



Food  
and  
Agriculture  
Organization  
of  
the  
United  
Nations

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

Organización  
de las  
Naciones  
Unidas  
para la  
Agricultura  
y la  
Alimentación

**WESTERN CENTRAL ATLANTIC FISHERY COMMISSION**

Eleventh Session

**LESSER ANTILLES FISHERIES COMMITTEE**

Eighth Session

**St. George's, Grenada, 21-24 October 2003**

**PROGRESS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CODE OF CONDUCT  
FOR RESPONSIBLE FISHERIES IN THE WECAFC REGION**

## SUMMARY

The document reviews the progress made in the implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries in the region served by the Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission (WECAFC).

## INTRODUCTION

1. At its Tenth Session, WECAFC recommended that FAO should report on the progress made by each country in implementing the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries. For a variety of reasons, it was felt that the States should receive regular updates on the progress made by the States in implementing the Code in their region and subregion. The information provided in this report has been furnished by the member countries and has been compiled and analysed on the basis of the self-evaluation questionnaires distributed by FAO. This information also figures in the report<sup>1</sup> on the implementation of the Code submitted by FAO at the Twenty-fifth Meeting of the Committee on Fisheries (COFI) in accordance with Article 4 of the Code of Conduct.
2. In all, 57 percent of the member countries of FAO (105 countries) have completed and returned the questionnaires. Of this total, 17 of the respondent countries are in the WECAFC region<sup>2</sup> (i.e., 61 percent of the 28 member countries of WECAFC). WECAFC is one of the 19 regional fishery bodies that have responded to the questionnaire.

<sup>1</sup> The document entitled, "Progress in the Implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries and Related International Plans of Action" (COFI/2003/3) has been used as a source of information for the preparation of this report.

<sup>2</sup> Bahamas, Barbados, Brazil, Colombia, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Saint Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago, United States of America and Venezuela.

## **ACTION TAKEN BY FAO TO PROMOTE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CODE OF CONDUCT**

3. FAO conducts a wide range of activities to promote the implementation of the Code of Conduct. In fact, the entire Programme of Work and Budget of the Fisheries Department is, to a greater or lesser extent, aimed at implementing the Code. As an important part of the effort to foster an understanding of the Code, its text is distributed along with the technical guidelines that have been prepared to support its application. Over the past two years, more than 13,000 copies of the Code and the guidelines have been printed up for distribution. The Code is now available in over 40 languages. During the past two years, two technical guidelines have been published that directly concern the field of aquaculture: “Aquaculture Development, Suppl.1. Good Aquaculture Feed Manufacturing Practice”, which complements “FAO Technical Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries – Aquaculture Development – 5” published in 1999, and “FAO Technical Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries – Inland Fisheries – 6.” A CD-ROM containing documents related to the Code of Conduct has also been prepared and distributed.
4. The steps taken to promote the implementation of the Code as it relates to WECAFC have taken the form of the inter-sessional activities covered in reports WECAFC/XI/03/5 and WECAFC/XI/03/6.
5. Meetings aimed at improving the implementation of the Code of Conduct which have been held since the last session of COFI and which were either sponsored by or organized in cooperation with FAO include the following:
  - March 2001: FAO and the Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission (WECAFC), Meeting of Fisheries Managers and Ministers of the WECAFC Ad Hoc Working Group on Shrimp and Groundfish Resources in the Brazil-Guianas Shelf, Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago.
  - March 2002: FAO and WECAFC, First Regional Conference on the Sustainability of Fisheries Resources in the Brazil-Guianas Shelf, Paramaribo, Suriname.
  - September 2002: FAO and WECAFC, Second workshop on management of the Caribbean spiny lobster fisheries in the WECAFC area, Havana, Cuba.
  - November 2002: FAO and WECAFC, Workshop on the evaluation of straddling fish stocks shared by Trinidad and Tobago and Venezuela (WECAFC Ad Hoc Working Group on Shrimp and Groundfish Resources in the Brazil-Guianas Shelf), Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago.

