2)	100	100
	South West Pacific (1) (1)	100	100
	Total (30) (20) and averages	100	80
Addressing fishing capacity, including the economic conditions under which the industry operates	Africa (4) (3)	100	66.7
	Asia (4) (3)	100	100
	Europe (2) (2)	100	50
	Latin America and the Caribbean (14) (8)	100	87.5
	Near East (3) (1)	100	100
	Northern America (2) (2)	100	100
	South West Pacific (1) (1)	100	0
	Total (30) (20) and averages	100	80

Measures	Region (number of specified responses in brackets for both marine and inland fisheries)	Marine fisheries management plans	Inland fisheries management plans
Providing for the protection of endangered species	Africa (4) (3)	75	66.7
	Asia (4) (3)	100	100
	Europe (2) (2)	100	50
	Latin America and the Caribbean (14) (8)	92.9	87.5
	Near East (3) (1)	100	100
	Northern America (2) (2)	100	100
	South West Pacific (1) (1)	100	100
	Total (30) (20) and averages	93.3	85
Making use of stock specific target reference points	Africa (4) (3)	100	66.7
	Asia (4) (3)	100	100
	Europe (2) (2)	100	50
	Latin America and the Caribbean (14) (8)	85.7	87.5
	Near East (3) (1)	100	100
	Northern America (2) (2)	100	100
	South West Pacific (1) (1)	100	100
	Total (30) (20) and averages	93.3	85
Allowing depleted stocks to recover	Africa (4) (3)	100	66.7
	Asia (4) (3)	100	100
	Europe (2) (2)	100	50
	Latin America and the Caribbean (14) (8)	92.9	75
	Near East (3) (1)	100	100
	Northern America (2) (2)	100	100
	South West Pacific (1) (1)	100	100
	Total (30) (20) and averages	96.7	80
Plans falling within (or constituting and integral part of) wider management plans of the coastal zone	Africa (4) (3)	75	66.7
	Asia (4) (3)	100	100
	Europe (2) (2)	100	50
	Latin America and the Caribbean (14) (8)	85.7	87.5
	Near East (3) (1)	100	100
	Northern America (2) (2)	100	100
	South West Pacific (1) (1)	100	100
	Total (30) (20) and averages	90	85
Using precautionary approaches which provide for conservative safety margins in decision making	Africa (4) (3)	100	66.7
	Asia (4) (3)	100	100
	Europe (2) (2)	100	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean (14) (8)	100	75
	Near East (3) (1)	100	100
	Northern America (2) (2)	100	100
	South West Pacific (1) (1)	100	100
	Total (30) (20) and averages	100	75
Prohibiting destructive fishing methods and practices	Africa (4) (3)	75	33.3
	Asia (4) (3)	100	100
	Europe (2) (2)	100	50
	Latin America and the Caribbean (14) (8)	92.9	87.5
	Near East (3) (1)	100	100
	Northern America (2) (2)	100	100
	South West Pacific (1) (1)	100	100
	Total (30) (20) and averages	93.3	80
Addressing biodiversity of aquatic habitats and ecosystems, including the identification of essential fish habitats	Africa (4) (3)	100	66.7
	Asia (4) (3)	100	100
	Europe (2) (2)	50	0
	Latin America and the Caribbean (14) (8)	78.6	50
	Near East (3) (1)	66.7	100
	Northern America (2) (2)	100	100
	South West Pacific (1) (1)	100	100
	Total (30) (20) and averages	83.3	65

Measures	Region (number of specified responses in brackets for both marine and inland fisheries)	Marine fisheries management plans	Inland fisheries management plans
Providing for stakeholder participation in determining management decisions	Africa (4) (3)	50	66.7
	Asia (4) (3)	100	100
	Europe (2) (2)	100	50
	Latin America and the Caribbean (14) (8)	71.4	50
	Near East (3) (1)	66.7	100
	Northern America (2) (2)	100	100
	South West Pacific (1) (1)	100	100
	Total (30) (20) and averages	76.7	70
Addressing selectivity of fishing gear	Africa (4) (3)	50	66.7
	Asia (4) (3)	50	0
	Europe (2) (2)	100	50
	Latin America and the Caribbean (14) (8)	71.4	25
	Near East (3) (1)	33.3	0
	Northern America (2) (2)	100	100
	South West Pacific (1) (1)	100	100
	Total (30) (20) and averages	66.7	40
Ensuring the level of fishing is commensurate with the state of fisheries resources	Africa (4) (3)	50	66.7
	Asia (4) (3)	25	66.7
	Europe (2) (2)	0	50
	Latin America and the Caribbean (14) (8)	14.3	37.5
	Near East (3) (1)	33.3	0
	Northern America (2) (2)	0	0
	South West Pacific (1) (1)	0	0
	Total (30) (20) and averages	20	40

TABLE 11
Implementation of the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF) (figures in %)

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Have started to implement EAF	For those countries that have started to implement EAF, the following apply:		
		Ecological, socio-economic and governance objectives established	Key issues to be addressed by management actions identified	Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms established
Africa (6)	83.3	66.7	50	50
Asia (7)	85.7	85.7	85.7	85.7
Europe (4)	25	25	25	25
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	57.9	42.1	47.4	15.8
Near East (5)	80	80	40	60
Northern America (2)	100	100	100	100
South West Pacific (2)	100	100	100	100
Total (45) and averages	68.9	60	55.6	44.4

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries having developed stock specific target reference points	Sum of stocks for which stock (or resource/multi-species) specific target reference points have been developed	For those countries that have developed such specific target reference points:	
			Have they been exceeded?	Are they being approached?
Africa (5)	60	8	66.7	66.7
Asia (7)	57.1	98	50	75
Europe (3)	66.7	49	100	100
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	52.6	52	60	70
Near East (4)	50	17	50	50
Northern America (2)	100	110	100	100
South West Pacific (2)	100	511	100	100
Total (42) and averages	59.5	845	68	76

