



联合国
粮食及
农业组织

Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations

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

Продовольственная и
сельскохозяйственная организация
Объединенных Наций

Organización de las
Naciones Unidas para la
Alimentación y la Agricultura

منظمة
الأغذية والزراعة
للأمم المتحدة

E

**Fifth Meeting of the Parties to the
2009 FAO Agreement on Port State Measures**

**21 to 25 April 2025
Manta, Ecuador**

**Results of the 2024 questionnaire for the review and assessment of the
effectiveness of the PSMA**

The Parties are invited to:

- Review the progress made by Parties in the implementation of the PSMA as reported through the 2024 questionnaire;
- Provide guidance on ways to improve implementation and enhance the effectiveness of the Agreement;
- Reflect on whether the current design of the questionnaire should be revised to improve the efficiency of collecting the necessary information from PSMA Parties;
- Advise on how the periodicity of the questionnaire, its electronic platform or the analysis of the responses could be improved.

I. Introduction

1. At the second meeting of the Parties (MOP2) to the Agreement on Port State Measures to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing (PSMA), Parties adopted a questionnaire for the review and assessment of the effectiveness of the Agreement. This questionnaire was circulated to Parties by FAO on 1 December 2020 for a three-month period with results reported to MOP3 in June 2021.
2. At MOP4 in May 2023 the Parties to the PSMA adopted *A Strategy to Improve the Effectiveness of the Agreement on Port State Measures to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing* (the “Bali Strategy”). MOP4 also adopted an amended questionnaire for Parties and a new questionnaire for Regional Fisheries Bodies (RFBs) and other international organizations after considering amendments suggested intersessionally via the First Meeting of the PSMA Strategy ad hoc Working Group (SWG1).
3. These latest versions of the questionnaires were considered at five PSMA Regional Coordination Meetings held for the Southwest Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean, Africa and Near East, Asia, and Europe regions throughout 2024. During these consultations many participants expressed the view that the questionnaire should be simplified and conducted more frequently (PSMA_StrategyWG2/2024/4 and PSMA_StrategyWG2/2024/Inf.8). The Second Meeting of the Strategy ad hoc Working Group (SWG2) held in October 2024 recommended to MOP5 that it weigh the value of the information resulting from the 2024 questionnaire against the effort required by Parties to complete it with a view to revising it where appropriate for the next review cycle.
4. The 2024 questionnaires were released in October 2024 with responses due by 31 December 2024. This paper presents the results of the 2024 questionnaire and draws comparisons to the 2021 questionnaire results as appropriate.

II. Results of the responses to the questionnaire from Parties

Response Rates by Parties

5. Overall, 61 PSMA Parties submitted a response to the questionnaire for a response rate of 77 percent (**Tables 1 and 2**). In aggregate the number of responses for the 2024 questionnaire was higher (61 versus 56) but the response rate was slightly lower (77 percent versus 82 percent) given that the number of PSMA Parties has increased since 2021. By region, response rates were 76 percent of Parties in Africa; 100 percent of Parties in Asia; 70 percent of Parties in Europe; 71 percent of Parties in Latin America and the Caribbean; 60 percent of Parties in the Near East; 100 percent of Parties in Northern America; and 75 percent of Parties in the Southwest Pacific.

Application of the PSMA (Article 3)

6. Similar to the 2021 results, in 2024 the majority of Parties (89 percent overall) indicated that they have reviewed their legislation to determine whether it allows them to fulfil their obligations under the Agreement, with the remaining indicating they intend to do so in the future (**Table 3**). Of the Parties that reported conducting a review of their legislation, one-third (33 percent) did not require changes to their legislation, an increase from one-quarter in 2021, and for those finding that changes were required the average extent to which these were implemented was 3.89¹.
7. Where applicable, nearly all responding Parties reported to be cooperating with neighbouring countries to prevent artisanal fisheries for subsistence engaging in IUU fishing (91 percent), with somewhat lower cooperation in this regard reported from Latin America and the Caribbean (73 percent; **Table 4**). From those Parties cooperating in this regard, almost all (98 percent) reported having measures in place to ensure that such activities do not contribute to IUU fishing. Where applicable, 68 percent of responding Parties apply the Agreement to vessels chartered by their

¹ Parties were asked to rate the extent from “1” being “not at all” to “5” being “fully”.

country operating in waters under their jurisdiction with the exception of the Asia region where none of the responding Parties apply it to these vessels. Of those applying the Agreement to chartered vessels, 88 percent have measures in place to ensure that those vessels are subject to measures as effective as those applied to vessels flying their flag.

8. With regard to containers (**Table 5**), slightly more than half (56 percent) of responding Parties reported having procedures in place to identify whether fish on board container vessels had previously been landed. Only Parties from the Africa region reported cases where a container vessel was found to be carrying fish that were not previously landed, but in all reported cases these fish were not thought to be sourced from IUU fishing activities. Only two Parties reported finding containers carrying previously landed fish that had been sourced from IUU fishing activities.

Implementation of RFMO/A measures relevant to the PSMA (Article 4)

9. Almost all responding Parties (93 percent) reported implementing measures relevant to the PSMA in compliance with RFMO/A requirements (**Table 6**).

Integration and cooperation at national level (Article 5)

10. Responding Parties reported on average a high extent (3.95)² of measures taken to exchange information and coordinate activities among relevant agencies at a national level (**Table 7**), with on average close to eight agencies playing a role in the implementation of the Agreement. The agencies most commonly reported by Parties to play a role in implementing the Agreement were fisheries (100 percent of Parties), port (90 percent of Parties), customs (87 percent of Parties), maritime (83 percent of Parties), and navy/coastguard (82 percent of Parties), and are largely unchanged from 2021.
11. With regard to the extent of integration of port State measures with other measures to combat IUU fishing such as the FAO International Plan of Action to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate IUU Fishing, on average Parties reported a high degree (4.02)³ of integration (**Table 8**).

Cooperation and exchange of information (Article 6)

12. In order to promote the effectiveness of the Agreement, nearly all Parties (>90 percent) reported to cooperate and/or exchange information in relation to its objectives with FAO, relevant RFMO/As and relevant States. Whilst, 62 percent cooperate and/or exchange information with other intergovernmental organizations and 27 percent do so with other entities (**Table 9**).