## **ACTION TAKEN BY MEMBER COUNTRIES OF THE REGION TO IMPLEMENT THE CODE OF CONDUCT**

6. The information included in this report has been selected, insofar as possible, with a view to the coverage of issues that directly or indirectly concern fishery and aquaculture activities within the WECAFC jurisdiction. Since this information refers to the Latin American countries that completed the questionnaire, it may not be entirely applicable to all the member countries of the region, even though it does come from a large sampling of them. Information is also provided on countries of the region that do not belong to WECAFC when, for technical reasons, it has been deemed useful to do so for the purposes of this report.

## Objectives and issues addressed in the Code of Conduct

7. The member countries were invited to rank the Code's ten objectives from 1 (not very relevant) to 5 (extremely relevant). The group of Latin American and Caribbean countries<sup>3</sup> underscored the importance of most of the objectives, and particularly Objectives A, B, F, G, I and J. The North American countries<sup>4</sup> ranked all the objectives as very relevant.

**Table 1**  
**PRIORITIZATION OF THE OBJECTIVES OF THE CODE OF CONDUCT BY THE**  
**MEMBER COUNTRIES OF THE LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN REGION**  
**(Ranking: 1=not very relevant, 3=relevant, 5=extremely relevant)**

Objectives	1	2	3	4	5
Objective A: Establish principles for responsible fishing and fisheries activities, taking into account all their relevant biological, technological, economic, social, environmental and commercial aspects				1	20
Objective B: Establish principles and criteria for the implementation of policies for conservation of fisheries resources and fisheries management and development			1	1	19
Objective C: Serve as an instrument of reference to improve the legal and institutional framework required for the implementation of appropriate measures			2	7	12
Objective D: Provide guidance in the formulation and implementation of international agreements and other legal instruments			6	6	9
Objective E: Facilitate and promote cooperation in conservation of fisheries resources and fisheries management and development			5	7	9
Objective F: Promote the contribution of fisheries to food security and food quality, giving priority to the nutritional needs of local communities			3	5	13
Objective G: Promote protection of living aquatic resources and their environments and coastal areas			1	9	11
Objective H: Promote the trade of fish and fishery products in conformity with relevant international rules			6	6	8
Objective I: Promote research on fisheries as well as on associated ecosystems and relevant environmental factors			3	5	13
Objective J: Provide standards of conduct for all persons involved in the fisheries sector			3	6	12

8. The member countries were also invited to rank the eight issues addressed by the Code on a scale ranging from high priority to low priority (Table 2). Not all the Latin American

<sup>3</sup> Argentina, Bahamas, Barbados, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Saint Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela.

<sup>4</sup> Canada and the United States of America.

and Caribbean countries that responded to the questionnaire<sup>5</sup> ranked all the issues. A vast majority of them placed a high priority on fisheries management. High priority was also assigned to the development of aquaculture, fishery research, post-harvest practices and management of inland fisheries. More than 60 percent of the countries that ranked this last issue felt it was either a priority or high priority subject.

**Table 2**  
**PRIORITIZATION OF ISSUES COVERED IN THE CODE OF CONDUCT BY THE COUNTRIES OF THE LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN REGION**

<b>Issue</b>	<b>High priority</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Low priority</b>
Fisheries management	18	3	
Fishing operations	7	14	
Aquaculture development	9	8	3
Integration of fisheries into coastal area management	4	3	2
Post-harvest practices	6	8	7
Trade	4	6	2
Fisheries research	11	5	4
Inland fisheries management	2	9	8

### **Compliance of national laws and policies with the Code**

9. Most of the countries in the region reported that their fishery policies and legislation are either entirely or partially in compliance with the Code (7 countries reported total compliance and 13 reported partial compliance). In order to implement the Code on a sustainable basis, national policies and legislation must reflect the spirit of the Code, since they form the foundation for its implementation. A number of countries in the region have reported on the steps they are taking to review their fishery policies and legislation as a means of facilitating the Code's implementation.