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

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Catch and effort indicators (76.5%)	Ecosystem indicators (17.6%)	Socio-economic indicators (52.9%)	Validated stakeholder knowledge (47.1%)	Others (35.3%)
Africa (2)	100	0	100	0	0
Asia (3)	100	66.7	100	66.7	33.3
Europe (1)	100	0	0	100	0
Latin America and the Caribbean (9)	55.6	0	22.2	33.3	55.6
Near East (2)	100	50	100	100	0
Northern America (0)	–	–	–	–	–
South West Pacific (0)	–	–	–	–	–

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

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

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Limiting fishing effort (94.1%)	Carrying out more research (82.4%)	Strengthening MCS (76.5%)	Closing fishery (76.5%)	Effecting capacity adjustments (70.6%)
Africa (5)	100	100	100	50	100
Asia (7)	100	100	100	100	100
Europe (3)	100	100	100	100	100
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	83.3	66.7	83.3	66.7	66.7
Near East (4)	100	100	100	100	100
Northern America (2)	100	50	0	100	0
South West Pacific (2)	100	100	50	50	50

Legend to table headers: the percentage value indicated below each action represents the overall percentage of countries that reported to use it for countering the exceeding of stock-specific target reference points. 41.2% of countries reported to use other actions than those reported in the table to mitigate impacts.

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries reporting to have taken steps (95.6%)	Strengthening MCS system (74.4%)	Existence of a vessel register (58.1%)	Deterrent penalties and sanctions (46.5%)	Mandatory logbook and reporting system (30.2%)	Link between registration and licensing authorities (27.9%)
Africa (6)	83.3	60	60	20	40	20
Asia (7)	100	85.7	71.4	42.9	42.9	42.9
Europe (4)	100	100	25	25	75	0
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	94.7	72.2	66.7	55.6	11.1	22.2
Near East (5)	100	40	60	60	20	80
Northern America (2)	100	100	0	50	50	0
South West Pacific (2)	100	100	50	50	50	0

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

Legend to table headers: the percentage value indicated below each measure represents the overall percentage of countries that reported to apply the same measure. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 84.3 percent of all reported measures. Other reported measures include (by descending order of importance) [Mandatory national landing of catch and/or prohibition to tranship at sea], [Strengthening Port State Measures], [NPOA-IUU development and implementation].

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries reporting to have taken steps (77.8%)	Mandatory authorization to operate beyond EEZ (77.1%)	Mandatory logbooks and reporting system (45.7%)	Enforcing compliance with laws of other States, and RFMO decisions (40%)	Enhanced MCS measures (40%)	Ratification of relevant international instruments (34.3%)
Africa (6)	50	33.3	100	33.3	66.7	0
Asia (7)	100	71.4	14.3	42.9	57.1	42.9
Europe (4)	100	75	25	50	50	25
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	73.7	85.7	50	35.7	28.6	21.4
Near East (5)	60	66.7	100	33.3	0	66.7
Northern America (2)	100	100	0	100	0	100
South West Pacific (2)	100	100	50	0	100	50

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

Legend to table headers: the percentage value indicated below each measure represents the overall percentage of countries that reported to use the same as an enforcement measure. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 81.4 percent of all mechanisms reported. Other reported measures include (by descending order of importance) [Cooperation with third countries and/or with RFMOs], [On-board observer programme], [Pre-licensing inspection and brief], [NPOA and RPOA-IUU development and implementation], [Deterrent penalties and sanctions].

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries where bycatches and discards occur in major fisheries	Formally monitor bycatch and discards	Bycatch and discards are found to be unsustainable	Management measures to minimize bycatch and discards are in place	These measures do also address the following:	
					Protection of juveniles	Ghost fishing
Africa (6)	83.3	33.3	40	40	40	40
Asia (7)	100	85.7	57.1	57.1	57.1	28.6
Europe (4)	50	75	50	0	0	0
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	68.4	42.1	38.5	23.1	23.1	7.7
Near East (5)	60	20	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3
Northern America (2)	100	100	100	100	100	100
South West Pacific (2)	100	100	50	50	50	0
Total (45) and averages	75.6	53.3	47.1	38.2	38.2	23.5

TABLE 18
VMS implementation (figures in %)

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Has VMS been implemented? (for countries not having implemented VMS as yet, percentage planning to do so in brackets)			Countries not yet having implemented VMS, but using an external VMS center to monitor foreign fishing vessels in their EEZ*
	Yes	No	Partially	
Africa (6)	33.3 (66.7)	50	16.7	0
Asia (7)	14.3 (-)	0	85.7	-
Europe (4)	0 (-)	0	100	-
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	15.8 (66.7)	47.4	36.8	0
Near East (5)	40 (100)	20	40	0
Northern America (2)	0 (-)	0	100	-
South West Pacific (2)	0 (-)	0	100	-
Total (45) and averages	17.8 (69.2)	28.9	53.3	0

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

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries where aquaculture development occurs	Policy framework			Legal framework			Institutional framework		
		Largely complete and enabling	Partial	None or largely insufficient	Largely complete and enabling	Partial	None or largely insufficient	Largely complete and enabling	Partial	None or largely insufficient
Africa (6)	100	16.7	83.3	0	16.7	66.7	16.7	16.7	83.3	0
Asia (7)	100	71.4	28.6	0	71.4	14.3	14.3	71.4	28.6	0
Europe (4)	100	75	25	0	100	0	0	100	0	0
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	100	26.3	52.6	21.1	15.8	52.6	31.6	15.8	68.4	15.8
Near East (5)	80	33.3	66.7	0	25	75	0	33.3	66.7	0
Northern America (2)	100	100	0	0	50	50	0	50	50	0
South West Pacific (2)	100	100	0	0	50	50	0	100	0	0
Total (45) and averages	97.8	44.2	46.5	9.3	36.4	45.5	18.2	39.5	53.5	7