Designation of ports (Article 7)

13. Most responding Parties (89 percent) reported that they have designated ports under the Agreement and approximately the same percentage of Parties (87 percent) report that they have provided a list of their designated ports to FAO (**Table 10**). This represents an increase of approximately 10 percent compared to the 2021. Of those Parties with designated ports, approximately one-third restrict landings to specific types of products (i.e. frozen, refrigerated, fresh), or restrict landings or transshipments to specific times or days. In those designated ports, on average Parties reported to have a high extent (3.92)⁴ of capacity to conduct inspections pursuant to the Agreement.
14. The total number of advanced requests to enter designated ports reported by all responding Parties was 13,867 per year with an average of 252 per Party, whereas the reported entries into designated ports totalled 12,617 per year and averaged 229 per Party (**Table 11**). The average number of inspectors available nationally was 162 per Party, and the average number of inspections conducted per year was 396 per Party, with a global total number of inspections

² Parties were asked to rate the extent from “1” being “not at all” to “5” being “fully”.

³ Parties were asked to rate the extent from “1” being “not at all” to “5” being “fully”.

⁴ Parties were asked to rate the extent from “1” being “not at all” to “5” being “fully”.

undertaken as 22,198⁵. These inspector and inspection figures are, however, skewed by comparatively high numbers reported in Europe. In contrast, the percentage of vessels inspected annually from the total number of foreign vessels entering designated ports varies from a low of 12 percent in Europe to a high of 93 percent in the Southwest Pacific with an overall average across regions of 49 percent.

Advance request for port entry (Article 8)

15. In addition to these statistics on actual port entries, the questionnaire compiled information on the advance notice procedures applied by Parties for port entry (**Table 12**). Across all regions, nearly all of Parties (98 percent) require an advance request for port entry (ARPE) with 93 percent of the ARPEs containing the minimum standards under the PSMA and 56 percent exceeding these standards. Across Parties requiring ARPEs, advance notice time ranged from 0 to 168 hours with an average of 59 hours. However, a majority of Parties (59 percent) indicated that different advance notice times may apply under particular situations.

Port entry, authorization or denial (Article 9)

16. On average, Parties indicated having five agencies involved in port entry, authorization or denial (**Table 13**) as well as in determining whether to authorise or deny entry (**Tables 15 and 16**). The two most involved agencies in these processes were reported by Parties to be, fisheries (between 92 and 97 percent) and port (between 69 and 78 percent) authorities. Maritime, navy/coastguard and customs authorities were also reported as being involved by a majority of Parties but to a lesser degree. This list of agencies is similar to those reported in 2021, although the average number of agencies involved has risen slightly in 2024.
17. After receiving an ARPE, almost all Parties (95 percent) determine whether the vessel was engaged in IUU fishing, prior to authorizing or denying entry into port (**Table 14**). Of these, a large majority have a standardized method for this determination (88 percent) and most of these apply risk assessment methods (84 percent).
18. The percentage of Parties requesting cooperation from a vessel's flag State when determining whether to authorize entry into port varied from 33 to 100 percent across regions with an overall average of 60 percent (**Table 17**). Of the Parties requesting cooperation from the vessel's flag State, 71 percent also request cooperation from a coastal State and 74 percent only request flag State cooperation if called for by the risk assessment.
19. The most commonly reported data/information sources to inform decisions to authorize or deny entry into port by Parties were fishing license / authorizations (98 percent), national records (including fisheries and other relevant ministries / agencies) (93 percent), and RFMO/A records (90 percent) (**Table 18**).
20. Most Parties (83 percent) have measures in place to deny entry into port when sufficient proof is present that a vessel has engaged in IUU fishing (**Table 19**). Of these, 24 percent have denied a vessel entry into port on the basis of having sufficient proof that a vessel has engaged in IUU fishing.
21. In the case of denial of entry into port, most Parties communicate the decision to the flag State (85 percent), the relevant coastal States (73 percent) and RFMO/As (80 percent). A denial of entry into port is less frequently (51 percent) communicated to other relevant international organizations except in the case of the Southwest Pacific where this is always the case (**Table 20**).

⁵ Due to the clear disparity between the lower number of entries to designated ports as compared to the number of inspections reported, some further data assurance checks will be inserted the questionnaire application for the next edition of the questionnaire. This disparity was in small part cause by some Parties providing higher figures for inspections as opposed to entries but mainly due to some Parties not providing a figure for entries, whilst providing a figure for inspections.

Force majeure (Article 10)

22. Nearly all Parties (95 percent) have provisions in place to allow entry into port in accordance with international law for reasons of force majeure or distress (**Table 21**).

Use of ports (Article 11)

23. Parties reported having an overall average of five agencies involved in enforcing procedures to authorise or deny use of ports (**Table 22**). The agencies most commonly reported by Parties as playing a role in enforcing procedures to authorize or deny use of ports were fisheries (93 percent), port (85 percent), maritime (64 percent), navy/coastguard (63 percent), and customs (60 percent of Parties).
24. Parties reported on whether measures were in place to deny use of port after a vessel has entered into port in the following scenarios (**Table 23**):
- a. the vessel does not have a valid and applicable authorization to engage in fishing and fishing activities required by its flag State (90 percent of Parties);
 - b. the vessel does not have a valid and applicable authorization to engage in fishing and fishing activities required by the coastal State in respect to areas under the national jurisdiction of that State (88 percent of Parties);
 - c. there is clear evidence that the fish on board was taken in contravention of applicable requirements of a coastal State in respect to areas under the national jurisdiction of that State (88 percent of Parties);
 - d. the flag State does not confirm within a reasonable period of time that the fish on board the vessel were taken in accordance with applicable requirements of a relevant RFMO (78 percent of Parties); or
 - e. there are reasonable grounds to believe that the vessel was otherwise engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing (92 percent of Parties).
25. Respondent Parties reported denying use of port to a vessel for the following reasons (**Table 24**):
- a. the vessel did not have a valid and applicable authorization to engage in fishing and fishing activities required by its flag State (23 percent of Parties);
 - b. the vessel did not have a valid and applicable authorization to engage in fishing and fishing activities required by the coastal State in respect to areas under the national jurisdiction of that State (20 percent of Parties);
 - c. there was clear evidence that the fish on board was taken in contravention of applicable requirements of a coastal State in respect to areas under the national jurisdiction of that State (17 percent of Parties);
 - d. the flag State did not confirm within a reasonable period of time that the fish on board the vessel was taken in accordance with applicable requirements of a relevant RFMO (20 percent of Parties); or
 - e. there were reasonable grounds to believe that the vessel was otherwise engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing (25 percent of Parties).
26. In cases where the use of port was denied, most Parties reported that they communicate, to the extent possible, their decision to the flag State (82 percent), to the relevant coastal States when appropriate (71 percent), and to relevant RFMO/As when appropriate (76 percent). Less than half (44 percent) reported communicating their decision to other relevant international organizations (**Table 25**).
27. A majority of Parties (75 percent) reported that they will withdraw their denial use of port if there is sufficient proof that the grounds on which use was denied were inadequate or erroneous, or that