### **Fishery management**

10. Countries of the region have reported the development of a total of 130 marine fishery management plans (62 percent of which have been implemented)<sup>6</sup> and 26 inland fishery management plans (63 percent of which have been implemented).<sup>7</sup>
11. The countries were invited to indicate whether or not their inland fishery management plans include measures designed to promote responsible resource use in accordance with the principles of the Code (Table 3). The number of responses exceeded 50 percent of the total number of countries in the region that completed the questionnaire, with the exception of the question as to whether the level of fishing is commensurate with the status of fishery resources. In this latter case, few answers were provided. Most of the countries reported that their management plans included most of the measures mentioned in the questionnaire. The areas that appear to be the weakest (more negative responses than positive ones) refer to benchmarking and fishing capacity. Various countries reported that when benchmarks were not utilized, other indicators are used in their place, such as output levels, capture and reproduction data, statistics on catches and size

<sup>5</sup> Argentina, Bahamas, Barbados, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Saint Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela

<sup>6</sup> Barbados, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, El Salvador, Guyana, Mexico, Nicaragua, Peru, Trinidad and Tobago, and Uruguay.

<sup>7</sup> Brazil, Colombia, El Salvador, Guyana, Mexico, Nicaragua, Peru and Uruguay

analyses. Some countries reported that their plans contain such measures as the setting of limits by fishery area and for given species, the creation of reserves and protected areas, mandatory inspections of landings, special checks of artisanal fishermen and provisions for community-based fishery management.

**Table 3**  
**MEASURES INCLUDED IN FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLANS OF COUNTRIES IN THE**  
**LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN REGION AIMED AT PROMOTING**  
**RESPONSIBLE RESOURCE USE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CODE OF CONDUCT**

Measure	Yes	No	Partially
Ensure that the level of fishing effort is commensurate with the status of fishery resources	4	2	
Permit depleted fish stocks to recover	11	3	
Contain specific benchmarks as target levels for fish stocks	6	7	
Selectivity of fishing gear	11	2	1
Ban destructive fishing methods and practices	11	3	
Address the issue of fishing capacity, including the economic conditions under which the industry operates	6	7	
Address the question of aquatic habitats' and ecosystems' biodiversity, including the identification of specific habitats	10	3	
Provide for participation by stakeholders in fishery management decision-making	10	4	
Provide for the protection of endangered species	11	3	
Take into account the interests of small-scale fishers	11	3	

12. A number of countries stated that they were reaching or exceeding their benchmarks or other management indicators.<sup>8</sup> They indicated that, when this occurs, they take other types of steps to deal with the situation. Such measures include fines, reductions in permit issuance, strict area restrictions, the establishment of fishing and capture seasons for individual species, tighter restrictions on permissible fishing gear, reductions in the countries' fishing effort through the use of strict controls on shipping operations, and limitations or bans on the purchase of certain species. Many member countries of the region reported that they were employing a precautionary approach.<sup>9</sup>

### **Fishing operations**

13. Some countries<sup>10</sup> indicated that they had taken steps to ensure that ships fishing in their own exclusive economic zones (EEZs), in the EEZs of other States and in international waters were duly authorized to do so, while other Members<sup>11</sup> noted that their shipments were partially authorized (Table 4). The North American Members<sup>12</sup> indicated that, in general, all or most of their ships were duly authorized to engage in fishing operations.

<sup>8</sup> Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Trinidad and Tobago and Uruguay.

<sup>9</sup> Argentina, Bahamas, Barbados, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Mexico, Nicaragua, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela.

<sup>10</sup> Argentina, Barbados, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominica, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Saint Lucia, Uruguay and Venezuela.

<sup>11</sup> Bahamas, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Mexico, and Trinidad and Tobago.

<sup>12</sup> Canada and the United States of America.

**Table 4**  
**OPERATIONS IN MARINE CAPTURE FISHERIES**  
**IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CODE OF CONDUCT**

Response	¿Are vessels duly authorized to engage in fishing operations?		¿Have steps been taken to limit bycatches and discards?		Have ship surveillance systems been implemented?		
	Yes	Partial	Yes	Partial	Yes	Partial	Intention to do so exists
<b>Total</b>	9	7	6	5	2	9	3