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

TABLE 20

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Government (75%)	Producers (59.1%)	Suppliers (31.8%)	Manufacturers (31.8%)	Others (27.3%)
Africa (6)	83.3	66.7	16.7	16.7	16.7
Asia (7)	100	85.7	57.1	57.1	57.1
Europe (4)	75	75	75	75	75
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	63.2	36.8	15.8	15.8	15.8
Near East (4)	100	50	25	25	0
Northern America (2)	50	100	0	0	0
South West Pacific (2)	50	100	100	100	50

TABLE 21

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Environmental assessments of aquaculture operations (77.3%)	Monitoring of aquaculture operations (84.1%)	Minimizing harmful effects of alien species introductions (81.8%)
Africa (6)	83.3	83.3	66.7
Asia (7)	100	85.7	100
Europe (4)	100	100	100
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	57.9	78.9	73.7
Near East (4)	75	75	75
Northern America (2)	100	100	100
South West Pacific (2)	100	100	100

TABLE 22

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Environmental assessments of aquaculture operations			Monitoring of aquaculture operations			Minimizing harmful effects of alien species introductions		
	Highly effective	Improvements needed	Largely ineffective	Highly effective	Improvements needed	Largely ineffective	Highly effective	Improvements needed	Largely ineffective
Africa (6)	20	80	0	0	80	20	0	75	25
Asia (7)	28.6	71.4	0	50	50	0	33.3	66.7	0
Europe (4)	33.3	66.7	0	25	75	0	66.7	33.3	0
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	0	100	0	13.3	80	6.7	21.4	71.4	7.1
Near East (5)	50	50	0	50	50	0	100	0	0
Northern America (2)	50	50	0	100	0	0	50	50	0
South West Pacific (2)	50	50	0	50	50	0	100	0	0
Total (45) and averages	21.9	78.1	0	27.8	66.7	5.6	36.4	57.6	6.1

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

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

Rank	Environmental assessments of aquaculture operations	Monitoring of aquaculture operations	Minimizing harmful effects of alien species introductions
1	Strengthen institutional technical capacity (equipment and HR) (84%)	Strengthen institutional technical capacity (equipment and HR) (76.9%)	Strengthen institutional technical capacity (equipment and HR) (81%)
2	Improve legal framework (68%)	Improve periodicity and/or coverage of monitoring (73.1%)	Strengthen institutional collaboration (71.4%)
3	Improve periodicity and/or coverage of assessment (60%)	Develop an aquaculture production database (73.1%)	Improve legal framework (66.7%)
4	Introduce a certification scheme of operators (40%)	Improve legal framework (57.7%)	Carry out more research (66.7%)
5	Lower costs of assessments (28%)	Widen scope of monitoring (38.5%)	Develop contingency plans (66.7%)
6	Widen scope of assessment (24%)	Lower costs of monitoring (34.6%)	Improve periodicity and/or coverage of inspections (52.4%)
7	Other (12%)	Other (7.7%)	Raise awareness (52.4%)
8	Improve monitoring of released species (47.6%)		
9	Other (0%)		

Note: the percentage value indicated after each tabulated need represents the fraction of all countries having put a particular mechanism in place.

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries having taken measures in this sense (90.9%)	Institutional strengthening (50%)	Designing and implementing extension programmes (47.5%)	Facilitating access to credit and grant facilities (30%)	Creating an enabling investment climate (27.5%)	Improving access to markets and market information (27.5%)
Africa (6)	83.3	80	40	20	40	0
Asia (7)	100	14.3	85.7	28.6	14.3	42.9
Europe (4)	100	75	25	0	50	75
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	89.5	52.9	47.1	41.2	17.6	5.9
Near East (4)	75	33.3	33.3	0	33.3	33.3
Northern America (2)	100	50	50	50	50	50
South West Pacific (2)	100	50	0	50	50	100

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

Legend to table headers: the percentage value indicated below each measure represents the overall percentage of responding countries that reported to use it as a support mechanism. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 70.2 percent of all mechanisms reported. Other reported measures include (by descending order of importance)[Assisting farmers to organize into producer associations], [Binding stakeholders into aquaculture planning processes], [Improving access to land and titles], [Improving access to feed supplements and other inputs], [Rehabilitating degraded ecosystems].

TABLE 25

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries with a coastline	Policy framework			Legal framework			Institutional framework		
		Largely complete and enabling	Partial	None or largely insufficient	Largely complete and enabling	Partial	None or largely insufficient	Largely complete and enabling	Partial	None or largely insufficient
Africa (6)	100	50	50	0	33.3	50	16.7	16.7	83.3	0
Asia (7)	100	57.1	42.9	0	57.1	42.9	0	66.7	33.3	0
Europe (14)	85.7	50	50	0	58.3	33.3	8.3	33.3	66.7	0
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	94.7	29.4	41.2	29.4	5.6	55.6	38.9	11.1	66.7	22.2
Near East (5)	100	0	75	25	0	60	40	0	75	25
Northern America (2)	100	50	50	0	50	50	0	50	50	0
South West Pacific (2)	100	50	50	0	50	50	0	50	50	0
Total (55) and averages	94.5	40	48	12	30.8	48.1	21.2	26	64	10