such grounds no longer apply (**Table 26**). Of these Parties, nearly all (98 percent) promptly notify those to whom the notification was issued.

Levels and priorities for inspection (Article 12)

28. Just over half of Parties (57 percent) reported having a minimum level of inspection which they consider to be required to achieve the objectives of the Agreement. Approximately half of Parties (49 percent) report having a requirement to meet this rate, of which 93 percent reported having attained this minimum rate of inspection (**Table 27**). The reported inspection rate specified by these Parties ranged between 15 to 88 percent by region with a global average of 51 percent.
29. Parties reported on the existence of measures to prioritize inspections of vessels (**Table 28**) and whether such inspections have been undertaken (**Table 29**) under three scenarios. The scenarios, and the percentage of respondents confirming the existence of prioritization measures and the undertaking of inspections for each, were as follows:
 - a. vessels denied entry or use of port in accordance with the Agreement (78 percent have prioritization measures and 25 percent have undertaken inspections);
 - b. requests from other relevant Parties, States or RFMO/As requesting that a particular vessel be inspected, particularly where such requests are supported by evidence of IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing (88 percent have prioritization measures and 34 percent have undertaken inspections);
 - c. other vessels with clear grounds for suspecting that they have engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing (85 percent have prioritization measures and 33 percent have undertaken inspections).

Conduct of Inspections (Article 13)

30. On average, Parties have five agencies involved in the conduct of inspections of a vessel at port (**Table 30**). The agencies most commonly reported by Parties to play a role in conducting inspections are, in decreasing order: fisheries (97 percent), customs (65 percent), maritime (61 percent), port (57 percent) and navy/coastguard (55 percent).
31. Parties reported on the presence or extent to which different procedures were covered within the conduct of their inspections, as following (**Table 31**):
 - a. Include the functions outlined in Annex B as a minimum standard (high average extent at 4.07⁶ by reporting Parties);
 - b. Ensure that properly qualified inspectors carried out inspections and are authorized for this purpose, taking into account the guidelines set out in Annex E of the Agreement for the training of inspectors (high average extent at 4.05⁷ by responding Parties);
 - c. Require inspectors, before an inspection, to present to the master of the vessel an appropriate document identifying the inspector as such (92 percent of responding Parties do so);
 - d. Ensure that its inspectors examine all relevant areas on board, the nets and any other gear, equipment, and any other document or record on board that is relevant to verifying compliance with relevant conservation and management measures (high average extent at 4.19⁸ by responding Parties);
 - e. Examine the fish, including by sampling, to determine its quantity and composition before the landing or transshipment begins (75 percent of responding Parties do so);

⁶ Parties were asked to rate the extent from “1” being “not at all” to “5” being “fully”.

⁷ Parties were asked to rate the extent from “1” being “not at all” to “5” being “fully”.

⁸ Parties were asked to rate the extent from “1” being “not at all” to “5” being “fully”.

- f. Inspect the landing or transshipment to determine the quantity and composition of the catch (93 percent of responding Parties do so, with a high average extent to which this is achieved at 4.27⁹);
- g. Require the master of the vessel to give inspectors all necessary assistance and information, and to present relevant material and document as may be required, or certified copies thereof (95 percent of responding Parties do so);
- h. In case of appropriate arrangements, invite the vessel's flag State to participate in the inspection (48 percent of responding Parties do so);
- i. Make all possible efforts to avoid unduly delaying the vessel to minimize interference and inconvenience, including any unnecessary presence of inspectors on board, and to avoid action that would adversely affect the quality of the fish on board (92 percent of responding Parties do so);
- j. Make all possible efforts to facilitate communication with the master or senior crew members of the vessel, including where possible and where needed that the inspector is accompanied by an interpreter (85 percent of responding Parties do so);
- k. Ensure that inspections are conducted in a fair, transparent and non-discriminatory manner and would not constitute harassment of any vessel (95 percent of responding Parties do so); and
- l. Not interfere with the master's ability, in conformity with international law, to communicate with the authorities of the flag State (85 percent of responding Parties do so)

Extent of content in inspection reports (Article 14)

32. With regard to the content of inspection reports (**Table 32**), most responding Parties include the information set out in Annex C of the Agreement as a minimum standard (87 percent), and slightly more than half of these (56 percent) include content that goes beyond the information set out in Annex C of the Agreement. A majority of responding Parties (70 percent) reported having a system for reporting detection of IUU fishing following an inspection and of these nearly all (95 percent) reported that this system works efficiently.

Transmittal of inspection results (Article 15)

33. Parties reported transmitting inspection results to various entities in descending order as follows (**Table 33**): RMFO/A(s) (67 percent), those States for which there is evidence through inspection that the vessel has engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing within waters under their national jurisdiction (64 percent), the flag State of the inspected vessel (61 percent), FAO (51 percent), the State of which the vessel's master is a national (39 percent), and other relevant international organizations (20 percent).