14. The countries use different methods to ensure that fishing operations are duly authorized. These methods include comprehensive licensing arrangements, vessel registers, checks to ensure that vessels comply with international safety regulations, quotas, supervision of transshipments, on-board observers, monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS), vessel monitoring systems (VMS), surface and aerial surveillance, at-sea inspection, port inspections, gear checks, heavy penalties for violations, consultations with fishers, fishing communities and the industry concerning fishing policies and regulations, collection and sharing of information on a regional basis and cooperation with regional fishery bodies (RFBs). Some Members also stressed the importance of accepting recently concluded international fishery instruments as a means of ensuring that fishing operations are conducted responsibly and establishing community-based fisheries management for small-scale fisheries.
15. Many countries<sup>13</sup> reported that they have taken measures to limit bycatches and discards in their fishing operations, while others<sup>14</sup> indicated that they had done so to a partial extent (Table 4). Measures that have been adopted to limit bycatches and discards include gear restrictions, modifications and controls (e.g., turtle excluder devices (TEDs) and bycatch excluder devices (BEDs) in trawl fisheries), the provision of information and education about the harmful impact of environmentally unfriendly gear, closed seasons and areas (e.g., bans on trawling in near-shore areas, exclusion of commercial vessels from artisanal fishing areas), the establishment of size limits, on-board observers, checks on rejects at sea and in port, bans on the transport and sale of undersized fish, the establishment of bycatch and discard quotas for fishers, prohibitions on discarding at sea, designation of marine reserves, the prohibition of targeting bycatch or undersized species, and the imposition of penalties or fines for violations.
16. Many countries are moving towards the implementation of VMS (Table 4). Some Members<sup>15</sup> indicated that they have deployed VMS on their vessels, and many of them<sup>16</sup> have done so to a partial extent. Others<sup>17</sup> reported that they intend to implement VMS. There appears to be no controversy with respect to VMS as such. Rather, it is simply a question of resources and capacity. Twenty-nine Members reported that they have not implemented VMS.

### **Aquaculture development**

<sup>13</sup> Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Dominica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Peru, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela; Canada and the United States of America.

<sup>14</sup> Bahamas, Brazil, Dominican Republic, Mexico and Saint Lucia.

<sup>15</sup> Chile, Dominica, El Salvador and Honduras.

<sup>16</sup> Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Guyana, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela; Canada and United States of America.

<sup>17</sup> Guatemala, Haiti, Saint Lucia, and Trinidad and Tobago.

17. The countries of the region reported that they have a total of 20 codes or instruments at their disposal for the promotion of responsible aquaculture (Table 5). Codes promoted by government<sup>18</sup> and industry<sup>19</sup> are the most numerous.

**Table 5**  
**NUMBER OF COUNTRIES IN THE LATIN AMERICAN REGION THAT HAVE DEVELOPED AND ADOPTED A CODE OR INSTRUMENT OF BEST PRACTICES FOR RESPONSIBLE AQUACULTURE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CODE OF CONDUCT, BY PROMOTING SECTOR**

Government	Producers	Suppliers	Manufacturers	Other
9	5	1	3	2

18. Most of the countries of the region (Table 6) indicated that they have procedures available to undertake environmental assessments of aquaculture operations, as envisaged in the Code.<sup>20</sup> Many of them<sup>21</sup> reported that they monitor aquaculture operations. Many countries<sup>22</sup> also indicated that they have measures in place to minimize the harmful effects of the introduction of non-native species or genetically altered stocks used for aquaculture.

**Table 6**  
**NUMBER OF COUNTRIES IN THE LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN REGION HAVING PROCEDURES FOR THE ASSESSMENT, MONITORING AND MINIMIZATION OF HARMFUL EFFECTS OF THE INTRODUCTION OF SPECIES OR GENETICALLY ALTERED STOCKS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CODE OF CONDUCT**

Undertake environmental assessments of aquaculture operations			Monitor aquaculture operations			Minimize harmful effects of the introduction of species or genetically altered stocks used in aquaculture		
Yes	No	Partial	Yes	No	Partial	Yes	No	Partial
19	2	0	16	4	0	15	5	0

19. In various countries of the region, governments and producers have developed or are in the process of developing guidelines for improving aquacultural practices. Numerous countries reported on steps they are taking to promote responsible aquaculture and to support rural communities, producer organizations and aquaculturists. Many countries also identified areas in which they feel they are in need of technical assistance.