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

TABLE 26

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

Type of conflict between	Region (number of responses in brackets)	Nature of conflict					Conflict resolution mechanisms in place
		Not applicable	Strong	Moderate	Light	None	
Gear types operating in the coastal area	Africa (6) (3)	0	33.3	50	0	16.7	50
	Asia (7) (5)	14.3	28.6	28.6	28.6	0	71.4
	Europe (14) (11)	14.3	0	71.4	14.3	0	78.6
	Latin America and the Caribbean (19) (15)	5.3	21.1	26.3	42.1	5.3	78.9
	Near East (5) (2)	0	0	20	60	20	40
	Northern America (2) (2)	0	0	100	0	0	100
	South West Pacific (2) (2)	0	50	0	50	0	100
	Total (55) (40) and averages	7.3	16.4	41.8	29.1	5.5	72.7
Coastal fisheries and industrial fisheries	Africa (6) (5)	0	16.7	50	33.3	0	83.3
	Asia (7) (5)	14.3	28.6	0	57.1	0	71.4
	Europe (14) (10)	21.4	7.1	28.6	35.7	7.1	71.4
	Latin America and the Caribbean (19) (10)	21.1	21.1	26.3	10.5	21.1	52.6
	Near East (5) (2)	40	0	20	0	40	40
	Northern America (2) (2)	0	0	50	50	0	100
	South West Pacific (2) (2)	0	0	50	50	0	100
	Total (55) (36) and averages	18.2	14.5	27.3	27.3	12.7	65.5
Coastal fisheries and coastal aquaculture	Africa (6) (1)	16.7	0	16.7	16.7	50	16.7
	Asia (7) (6)	14.3	14.3	0	71.4	0	85.7
	Europe (14) (10)	14.3	7.1	35.7	14.3	28.6	71.4
	Latin America and the Caribbean (19) (8)	10.5	5.3	21.1	15.8	47.4	42.1
	Near East (5) (2)	20	0	20	20	40	40
	Northern America (2) (2)	0	0	50	50	0	100
	South West Pacific (2) (2)	0	50	0	50	0	100
	Total (55) (31) and averages	12.7	7.3	21.8	25.5	32.7	56.4

Type of conflict between	Region (number of responses in brackets)	Nature of conflict					Conflict resolution mechanisms in place
		Not applicable	Strong	Moderate	Light	None	
Fisheries and recreational development	Africa (6) (1)	0	16.7	16.7	16.7	50	16.7
	Asia (7) (2)	14.3	0	0	57.1	28.6	28.6
	Europe (14) (10)	14.3	0	42.9	35.7	7.1	71.4
	Latin America and the Caribbean (19) (9)	5.3	5.3	36.8	42.1	10.5	47.4
	Near East (5) (3)	0	0	20	20	60	60
	Northern America (2) (2)	0	0	100	0	0	100
	South West Pacific (2) (2)	0	50	50	0	0	100
	Total (55) (29) and averages	7.3	5.5	32.7	34.5	20	52.7
Fisheries and port development	Africa (6) (2)	0	0	16.7	16.7	66.7	33.3
	Asia (7) (5)	14.3	0	14.3	42.9	28.6	71.4
	Europe (14) (8)	21.4	0	28.6	28.6	21.4	57.1
	Latin America and the Caribbean (19) (8)	0	10.5	26.3	31.6	31.6	42.1
	Near East (5) (1)	0	0	40	40	20	20
	Northern America (2) (2)	0	0	50	50	0	100
	South West Pacific (2) (2)	0	0	100	0	0	100
	Total (55) (28) and averages	7.3	3.6	29.1	30.9	29.1	50.9
Fisheries and mineral extraction activities	Africa (6) (3)	0	0	16.7	16.7	50	50
	Asia (7) (5)	14.3	14.3	14.3	42.9	14.3	71.4
	Europe (14) (7)	21.4	0	14.3	21.4	42.9	50
	Latin America and the Caribbean (19) (7)	26.3	36.8	0	15.8	21.1	36.8
	Near East (5) (1)	20	0	20	0	60	20
	Northern America (2) (2)	0	0	0	100	0	100
	South West Pacific (2) (2)	0	0	50	0	50	100
	Total (55) (27) and averages	18.2	14.5	10.9	21.8	32.7	49.1

Note: only answers from nations to whom the previous table was applicable are recorded in this table. The first bracketed number following the FAO region indicates the number of answers to the question summarized in the first five columns, while the number in the second bracket indicates the number of answers summarized in the last column. Conflicts listed in the table (left most column - row headers) are listed by decreasing order of relevance, using the combined average of the "Total" percentage value scored by each measure to establish the ranking.

TABLE 27
FAO Members and effective food safety and quality assurance system for fish and fisheries products
(figures in %)

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Food safety and quality assurance system		
	Largely complete and enabling	Partial	None or largely insufficient
Africa (6)	66.7	33.3	0
Asia (7)	100	0	0
Europe (4)	50	50	0
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	68.4	31.6	0
Near East (5)	100	0	0
Northern America (1)	100	0	0
South West Pacific (2)	100	0	0
Total (44) and averages	77.3	22.7	0

TABLE 28

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries reporting post-harvest losses as a problem (100%)	No measure taken (4.5%)	Food-safety regulations, codes, SOPs, and/or HACCP (63.6%)	Creating competent authority/regulatory body (40.9%)	Enhanced monitoring, control and inspections (36.4%)	Providing/improving infrastructure (36.4%)	Promoting by-product utilization value addition (29.5%)
Africa (6)	100	16.7	33.3	33.3	16.7	50	50
Asia (7)	100	0	71.4	42.9	42.9	42.9	28.6
Europe (4)	100	0	100	100	50	0	0
Latin America and the Caribbean (18)	100	0	61.1	33.3	38.9	44.4	38.9
Near East (5)	100	20	40	40	40	20	20
Northern America (2)	100	0	100	50	50	50	0
South West Pacific (2)	100	0	100	0	0	0	0

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

Legend to table headers: the percentage value indicated below each measure represents the overall percentage of responding countries that reported to have implemented it. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 79.1 percent of all mechanisms reported. Other reported measures include (by descending order of importance) [Funding Research and Development], [Encouraging founding of professional organizations], [Providing financial incentives], [Pest and residue control programmes (in aquaculture)].

TABLE 29

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries reporting that bycatch problems do exist in their fisheries (100%)	No measure taken (11.4%)	Awareness raising and training/dialogue with processors (47.7%)	Fostering adoption of new processing techniques and technology (36.4%)	Funding Research and Development programmes and/or pilot projects (31.8%)	Mandatory landing of bycatch in given fisheries (29.5%)	Improvement of handling infrastructures and conservation facilities (25%)
Africa (6)	100	16.7	66.7	16.7	16.7	33.3	50
Asia (7)	100	0	28.6	57.1	42.9	28.6	42.9
Europe (4)	100	0	50	0	50	25	25
Latin America and the Caribbean (18)	100	16.7	38.9	44.4	22.2	27.8	22.2
Near East (5)	100	20	60	40	20	40	0
Northern America (2)	100	0	100	50	50	0	0
South West Pacific (2)	100	0	50	0	100	50	0

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

Legend to table headers: the percentage value indicated below each measure represents the overall percentage of responding countries that reported to have implemented it. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 76.5 percent of all mechanisms reported. Other reported measures include (by descending order of importance). [Strengthening relationship between producers, processors and distributors], [Assist processors accessing new markets], [Force operators to sell all bycatch locally], [Encourage immediate onboard processing], [Providing financial incentives for bycatch related commercial activities] .