Electronic exchange of information (Article 16)

34. Almost all Parties (95 percent) reported to have designated an authority to act as a contact point for the exchange of information under the Agreement, and slightly less than three-quarters (74 percent) have a national communication mechanism for direct electronic sharing of information relevant to the Agreement (**Table 34**).
35. Seventy percent of Parties use electronic information exchange mechanisms to communicate with a vessel's flag State, other port States or coastal States (**Table 35**). Of these Parties, approximately two-thirds (65 percent) report using bilateral electronic information exchange mechanisms, and 79 percent report using regional electronic information exchange mechanisms. As regards the extent to which information transmitted through relevant information exchange

⁹ Parties were asked to rate the extent from "1" being "not at all" to "5" being "fully".

mechanisms is consistent with Annex D of the Agreement, Parties reported on average a medium to high degree of consistency at 3.64¹⁰.

Training of inspectors (Article 17)

36. As regards the training of inspectors in line with the guidelines in Annex E of the Agreement, Parties reported on average a high degree of consistency at 3.92¹¹ (**Table 36**). Seventy-eight percent of Parties reported to have had national inspectors participate in port State measures training courses conducted by other States or organizations, in comparison to 61 percent in 2021. Most commonly Parties reported having received trainings in this regard from FAO (78 percent), followed by RFMO/As (58 percent), other Parties (49 percent), and other (44 percent). Under the other category, regional fishery advisory bodies (RFAB) and INGOs were most commonly mentioned.

Port State actions following inspection (Article 18)

37. In cases where following inspection there are clear grounds to suspect IUU fishing, Parties reported to promptly notify their findings to the flag State (80 percent), relevant coastal States (77 percent), relevant RFMO/As (81 percent), and other relevant international organisations (41 percent) (**Table 37**). In such cases, 83 percent of Parties reported to have a process in place to deny vessels use of the port and 18 percent reported having denied use of the port (**Table 38**).

Information on recourse in a port State (Article 19)

38. As regards port State measures (PSMs) taken pursuant to the Agreement, just over half of Parties have a process in place to maintain the relevant information on recourse available to the public, with regard to port State measures taken pursuant to each of Article 9, 11, 13 and 18 of the Agreement (**Table 39**). Just under 70 percent of Parties have a process in place to provide information on recourse to the owner, operator, master or representative of a vessel with regard to port State measures taken pursuant to each of Articles 9, 11, 13 and 18 of the Agreement (**Table 40**), whilst just under 60 percent of Parties have provided such information (**Table 41**). Sixty-eight percent of Parties have measures in place to report the outcome of recourse to the flag State and the owner, operator, master or representative, and over half (55 percent) have reported such information (**Table 42**). In cases where other Parties, States or international organizations have been informed of the prior decision pursuant to Articles 9, 11, 13 or 18 of the Agreement, 63 percent of Parties have a process in place to inform them of any change in this decision, and half have informed them of any change in this decision.

¹⁰ Parties were asked to rate the extent from “1” being “not at all” to “5” being “fully”.

¹¹ Parties were asked to rate the extent from “1” being “not at all” to “5” being “fully”.

Role of flag States (Article 20)

39. Parties reported on the presence of various measures in their capacity as flag States, as following (**Table 43**):
- a. Require the vessels entitled to fly its flag to cooperate with the port State in inspections carried out pursuant to this Agreement (85 percent of Parties);
 - b. In accordance with Article 20 paragraph 2 of the Agreement, as appropriate, request that State to inspect the vessel or to take other measures consistent with this Agreement (85 percent of Parties);
 - c. Encourage vessels entitled to fly its flag to land, transship, package and process fish, and use other port services, in ports of States that are acting in accordance with, or in a manner consistent with the Agreement (75 percent of Parties)
 - d. In cases where, following port State inspection, the Party receives an inspection report indicating that there are clear grounds to believe that a vessel entitled to fly its flag has engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing, immediately and fully investigate the matter and, upon sufficient evidence, take enforcement action without delay in accordance with its laws and regulations (90 percent of Parties);
 - e. Report to other parties, relevant port and other states, regional fisheries management organizations and FAO on actions it has taken in respect of vessels entitled to fly its flag that, as a result of port State measures taken pursuant to this Agreement, have been determined to have engaged in IUU fishing or fishing-related activities in support of such fishing (80 percent of Parties); and
 - f. Ensure that measures applied to vessels entitled to fly its flag are at least as effective in preventing, deterring, and eliminating IUU fishing and fishing related activities in support of such fishing as measures applied to vessels referred to in paragraph 1 of Article 3 (90 percent of Parties).

Requirements of developing States (Article 21)

40. Over two-thirds of applicable Parties (68 percent) have obtained external assistance on PSMA implementation (**Table 44**). As in 2021, FAO was most commonly cited as the source for such assistance (97 percent), followed by other States (40 percent), RFMO/As (35 percent) and other entities (35 percent). Within the other category, RFABs and INGOs were most commonly mentioned.

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

41. Almost three-quarter of Parties reported that their designated ports have been allocated a UN/LOCODE, an increase in comparison to the 57 percent reported in 2021 (**Table 45**).

III. Results of the responses to the questionnaire from RFBs

Response rate by RFBs

42. Twenty-five¹² RFBs submitted a response to the questionnaire.

Preliminary questions

43. From the reporting RFBs, 64 percent have adopted decisions, measures, recommendations or similar instruments consistent with the measures established in the Agreement and one intending to do so in the future. Forty-eight percent of these measures were reported to be binding.

Use of terms (Article 1)

44. Forty-eight percent of RFBs reported that decisions include definitions consistent with Article 1 of the Agreement, 57 percent define separately or make a distinction between fishing and fishing related activities, and 57 percent define vessels to include both fishing and fishing related activities.

Application (Article 3)

45. Sixty-eight percent of RFBs reported that decisions require that a Party/Member apply the measures to vessels not entitled to fly its flag that are seeking entry to its ports, 23 percent reported that they were applicable to artisanal fishing for subsistence, 41 percent contain provisions on chartered vessels, and 48 percent require Parties/Members to apply to chartered vessels measures as effective as measures applied in relation to vessels entitled to fly its flag.

Relationship with international law and other international instruments (Article 4)

46. Presence of decisions that include or request the application of measures more stringent than those under the Agreement were reported by 36 percent of RFBs.