<sup>18</sup> Bahamas, Chile, Colombia, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Peru and Uruguay.

<sup>19</sup> Chile, Colombia, Guatemala, Honduras and Mexico.

<sup>20</sup> Bahamas, Barbados, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Saint Lucia., Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela.

<sup>21</sup> Bahamas, Barbados, Brazil, Chile, Dominica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Saint Lucia, Uruguay and Venezuela.

<sup>22</sup> Bahamas, Barbados, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guyana, Honduras, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Saint Lucia, Uruguay and Venezuela.

## Integration of fisheries into coastal and basin area management

20. Various countries of the region reported that they do not have a specific framework (specific legislation and/or regulations) in place for the integration of fisheries into coastal and basin area management. Countries that do have such a framework<sup>23</sup> indicated that they are indeed promoting the integration of fisheries as foreseen in the Code.
21. The countries of the region reported that the most severe conflicts (Table 7) arise between coastal and commercial fisheries and between different types of gear in coastal areas. Less serious, but still significant, conflicts exist between coastal fisheries and coastal aquaculture and between commercial fishery and recreational activities.

**Table 7**  
**CONFLICT LEVELS WITHIN THE FISHERIES SECTOR AND BETWEEN THE FISHERIES SECTOR AND ACTIVITIES OF OTHER SECTORS, AS REPORTED BY COUNTRIES IN THE LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN REGION**

Type of conflict between:	Severe	Moderate	Slight	None
Coastal and industrial fisheries	6	7	3	4
Coastal fisheries and coastal aquaculture		7	4	7
Types of fishing gear in coastal areas	5	6	7	2
Fishery and recreational activities	1	5	4	2
Fisheries and port development	1	4	8	7
Fishery and mining activities	1	3	3	13

22. Some countries<sup>24</sup> reported that they have well developed mechanisms for resolving conflicts within the fisheries sector and between it and other sectors (Table 8). A larger number of countries in the region indicated that they have measures for dealing with conflicts between coastal and commercial fisheries, with gear interactions and with conflicts between fisheries and recreational activities. Fewer countries<sup>25</sup> of the region have mechanisms for addressing conflicts between fisheries and other sectors.

**Table 8**  
**NUMBER OF COUNTRIES IN THE REGION HAVING MECHANISMS FOR RESOLVING CONFLICTS OVER THE USE OF COASTAL RESOURCES IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CODE OF CONDUCT**

Type of conflict between:	Yes	No
Coastal and industrial fisheries	14	6
Coastal fisheries and coastal aquaculture	10	11
Types of fishing gear in coastal areas	17	3
Fishery and recreational activities	8	12
Fisheries and port development	7	12
Fishery and mining activities	3	16

<sup>23</sup> Barbados, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama and Peru.

<sup>24</sup> Argentina, Barbados, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Uruguay and Venezuela.

<sup>25</sup> Argentina, Barbados, Chile, Colombia, Saint Lucia and Uruguay.

## Post-harvest practices and trade

23. Many countries<sup>26</sup> of the region indicated that they have effective food safety and quality assurance systems in place (Table 9). Seven countries reported that they do not have such systems.

**Table 9**  
**NUMBER OF COUNTRIES IN THE REGION HAVING EFFECTIVE FOOD SAFETY AND QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEMS FOR FISH AND FISHERIES PRODUCTS**

Responses	Yes	No
Total	14	7

24. Most of the countries<sup>27</sup> of the region indicated that processors can readily identify the origin of fish and fishery products. Five countries<sup>28</sup> reported that consumers are able to identify the origin of such products (Table 10).

**Table 10**  
**NUMBER OF COUNTRIES IN THE LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN REGION HAVING THE ABILITY TO IDENTIFY THE ORIGIN OF FISH AND FISHERY PRODUCTS**

Product origin	Processors		Consumers	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Total	18	2	5	15

## Fisheries research

25. The countries of the region reported that in the last three years they have obtained reliable estimates for 61 fish stocks (an average of 65 percent of the most important national stocks) (Table 11). Many countries<sup>29</sup> indicated that they are collecting timely, complete and reliable statistics on catches and fishing effort. A smaller yet still significant number of countries<sup>30</sup> reported that they have qualified personnel available to generate the data required to manage fisheries on a sustainable basis. Eight countries indicated that they did not have a sufficient number of qualified staff for this purpose.