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Processors	Consumers
Africa (6) (6)	66.7	0
Asia (7) (7)	85.7	42.9
Europe (4) (4)	100	50
Latin America and the Caribbean (18) (17)	72.2	41.2
Near East (5) (5)	100	40
Northern America (2) (2)	100	50
South West Pacific (2) (2)	100	0
Total (44) (43) and averages	81.8	34.9

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

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries reporting this issue as a problem (100%)	No measure taken (7%)	Enhanced fisheries control and inspections (53.5%)	Implementing product traceability systems (32.6%)	Import restrictions for non-certified products (32.6%)	Enhanced customs and border controls (30.2%)	Trade restrictions for certain products (27.9%)
Africa (6)	100	33.3	50	50	16.7	33.3	0
Asia (7)	100	0	28.6	42.9	28.6	28.6	42.9
Europe (4)	100	0	75	25	50	75	25
Latin America and the Caribbean (18)	100	5.6	50	33.3	33.3	5.6	38.9
Near East (4)	100	0	50	25	75	100	0
Northern America (2)	100	0	100	0	0	50	50
South West Pacific (2)	100	0	100	0	0	0	0

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

Legend to table headers: the percentage value indicated below each measure represents the overall percentage of responding countries that reported to have implemented it. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 71 percent of all mechanisms reported. Other reported measures include (by descending order of importance), [Implementing NPOA-IUU and/or NPOA-Sharks], [Tougher sanctions], [Licensing processors, brokers and dealers], [Awareness raising and training], [Limiting sourcing to licensed operators].

TABLE 32
State of stock assessment in FAO Member countries

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Number of stocks for which reliable estimates are available	Fraction of key national stocks for which stock assessments are available
Africa (4)	12	21-30%
Asia (6)	238	21-30%
Europe (4)	127	81-90%
Latin America and the Caribbean (13)	107	21-30%
Near East (0)	–	–
Northern America (1)	184	61-70%
South West Pacific (2)	552	51-60%
Total (30) and averages	1 220	31-40%

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Timely, complete and reliable statistics on catch and fishing effort are collected	Sufficient qualified personnel exist to generate data in support of sustainable fisheries management
Africa (6) (6)	66.7	33.3
Asia (7) (7)	100	71.4
Europe (4) (4)	50	100
Latin America and the Caribbean (19) (17)	68.4	47.1
Near East (5) (5)	100	80
Northern America (1) (1)	100	100
South West Pacific (2) (2)	100	100
Total (44) (42) and averages	77.3	61.9

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

TABLE 34
Requirements for additional qualified personnel by subject area (figures in %)

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Fish biology and stock assessment (87.5%)	Fisheries statistics and sampling (81.2%)	Fisheries economics (37.5%)	Socio-economic analysis (25%)	Inspectors and observers (MCS) (18.8%)
Africa (6)	100	75	50	25	25
Asia (7)	100	50	0	0	50
Europe (4)	–	–	–	–	–
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	77.8	88.9	44.4	33.3	11.1
Near East (5)	100	100	0	0	0
Northern America (1)	–	–	–	–	–
South West Pacific (2)	–	–	–	–	–

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

Legend to table headers: the percentage value indicated below each measure represents the overall percentage of countries that reported to apply the same measure. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 87 percent of all reported measures. Other reported measures include (by descending order of importance) [Environmental/ecosystem appraisal], [Post-harvest technology and processing], [Gear technology].

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	In-port/ landing site sampling surveys (90.9%)	Routine data collection (logbooks, landings, vessel and licence registers) (88.6%)	Historical data (77.3%)	Processing, market and trade statistics (75%)	Research vessel surveys (68.2%)
Africa (6)	66.7	83.3	66.7	100	66.7
Asia (7)	100	85.7	71.4	100	100
Europe (4)	100	100	100	100	100
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	89.5	84.2	89.5	63.2	52.6
Near East (5)	100	100	20	40	40
Northern America (1)	100	100	100	0	100
South West Pacific (2)	100	100	100	100	100

Note: the five tabulated data sources represent a cumulative 47.8 percent of all reported sources. Other important data sources included (in descending order)[FAO and/or RFMO statistics], [Socio-economic surveys], [Surveillance/VMS/inspection (MCS) data], [On-board sampling from commercial vessels], [Comparative data from similar fisheries/ecosystems], [Mark/recapture surveys], [Discard and/or bycatch monitoring], [Frame surveys], [Underwater visual census / aerial abundance surveys].

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries reporting that management efforts are undermined by data gaps (93%)	Stock status data (45%)	Ecosystem data (45%)	Effort data (small-scale to industrial) (42.5%)	IUU fishing and/or MCS data (40%)	Catch data (small-scale to industrial) (27.5%)
Africa (6)	100	83.3	33.3	66.7	33.3	33.3
Asia (7)	85.7	83.3	50	50	33.3	0
Europe (4)	100	75	25	50	25	50
Latin America and the Caribbean (18)	100	22.2	38.9	44.4	38.9	38.9
Near East (5)	80	25	100	0	100	0
Northern America (1)	100	0	0	0	0	0
South West Pacific (2)	50	0	100	0	0	0

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

Legend to table headers: the five tabulated data gaps represent a cumulative 71.4 percent of all reported sources. Other important lacking data sources included (in descending order) [Not landed data], [Socio-economic data], [Capacity utilization data (small-scale to industrial)], [Market/trade/export data], [Technical fleet capacity data (small-scale to industrial)], [Historical/long term data series], [Landed data].