Cooperation and exchange of information (Article 6)

47. As regards cooperation and exchange of information, 77 percent of RFBs reported having decisions which establish mechanisms of cooperation and exchange of information among Parties/Members, whilst 59 percent also establish such mechanisms for Parties/Members with other relevant States, FAO and other relevant international organisations and RFMOs.

Designation of ports (Article 7)

48. Seventy-three percent of RFBs reported to have decisions that request Parties/Members to designate and publicize the ports to which vessels may request entry, with 68 percent reporting to receive and publish this list of ports, and 64 percent having decisions that require Parties/Members to have sufficient capacity to conduct inspections in those ports.

¹² Bay of Bengal Programme - Inter-Governmental Organization (BOBP-IGO), Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism (CRFM), Central Asian and Caucasus Regional Fisheries and Aquaculture Commission (CACFISH), Commission for Inland Fisheries of Latin America and the Caribbean (COPESCAL), Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna (CCSBT), European Inland Fisheries and Aquaculture Advisory Commission (EIFAAC), Fishery Committee for the Eastern Central Atlantic (CECAF), General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM), Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC), Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC), International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT), International Whaling Commission (IWC), Ministerial Conference on Fisheries Cooperation among African Countries Bordering the Atlantic Ocean (ATLAFCO), North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission (NPAFC), North Pacific Marine Science Organization (PICES), Northeast Atlantic Fisheries Commission (NEAFC), Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO), Organización del Sector Pesquero y Acuicola del Istmo Centroamericano (OSPESCA), South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organization (SPRFMO), Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center (SEAFDEC), Southeast Atlantic Fisheries Organization (SEAFO), Southern Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement (SIOFA), Sub-Regional Commission on Fisheries (SRFC), Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission (WECAFC), and Western Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC).

Advance request for port entry (Article 8)

49. As regards ARPEs, 68 percent reported that decisions request Parties/Members to require an advance request for port entry, 59 percent require as a minimum content covered under Annex A of Agreement, and on average advance requests are required to be sent 42 hours of advance.

Port entry, authorization or denial (Article 9)

50. As regards port entry authorization and denial, RFBs reported on the presence of decisions that request Parties/Members to:
- a. decide whether to authorize or deny port entry after doing due diligence considering, among others, the information received in the advance request (68 Percent);
 - b. communicate the decision taken to the master of the vessel or its representative (50 percent);
 - c. communicate denials of entry to the vessel's flag State and, as appropriate and to the extent possible, relevant coastal States, regional fisheries management organizations and other international organizations (59 percent);
 - d. deny access to port when a Party/Member has sufficient proof that a vessel seeking entry into its port has engaged in IUU fishing, in particular the inclusion of a vessel on a list of vessels having engaged in such fishing or fishing-related activities adopted by a relevant regional fisheries management organization (59 percent);
 - e. grant entry into its ports vessels with enough proof that it has been engaged in IUU fishing or fishing-related activities exclusively for the purpose of inspecting it and taking other appropriate actions (64 percent); and
 - f. Where a vessel with enough proof of having engaged in IUU fishing is in port, deny such vessels the use of its ports for landing, transshipping, or other port services including refuelling and resupplying, maintenance and drydocking (59 percent).

Force majeure or distress (Article 10)

51. Fifty-nine percent of RFBs have decisions which contemplate provisions to permit entry into port in cases of force majeure or distress, in such cases 59 percent only permit entry for the purpose of rendering assistance to persons ships or aircrafts in danger or distress.

Use of ports (Article 11)

52. RFBs reported on whether decisions request Parties/Members to deny use of port to vessels if:
- a. they find that the vessel does not have a valid and applicable authorization to engage in fishing or fishing-related activities required by its flag State (64 percent);
 - b. they find that the vessel does not have a valid and applicable authorization to engage in fishing or fishing-related activities required by a coastal State in respect of areas under the national jurisdiction of that State (50 percent);
 - c. they receive clear evidence that the fish on board was taken in contravention of applicable requirements of a coastal State in respect of areas under the national jurisdiction of that State (48 percent); and
 - d. the flag State does not confirm within a reasonable period of time, on the request of the port State, that the fish on board was taken in accordance with applicable requirements of a relevant regional fisheries management organization (59 percent);
 - e. they have reasonable ground to believe that the vessel was otherwise engaged in IUU fishing or fishing-related activities in support of such fishing, unless the vessel can establish:

- i. that it was acting in a manner consistent with relevant conservation and management measures (59 percent)
 - ii. in the case of provision of personnel, fuel, gear and other supplies at sea, the vessel that was provisioned was not, at the time of provisioning included on a list of vessels having engaged in IUU fishing or fishing-related activities adopted by a relevant RFMO (52 percent)
- 53. Notwithstanding any exceptions, 76 percent of RFBs reported that decisions that allow Parties/Members to permit the use of port services essential to the safety or health of the crew or the safety of the vessel, provided these needs are duly proven, and 38 percent where appropriate, for the scrapping of the vessel.
- 54. Finally, RFBs reported on whether decisions:
 - a. request Parties/Members promptly notify the denial of the use of port to relevant coastal States, regional fisheries management organizations and other relevant international organizations (64 percent)
 - b. allow Parties/Members to withdraw the denial of the use of port only if there is sufficient proof that the grounds on which such use was denied were inadequate or erroneous or that no longer apply (55 percent)
 - c. in the case of withdrawing a denial, request Parties/Members to notify those to whom a notification was issued promptly (50 percent)

Levels and priorities for inspection (Article 12)

- 55. Forty-five percent of RFBs reported having decisions that request Parties/Members to establish an annual level of inspection to reach. Inspection prioritisation for vessels is required by, 43 percent of RFBs when they have been denied entry or use in accordance with the decision, 59 percent of RFBs following relevant requests from other relevant parties, states or regional fisheries management organizations, and 55 percent of RFBs when there is clear grounds for suspecting that they have engaged in IUU fishing or fishing-related activities in support of such fishing.

Conduct of inspections (Article 13)

- 56. As regards decisions related to the conduct of inspections, 50 percent of RFBs had decisions which set functions for inspectors as a minimum standard, and of those, in 91 percent of RFBs those minimum standards were consistent with Annex B of the Agreement. As regards the coverage of inspection procedures set out in the paragraphs of Article 13(2) of the Agreement, the percentage of RFBs reporting that such procedures were included in decisions ranged from 38 percent to 67 percent.