<sup>26</sup> Argentina, Bahamas, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Uruguay and Venezuela.

<sup>27</sup> Argentina, Bahamas, Barbados, Chile, Colombia, Dominica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela.

<sup>28</sup> Chile, Dominica, El Salvador, Guyana and Uruguay.

<sup>29</sup> Argentina, Barbados, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Saint Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago, and Uruguay.

<sup>30</sup> Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Dominica, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Peru, Saint Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago, and Uruguay.

**Table 11**  
**SUMMARY INFORMATION ON RESPONSES BY LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN COUNTRIES REGARDING THE STATUS OF FISHERIES RESEARCH IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CODE OF CONDUCT**

Stock status		Are timely, complete and reliable statistics collected on catches and fishing effort?		Are there qualified personnel available to generate data for sustainable fishery management?	
Number of stocks for which reliable estimates are available (last three years)	Percentage of total major national stocks	Yes	No	Yes	No
61	65	17	4	13	8

26. Almost all the countries<sup>31</sup> of the region indicated that they have sufficient catch and fishing effort data available to permit the development of both artisanal and industrial fishery management plans (Table 12). Fewer countries reported that they have research vessel survey data<sup>32</sup> or data from on-board samplings from commercial vessels.<sup>33</sup> Almost all the countries reported that they have collected data from in-port samplings from commercial vessels.<sup>34</sup>

**Table 12**  
**AVAILABILITY OF DATA INPUTS FOR FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLANS IN LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN COUNTRIES**

Type of data	Availability of data		
	Yes	No	Partial
Catch and fishing effort data from industrial and artisanal fisheries	19	2	
Research vessel surveys	13	8	
On-board samplings from commercial vessels	15	6	
In-port sampling surveys	19	2	

**Constraints and possible solutions identified by countries of the region**

27. Many countries in the region face similar constraints in their efforts to implement the Code of Conduct. Some of the constraints, as well as suggestions for dealing with them, that were identified in supplementary annotations to the specific responses to the questionnaire are presented in Table 13.

<sup>31</sup> Argentina, Bahamas, Barbados, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guyana, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Saint Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela.

<sup>32</sup> Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominica, El Salvador, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Saint Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago, and Uruguay.

<sup>33</sup> Argentina, Bahamas, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Saint Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela.

<sup>34</sup> Argentina, Bahamas, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Saint Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela.

**Table 13**  
**CONSTRAINTS AND POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS IDENTIFIED BY COUNTRIES IN THE**  
**LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN REGION IN RELATION TO THE**  
**IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CODE OF CONDUCT**

<b>Main constraints</b>	
Insufficient monitoring of fishery activities Critical status of some fisheries Low educational level among fishers Lack of political will to support the Code Inadequate research capabilities Barriers to trade in fish and fishery products Insufficient policy support for the Code's implementation Insufficient public education programmes	Lack of MCS capacity Weak institutions Limited familiarity with the Code on the part of stakeholders Lack of professionalism Financial constraints Complexity of small-scale fisheries and the associated difficulties in managing them Inappropriate legal frameworks Lack of trained personnel Poor inter-agency coordination
<b>Suggested solutions</b>	
Development of plans for promoting the recovery of over-exploited species Improvement of MCS capabilities Training of fisheries personnel and other stakeholders Increase in budgetary support for the fisheries sector Liaison with WTO in regard to trade-related issues Increase in stakeholder awareness	Reassignment of vessels and workers to alternative fisheries Institution-building Workshops for the dissemination of information about the Code Development of technical guidelines for small-scale fishery management Review and strengthening of fishery policy and legislation Increase in professional staff assigned to the fishery sector Improved coordination among government agencies

**SUGGESTED ACTION BY THE COMMITTEE**

28. The Committee is invited to review the progress achieved by the WECAFC countries in implementing the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries and to provide comments and guidance in order to enhance the implementation of this instrument.