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries reporting to routinely monitor the state of the marine environment	Countries performing routine monitoring of:		
		Oceanographic parameters (chemo-physical and biological data)	Coastal parameters (chemo-physical and biological data)	Coastal and offshore habitats
Africa (6)	83.3	20	40	80
Asia (7)	85.7	83.3	83.3	83.3
Europe (4)	75	100	100	66.7
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	47.4	55.6	100	88.9
Near East (5)	60	100	100	100
Northern America (1)	100	100	100	0
South West Pacific (2)	100	100	100	50
Total (44) and averages	65.9	69	86.2	79.3

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

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Formal research to assess/predict impact of climate change in fisheries	Formal programs to address climate change in fisheries*
Africa (6)	83.3	20
Asia (7)	85.7	83.3
Europe (4)	75	100
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	47.4	55.6
Near East (5)	60	100
Northern America (1)	100	100
South West Pacific (2)	100	100
Total (44) and averages	65.9	69

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

TABLE 39

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries having developed and started to implement an NPOA-Capacity	Countries having launched the preliminary fishing capacity assessment	Status of the assessment*		Countries not yet started, but planning to commence the assessment**	Countries implementing management measures to adjust capacity *
			Ongoing	Finished		
Africa (6)	66.7	33.3	100	0	0	16.7
Asia (7)	100	85.7	57.1	42.9	–	14.3
Europe (4)	100	75	100	0	–	25
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	47.4	36.8	88.9	11.1	70	10.5
Near East (5)	60	60	100	0	50	40
Northern America (1)	100	100	0	100	–	0
South West Pacific (2)	0	0	–	–	0	0
Total (44) and averages	63.6	50	82.1	17.9	50	15.9

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

TABLE 40

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Using key fleet and vessel characteristics (78.6%)	Using potential catch to be harvested by fleet (39.3%)	Using potential fishing effort generated by fleet (32.1%)	Using more complex approaches (DEA, bioeconomic analysis...) (25%)	Other (14.3%)
Africa (6)	50	75	50	25	0
Asia (7)	85.7	57.1	28.6	28.6	14.3
Europe (4)	100	25	0	50	25
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	88.9	22.2	33.3	11.1	22.2
Near East (5)	66.7	33.3	66.7	0	0
Northern America (1)	0	0	0	100	0
South West Pacific (2)	–	–	–	–	–

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

TABLE 41

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries flagging and/or authorizing fishing vessels to fish on the high seas	Supplying a record of such vessels to FAO? *	Not supplying a record, but intending to do so in future **
Africa (6)	66.7	75	–
Asia (7)	85.7	66.7	50
Europe (4)	75	100	–
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	68.4	69.2	75
Near East (5)	40	100	–
Northern America (1)	100	0	100
South West Pacific (2)	100	100	–
Total (44) and averages	70.5	74.2	71.4

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

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries where fishing overcapacity is recognized as a problem (63.6%)	None (3.6%)	Freeze on current total number of licences/ vessels (42.9%)	Monitoring and research into fishing overcapacity (39.3%)	Capacity "self-adjusting" quota system (17.9%)	NPOA-Capacity development and implementation (14.3%)	Freeze on capacity-related technical elements (14.3%)
Africa (6)	83.3	0	60	40	40	20	20
Asia (7)	85.7	0	83.3	50	83.3	0	16.7
Europe (4)	100	0	75	50	0	25	0
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	42.1	12.5	37.5	37.5	25	25	12.5
Near East (5)	80	0	75	50	25	0	25
Northern America (1)	0	–	–	–	–	–	–
South West Pacific (2)	50	0	100	0	100	100	0

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

Legend to table headers: the percentage value indicated below each measure represents the overall percentage of responding countries that reported to use it as a mitigation mechanism. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 84.7 percent of all mechanisms reported. Other reported measures include (by descending order of importance)[Elimination of subsidies and/or tax incentives], [Increasing licence, registration and other fees], [Freeze on new acquisitions/investments].

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	None (10.7%)	Public buy-back and decommissioning schemes (32.1%)	Capacity "self-adjusting" quota system (25%)	Promotion of alternative income generating activities (25%)	NPOA-capacity development and implementation (21.4%)	Transfer of capacity and/or vessel reconversion schemes (21.4%)
Africa (5)	20	0	0	20	20	40
Asia (6)	0	33.3	16.7	33.3	50	16.7
Europe (4)	25	75	50	0	0	25
Latin America and the Caribbean (8)	12.5	25	37.5	25	12.5	12.5
Near East (4)	0	25	0	50	25	25
Northern America (0)	–	–	–	–	–	–
South West Pacific (1)	0	100	100	0	0	0

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

Legend to table headers: the percentage value indicated below each measure represents the overall percentage of responding countries that reported to use it as a mitigation mechanism. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 68.6 percent of all mechanisms reported. Other reported measures include (by descending order of importance)[Capacity-oriented vessel replacement rules], [Monitoring and research into fishing overcapacity], [Elimination of subsidies and/or tax incentives], [Freeze on new acquisitions/investments].

TABLE 44

IPOA capacity: Steps taken to prevent further negative impacts of existing fishing overcapacity on stocks (figures in %)

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	None (3.6%)	Spatial closures (67.9%)	Seasonal closures of particular fisheries (64.3%)	Technical restrictions on vessels and gear (53.6%)	Conservative/precautionary TACs and quotas (25%)	Limitation on number of fishing days (14.3%)
Africa (5)	0	60	100	20	40	0
Asia (6)	0	83.3	50	50	16.7	0
Europe (4)	0	75	25	75	50	75
Latin America and the Caribbean (8)	12.5	62.5	62.5	62.5	12.5	0
Near East (4)	0	75	75	50	0	25
Northern America (0)	–	–	–	–	–	–
South West Pacific (1)	0	0	100	100	100	0

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

Legend to table headers: the percentage value indicated below each measure represents the overall percentage of responding countries that reported to use it as a mitigation mechanism. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 95.5 percent of all mechanisms reported. Other reported measures include (by descending order of importance)[Recovery schemes/closures of given fisheries].