Results of inspections (Article 14)

- 57. Sixty-seven percent of RFBs reported that decisions request Parties/Members to include the information established as the minimum standard, consistent with Annex C of the PSMA, in the written inspection report of the result of each inspection

Transmittal of inspection results (Article 15)

- 58. RFBs reported on the presence within decisions that request the transmittal of inspection results to the flag State and as appropriate to:
 - a. Relevant Parties and States, including:
 - i. those states for which there is evidence through inspection that the vessel has engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing within waters under their national jurisdiction (71 percent)
 - ii. the state of which the vessel's master is a national (48 percent)
 - b. relevant regional fisheries management organizations (57 percent)

- c. FAO and other relevant international organizations (43 percent)

Electronic exchange of information (Article 16)

59. Thirty-eight percent of RFBs reported having within decisions requests for Parties/Members to establish a communication mechanism that allows for direct electronic exchange of information, with due regard to appropriate confidentiality requirements. Forty-three percent reported to be cooperating with FAO to establish an information sharing mechanism, and 38 percent reported to have decisions requesting Parties/Members to cooperate with FAO to establish an information sharing mechanism. Seventy-one percent reported having decisions that request Parties/Members to designate an authority that shall act as a contact point for the exchange of information under this decision. From the reporting RFBs, 43 percent reported to provide information to FAO concerning the measures or decisions adopted and implemented which relate to PSMA for their integration into the information-sharing mechanism.

Training of inspectors (Article 17)

60. Forty-eight percent of RFBs reported having decisions that request Parties/Members to ensure that their inspectors are properly trained, 43 percent include provisions for training of inspectors, and of those, 88 percent include or consider the guidelines of Annex E of the Agreement.

Port State actions following inspection (Article 18)

61. Where, following an inspection, there are clear grounds for believing that a vessel has engaged in IUU fishing or fishing-related activities in support of such fishing, RFBs with decisions that request Parties/Members to:
- a. promptly notify the flag State and other relevant entities of its findings (71 percent)
 - b. deny the vessel the use of its port facilities (67 percent)
 - c. permit such vessels the use of port services essential for the safety or health of the crew or the safety of the vessel (80 percent)

Information on recourse in the port State (Article 19)

62. As regards the presence within decisions of RFBs requesting Parties/Members to maintain the relevant information available to the public and provide such information, upon request, to the owner, operator, master or representative of a vessel with regard to any recourse concerning PSMs taken, including:
- a. information pertaining to the public services or judicial institutions available for this purpose (38 percent)
 - b. information on whether there is any right to seek compensation (24 percent)
63. Forty-five percent of RFBs reported that decisions request Parties/Members to inform the flag State, the owner, operator, master or representative, as appropriate, of the outcome of any such recourse and 45 percent of RFBs reported that, where other parties, states or international organizations have been informed of the prior decision pursuant to Articles 9, 11, 13 and 18, decisions request the Parties/Members to inform them of any change in its decision.

Role of flag States (Article 20)

64. As regards the role of flag States, RFB reported on measures within decisions that require Parties/Members to:
- a. request vessels entitled to fly its flag to cooperate with the port State in inspections carried out pursuant to the decision (67 percent)
 - b. When there is clear grounds to believe that a vessel entitled to fly its flag has engaged in IUU fishing or fishing-related activities in support of such fishing and is seeking entry to

- or is in the port of another state, request that State to inspect the vessel or to take other measures consistent with the decision (43 percent)
- c. encourage vessels entitled to fly its flag to land, transship, package and process fish, and use other port services, in ports of states that are also covered by this/these decision (43 percent)
 - d. develop fair, transparent and non-discriminatory procedures for identifying any state that may not be acting in accordance with, or in a manner consistent with the decision (43 percent)
 - e. Where, following port State inspection, a flag State Party or Member receives an inspection report indicating that there are clear grounds to believe that a vessel entitled to fly its flag has engaged in IUU fishing or fishing-related activities in support of such fishing, immediately and fully investigate the matter and to, upon sufficient evidence, take enforcement action without delay in accordance with its laws and regulations (67 percent)
 - f. report to other Parties/Members, relevant port States and, as appropriate, other relevant entities on actions they have taken in respect of vessels entitled to fly their flag that, as a result of PSMs taken pursuant to this decision, have been determined to have engaged in IUU fishing or fishing-related activities in support of such fishing (62 percent)
 - g. ensure that measures applied to vessels entitled to fly their flag are at least as effective in preventing, deterring, and eliminating IUU fishing and fishing-related activities in support of such fishing as measures applied to vessels in the scope of the decision (62 percent)

Requirements of developing States (Article 21)

65. Sixty-two percent of RFBs reported that decisions request Parties/Members to give full recognition to the special requirements of developing States Parties/Members in relation to the implementation of PSMs.
66. As regards the inclusion within RFB decisions that request for Parties/Members to provide assistance to developing States, either directly or through FAO, other relevant entities, in order to, inter alia:
 - a. enhance their ability, in particular the least-developed among them and Small Island Developing States, to develop a legal basis and capacity for the implementation of effective PSMs (48 percent of RFBs);
 - b. facilitate their participation in any international organizations that promote the effective development and implementation of PSMs (52 percent of RFBs);
 - c. facilitate technical assistance to strengthen the development and implementation of PSMs by them, in coordination with relevant international mechanisms (52 percent of RFBs).
67. Forty-eight percent have decisions that request Parties/Members to give due regard to the special requirements of developing port States Parties, in particular the least-developed among them and Small Island Developing States, to ensure that a disproportionate burden resulting from the implementation of the decision is not transferred directly or indirectly to them. In cases where the transfer of a disproportionate burden has been demonstrated, 38 percent of RFBs reported to have decisions to request Parties/Members to cooperate to facilitate the implementation by the relevant developing States Parties of specific obligations under the decision. Finally, 52 percent of RFBs have decisions that request Parties/Members to assess the special requirements of developing States Parties concerning the implementation of the decision.