TABLE 45

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries where sharks are caught (target or bycatch)	Assessment of shark stocks to determine the need for a shark plan			NPOA-sharks	
		Assessment conducted	Assessment concluded that an NPOA-sharks is needed *	Assessment not conducted, but planning to **	NPOA-sharks is in place ***	Intention to develop an NPOA-sharks ***
Africa (6)	50	33.3	100	100	100	–
Asia (7)	85.7	83.3	100	100	80	100
Europe (4)	50	100	100	–	100	–
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	73.7	50	100	85.7	71.4	100
Near East (5)	40	0	–	50	–	–
Northern America (1)	100	100	100	–	100	–
South West Pacific (2)	100	100	100	–	100	–
Total (44) and averages	68.2	60	100	83.3	83.3	100

Note: 68.2 percent of responding FAO Members indicated that sharks were caught in waters under their jurisdiction, or caught by national fishing units on the high seas, as target species, or as bycatch. Percentage values in this table only refer to that pool of nations. Figures in the column marked (*) only refer to the group of countries that have conducted an assessment. Figures in the column marked (**) only refer to the group of countries which have not yet conducted an assessment (40%). Figures in the columns marked (***) only refer to the group of countries that concluded that a plan was needed.

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries where longline, trawl and/or gillnet fishing was conducted in waters under their jurisdiction	Assessment of longline, trawl and/or gillnet fisheries to determine the need for a seabird plan			NPOA-seabirds	
		Assessment conducted	Assessment concluded that an NPOA-seabirds is needed *	Assessment not conducted, but planning to**	NPOA-seabirds is in place***	Intention to develop an NPOA-seabirds***
Africa (5)	80	0	–	66.7	–	–
Asia (6)	83.3	75	100	0	66.7	100
Europe (4)	100	50	100	50	0	100
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	78.9	100	100	80	80	100
Near East (5)	80	–	–	75	–	–
Northern America (1)	100	100	100	–	100	–
South West Pacific (2)	100	100	100	–	50	100
Total (42) and averages	83.3	80	100	70	66.7	100

Note: 83.3 percent of responding FAO Members indicated that longline fishing was conducted in waters under their jurisdiction, or by national fishing units on the high seas or in waters of third States. Percentage values in this table only refer to that pool of nations. Figures in the column marked (*) only refer to the group of countries that have conducted an assessment. Figures in the column marked (**) only refer to the group of countries that has not yet conducted an assessment (20%). Figures in the columns marked (***) only refer to the group of countries that concluded that a plan was needed.

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries involved in longline fisheries (67.4%)	None (44.8%)	Observer programme (34.5%)	Legal framework improvement (27.6%)	Spatial measures (13.8%)	Seabird avoidance Plan (10.3%)	Mandatory release of birds (6.9%)
Africa (6)	33.3	100	0	0	0	0	0
Asia (6)	83.3	20	60	60	40	0	20
Europe (4)	75	33.3	66.7	0	33.3	66.7	0
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	57.9	45.5	45.5	45.5	27.3	0	9.1
Near East (5)	100	80	0	0	0	20	20
Northern America (1)	100	0	100	100	100	0	0
South West Pacific (2)	100	0	100	50	50	50	0

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

Legend to table headers: the percentage value indicated below each measure represents the overall percentage of responding countries that reported to use it as a mitigation mechanism. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 88.4 percent of all mechanisms reported. Other reported measures include (by descending order of importance) [Deploying sets at night], [Strategic discarding of refuse/removing hooks], [Mandatory workshops/codes of practice].

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries involved in trawl and/or gillnet fisheries (54.8%)	None (56.5%)	Observer programme (21.7%)	Bird scaring devices (17.4%)	Preliminary research (17.4%)	Spatial measures (13%)	Seabird avoidance plan (8.7%)
Africa (6)	50	66.7	0	0	0	33.3	0
Asia (6)	50	66.7	33.3	33.3	33.3	0	0
Europe (4)	75	33.3	33.3	0	0	0	66.7
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	42.1	75	25	25	25	0	0
Near East (4)	75	66.7	33.3	0	0	33.3	0
Northern America (1)	100	0	0	0	0	100	100
South West Pacific (2)	100	0	0	100	50	50	0

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

Legend to table headers: the percentage value indicated below each measure represents the overall percentage of responding countries that reported to use it as a mitigation mechanism. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 80.8 percent of all mechanisms reported. Other reported measures include (by descending order of importance) [Fishing at night], [Strategic discarding of refuse], [Mandatory workshops/codes of practice].

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries where IUU fishing is perceived as a problem	Drafting and implementing an NPOA-IUU		
		Countries having drafted an NPOA-IUU *	Countries having started to formally implemented their NPOA-IUU **	Countries intending to draft an NPOA-IUU *
Africa (6)	100	33.3	50	100
Asia (7)	100	71.4	60	50
Europe (4)	75	100	100	–
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	84.2	50	75	100
Near East (5)	60	66.7	100	100
Northern America (1)	100	100	100	–
South West Pacific (2)	100	50	100	100
Total (44) and averages	86.4	57.9	77.3	93.3

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

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries where IUU fishing is perceived as a problem* (86.4%)	None (86.4%)	Legal framework improvement (60.5%)	Bilateral and regional collaboration (39.5%)	Improved port State control measures (28.9%)	Improved flag State controls (21.1%)	Developing and implementing NPOA-IUU (18.4%)
Africa (6)	100	0	66.7	50	50	50	0
Asia (7)	100	0	57.1	71.4	42.9	0	28.6
Europe (4)	75	0	100	100	66.7	33.3	66.7
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	84.2	18.8	87.5	62.5	31.2	25	12.5
Near East (5)	60	66.7	66.7	33.3	33.3	33.3	0
Northern America (1)	100	0	100	0	0	100	100
South West Pacific (2)	100	0	100	50	50	50	50

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

Legend to table headers: the percentage value indicated below each measure represents the overall percentage of responding countries that reported to use it as a mitigation mechanism. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 84.5 percent of all mechanisms reported. Other reported measures include (by descending order of importance) [Market-related measures], [Control over nationals], [Research].

TABLE 51**FAO Strategy for Improving Information on Status and Trends in Capture Fisheries (Strategy-STF) (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries aware of the Strategy-STF	Plans and programs are being implemented for the Strategy-STF	Component parts of such programmes include:		
			Activities to improve data collection	Activities to improve data analysis	Activities to improve data dissemination
Africa (6)	66.7	25	100	100	100
Asia (7)	85.7	66.7	100	100	100
Europe (4)	100	25	100	100	100
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	63.2	66.7	100	87.5	62.5
Near East (4)	75	100	100	100	100
Northern America (1)	100	0	–	–	–
South West Pacific (2)	50	0	–	–	–
Total (43) and averages	72.1	54.8	100	94.1	82.4

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

TABLE 52**FAO Strategy for Improving Information on Status and Trends in Aquaculture (Strategy-StA) (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries aware of the Strategy-StA	Plans and programs are being implemented for the Strategy-StA	Component parts of such programmes include:		
			Activities to improve data collection	Activities to improve data analysis	Activities to improve data dissemination
Africa (6)	66.7	50	100	100	100
Asia (7)	85.7	50	100	100	100
Europe (4)	50	100	100	100	100
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	57.9	45.5	100	80	60
Near East (4)	75	100	100	100	100
Northern America (1)	100	100	100	100	100
South West Pacific (2)	0	–	–	–	–
Total (43) and averages	62.8	59.3	100	93.8	87.5

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

TABLE 53

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	1993 FAO Compliance Agreement		1995 UN Fish Stocks Agreement		2009 Agreement on Port State Measures	
	Party to the Agreement	Intention to become a Party	Party to the Agreement	Intention to become a Party	Party to the Agreement	Intention to become a Party
Africa (6)	66.7	50	66.7	50	66.7	50
Asia (7)	42.9	25	57.1	0	0	33.3
Europe (4)	75	0	75	0	75	100
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	52.6	42.9	57.9	25	42.1	0
Near East (5)	60	0	60	0	60	50
Northern America (1)	100	–	100	–	0	100
South West Pacific (2)	100	–	100	–	0	100
Total (44) and averages	59.1	31.2	63.6	18.8	40.9	34.8

TABLE 54

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries reporting to face some constraints in implementing the Code (91.1%)	Insufficient budgetary resources (46.3%)	Insufficient human resources (41.5%)	Lack of awareness and information about the Code (36.6%)	Inadequate scientific research, statistics and information access (34.1%)	Incomplete policy and/or legal frameworks (26.8%)
Africa (6)	100	83.3	33.3	50	50	0
Asia (7)	85.7	16.7	0	50	16.7	33.3
Europe (4)	100	25	25	0	75	25
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	100	47.4	63.2	36.8	26.3	36.8
Near East (5)	80	25	50	50	50	25
Northern America (2)	100	100	0	0	0	0
South West Pacific (2)	0	–	–	–	–	–

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

Legend to table headers: the percentage value indicated below each constraint represents the overall percentage of responding countries that reported it. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 66.7 percent of all constraints reported. Other reported measures include (by descending order of importance) [Institutional weaknesses], [Difficult socio-economic climate], [Insufficient/inadequate MCS arrangements], [Insufficient capacities of primary actors], [Overcapacity and overcapitalization in key fisheries].

TABLE 55

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

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	More training and awareness raising (53.7%)	Access to more budgetary means (43.9%)	Improve institutional structures and collaboration (41.5%)	Access to more human resources (31.7%)	Improve research, statistics, and access to information (31.7%)	Improve MCS arrangements (19.5%)
Africa (6)	33.3	83.3	66.7	33.3	50	0
Asia (6)	50	16.7	33.3	0	16.7	16.7
Europe (4)	0	0	50	25	75	50
Latin America and the Caribbean (19)	68.4	52.6	42.1	47.4	26.3	15.8
Near East (4)	75	0	25	25	25	50
Northern America (2)	50	100	0	0	0	0
South West Pacific (0)	–	–	–	–	–	–

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

Legend to table headers: the percentage value indicated below each solution represents the overall percentage of responding countries that reported it. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 72.8 percent of all solutions reported. Other reported measures include (by descending order of importance) [Align policy and/or legal frameworks with the Code], [Improve socio-economic situation of fishing and/or aquaculture sector(s)], [Strengthen capacity and role of primary stakeholders], [Improve analysis and management planning processes].

TABLE 56

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

	Technical Guidelines to the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries	Global distribution and availability
1	Fishing Operations	83.3
1.1	Vessel Monitoring Systems	83.3
2	Precautionary Approach to Capture Fisheries and Species Introductions	76.2
3	Integration of Fisheries into Coastal Area Management	73.8
4	Fisheries Management	78.6
4.1	Conservation and Management of Sharks	73.8
4.2	Ecosystem approach to Fisheries	83.3
4.2.1	Best Practices in Ecosystem Modelling for Informing an Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries	64.3
4.3	Managing Fishing Capacity	61.9
5	Aquaculture Development	85.7
5.1	Good Aquaculture Feed Manufacturing Practice	61.9
5.2	Health Management for Responsible Movement of Live Aquatic Animals	52.4
5.3	Genetic Resource Management	50
6	Inland Fisheries	76.2
6.1	Rehabilitation of Inland Waters for Fisheries	50
7	Responsible Fish Utilization	71.4
8	Indicators for Sustainable Development of Marine Capture Fisheries	69
9	Implementation of the International Plan of Action to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing	73.8
10	Increasing the contribution of small-scale fisheries to poverty alleviation and food security	59.5
11	Responsible Fish Trade	50
12	Information and Knowledge Sharing	52.4