Non-Parties to this Agreement (Article 23)

68. Sixty-seven percent of RFBs reported that decisions request Parties/Members to take fair, non-discriminatory and transparent measures consistent with the decision and other applicable international law to deter the activities of non-Parties which undermine the effective implementation of this decision.

APPENDIX

Statistical analysis of responses by Parties to the 2023-24 questionnaire for the review and assessment of the effectiveness of the Agreement on Port State Measures

Abbreviations and Acronyms

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

Table 1

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

FAO Region	PSMA Parties	2021	2024
Africa	Angola	-	
	Benin	-	√
	Cabo Verde	-	√
	Comoros	-	√
	Côte d'Ivoire	√	√
	Eritrea	-	
	Gabon	√	√
	Gambia	√	√
	Ghana	√	√
	Guinea	√	√
	Kenya	√	√
	Liberia	√	
	Madagascar	√	√
	Mauritania		√
	Mauritius	√	√
	Morocco	-	√
	Mozambique	√	√
	Namibia	√	√
	Nigeria	-	√
	Sao Tome and Principe	√	√
Senegal	√	√	
Seychelles			
Sierra Leone			
South Africa	√		
Togo	√	√	
Asia	Bangladesh	√	√
	Cambodia	√	√
	Indonesia	√	√
	Japan	√	√
	Maldives	√	√
	Myanmar	√	√
	Philippines	√	√
	Republic of Korea	√	√
	Sri Lanka		√
	Thailand	√	√
	Timor-Leste	-	√
	Viet Nam	√	√
Europe	Albania	√	
	Denmark*	√	
	European Union	√	√

FAO Region	PSMA Parties	2021	2024
	France*	√	√
	Iceland	√	√
	Montenegro	√	
	Norway	√	√
	Russian Federation	-	√
	Turkey	√	√
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	√	√
Latin America and the Caribbean	Bahamas	√	
	Barbados		
	Chile	√	√
	Costa Rica	√	√
	Cuba		
	Dominica	√	√
	Ecuador	√	√
	Grenada		
	Guyana	√	√
	Mexico	-	√
	Nicaragua	√	√
	Panama	√	√
	Peru	√	√
	Saint Kitts and Nevis	√	√
	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	√	
	Trinidad and Tobago	√	√
Uruguay	√	√	
Near East	Djibouti	√	√
	Libya	√	√
	Oman		√
	Somalia		
	Sudan	√	
Northern America	Canada	√	√
	United States of America	√	√
Southwest Pacific	Australia	√	√
	Fiji	√	
	Marshall Islands	-	√
	New Zealand	√	√
	Palau		
	Papua New Guinea	-	√
	Tonga	√	√
Vanuatu		√	
Sum of counts		56	61

Note: Countries marked with a dash were not Parties to the Agreement at the time when the questionnaire data for that year was collected

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

Table 2

Comparative response rates by FAO Regions

FAO Region	Number of responding Parties	Response rate from total number of Parties in FAO region (%)
Africa	19	76.00
Asia	12	100.00
Europe	7	70.00
Latin America and the Caribbean	12	70.59
Near East	3	60.00
Northern America	2	100.00
Southwest Pacific	6	75.00
Total count and percentages	61	77.22

Table 3

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

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties having reviewed their legislation to determine whether it allows their country to fulfil its obligations under the Agreement (have not done so but intend to review) (%)	Parties which did not require changes to their legislation (%)*	Average extent to which changes were implemented**
Africa (19)	89.47 (100.00)	23.53	3.77
Asia (12)	91.67 (100.00)	36.36	4.14
Europe (7)	100.00 (-)	42.86	4.00
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	83.33 (100.00)	30.00	3.71
Near East (3)	66.67 (100.00)	100.00	-
Northern America (2)	100.00 (-)	0.00	5.00
Southwest Pacific (6)	83.33 (100.00)	40.00	3.33
Total (61) and averages	88.52 (100.00)	33.33	3.89

*From those who have reviewed their legislation

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

Table 4

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

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Artisanal fisheries		Chartering	
	Where applicable, Parties engaged in cooperation with neighbouring countries to prevent artisanal fisheries for subsistence engaging in IUU fishing*	Parties having measures in place to ensure that such activities do not contribute to IUU fishing**	Where applicable, Parties who apply Agreement to chartered vessels operating under their waters and jurisdiction***	Parties having measures in place to ensure that such vessels are subject to measures as effective as those applied to vessels flying their flag**
Africa (19)	93.75	100.00	78.57	90.91
Asia (12)	100.00	100.00	0.00	-
Europe (7)	100.00	100.00	75.00	100.00
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	72.73	87.50	75.00	83.33
Near East (3)	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Northern America (2)	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Southwest Pacific (6)	100.00	100.00	80.00	75.00
Total (61) and averages	90.91	97.50	68.42	88.46

* 17 parties reported that this question was not applicable and were not considered within this column

** From those who responded positively to the previous question

*** 23 parties reported that this question was not applicable and were not considered within this column

Table 5

Processes related to containers (Article 3) (%)

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties with procedures in place to identify if fish on board container vessels has previously been landed	Parties with cases where a container vessel was found to be carrying fish, not previously landed*	In cases of a container carrying not previously landed fish, Parties having determined that such product was sourced from IUU fishing activities*	Parties reporting cases of container vessel found to be carrying fish, previously landed, which was sourced from IUU fishing activities
Africa (19)	57.89	9.09	0.00	0.00
Asia (12)	66.67	0.00	-	0.00
Europe (7)	71.43	0.00	-	14.29
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	25.00	0.00	-	0.00
Near East (3)	33.33	0.00	-	0.00
Northern America (2)	100.00	0.00	-	50.00
Southwest Pacific (6)	66.67	0.00	-	0.00
Total (61) and averages	55.74	2.94	0.00	3.28

* From those who responded positively to the previous question

Table 6

Implementation of RFMO/A measures relevant to the PSMA (Article 4) (%)

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties implementing measures relevant to the PSMA in compliance with the respective RFMO/A(s) requirements*
Africa (19)	94.74
Asia (12)	83.33
Europe (7)	100.00
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	91.67
Near East (3)	100.00
Northern America (2)	100.00
Southwest Pacific (6)	100.00
Total (61) and averages	93.33

* 1 party reported that this question was not applicable and was not considered within this column

Table 7

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

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Extent to which measures taken to exchange information and coordinate activities among relevant agencies in the implementation of this Agreement* (Average number of agencies playing a role)	Ranking - agencies most commonly reported to be playing a role in the implementation of the Agreement (%)				
		Fisheries	Port authority	Customs	Navy / Coast guard	Maritime
Africa (19)	3.89 (9.00)	100.00	100.00	94.44	94.74	94.74
Asia (12)	4.17 (7.17)	100.00	91.67	100.00	72.73	58.33
Europe (7)	4.57 (6.43)	100.00	85.71	57.14	85.71	71.43
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	3.58 (6.92)	100.00	75.00	83.33	83.33	75.00
Near East (3)	2.67 (7.67)	100.00	100.00	66.67	100.00	100.00
Northern America (2)	5.00 (7.50)	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Southwest Pacific (5)	4.00 (7.67)	100.00	83.33	83.33	50.00	100.00
Total (60) and averages	3.95 (7.69)	100.00	90.16	86.67	83.33	81.97

Other reported agencies were: [Immigration: 68.97%], [Veterinary / Quarantine: 66.10%], [Police: 55.17%], [Health: 51.72%], [Trade: 40.35%], [Labour: 36.84%] and [Other: 27.59%]

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

Table 8

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

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Extent to which Parties have integrated PSMs with other actions to prevent, deter and eliminate IUU Fishing, including those described in the FAO IPOA-IUU*
Africa (18)	3.89
Asia (12)	4.25
Europe (7)	4.57
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	3.58
Near East (3)	3.00
Northern America (2)	5.00
Southwest Pacific (6)	4.33
Total (60) and averages	4.02

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

Table 9

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

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	In order to promote the effective implementation of the Agreement, Parties that cooperated and / or exchanged information with:				
	Other relevant States	Relevant RFMO/As	FAO	Other IGOs	Other
Africa (19)	94.74	100.00	94.74	66.67	35.29
Asia (12)	100.00	83.33	91.67	60.00	10.00
Europe (7)	100.00	100.00	85.71	42.86	14.29
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	91.67	100.00	100.00	66.67	16.67
Near East (3)	33.33	66.67	100.00	66.67	33.33
Northern America (2)	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	50.00
Southwest Pacific (6)	83.33	83.33	100.00	50.00	60.00
Total (61) and averages	91.80	93.44	95.08	62.07	26.79

Table 10

Designation of ports (Article 7)

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties that have designated ports under the Agreement (%)	Parties with designated ports that restrict landings to specific types of products? (i.e. frozen, refrigerated, fresh) (%)*	Parties with designated ports that restrict landings to specific times or days (%)*	Parties with designated ports that restrict transshipment to specific times or days (%)*	Parties reporting to have provided to the FAO their list of designated ports (%)	Extent to which sufficient capacity to conduct inspections pursuant to the Agreement is present in designated ports**
Africa (19)	94.74	33.33	33.33	33.33	94.74	3.74
Asia (12)	91.67	18.18	18.18	0.00	83.33	3.83
Europe (7)	100.00	85.71	57.14	66.67	100.00	4.83
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	75.00	11.11	11.11	22.22	75.00	3.73
Near East (3)	66.67	50.00	50.00	50.00	66.67	2.67
Northern America (2)	100.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	100.00	5.00
Southwest Pacific (6)	83.33	20.00	20.00	20.00	83.33	4.33
Total (61) and averages	88.52	33.33	29.63	28.30	86.67	3.92

*From those that have designated ports

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

Table 11

Figures on foreign vessel requests, entries, inspectors and inspections within designated ports (Article 7)

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	number per year of:		Number of inspectors available nationally (average number reported)	Number per year of inspections undertaken nationally (average number reported)	Annual average inspection rate reported by Parties from total entering their designated ports* (%)
	advanced requests to enter designated ports (average number reported)	Entries into designated ports (average number reported)			
Africa (19)	1868 (103.78)	2686 (149.22)	462 (24.32)	3497 (184.05)	58.16
Asia (12)	6515 (592.27)	6431 (584.64)	509 (46.27)	5005 (455.00)	35.27
Europe (7)	1099 (274.75)	919 (229.75)	5257 (1314.25)	10083 (2520.75)	11.80
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	2721 (247.36)	1253 (113.91)	884 (80.36)	625 (56.82)	38.82
Near East (3)	0 (0.00)	5 (1.67)	175 (58.33)	1000 (333.33)	33.33
Northern America (2)	165 (82.50)	115 (57.50)	585 (292.50)	140 (70.00)	82.50
Southwest Pacific (6)	1499 (249.83)	1208 (201.33)	1207 (201.17)	1848 (308.00)	93.33
Total (61) and averages	13867 (252.13)	12617 (229.40)	9079 (162.12)	22198 (396.39)	49.19

*Average rate of inspection rate as reported by Parties, figure not generated from reported number of entries and inspections.

Table 12

Advance request for port entry (Article 8)

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties that require an advance request for port entry (ARPE) (%)	From those which require an ARPE:			
		ARPE contains, as a minimum standard, the information contained within Annex A of the Agreement (%)	Information contained within ARPE goes beyond Annex A of the Agreement (%)*	General minimum required time for the ARPE (hours)	Parties reporting situations where a different minimum time is required for ARPE (%)
Africa (18)	100.00	88.89	37.50	58.18 (2.0 - 72.0)	44.44
Asia (12)	100.00	91.67	36.36	66.50 (6.0 - 168.0)	50.00
Europe (7)	100.00	100.00	71.43	32.43 (3.0 - 72.0)	85.71
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	100.00	100.00	83.33	50.42 (5.0 - 96.0)	58.33
Near East (3)	66.67	50.00	0.00	24.00 (0.0 - 48.0)	0.00
Northern America (2)	100.00	100.00	100.00	84.00 (72.0 - 96.0)	100.00
Southwest Pacific (6)	100.00	100.00	66.67	100.00 (48.0 - 168.0)	100.00
Total (60) and averages	98.33	93.22	56.36	59.22 (0.0 - 168.0)	59.32

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

Table 13

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

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Average number of agencies playing a role	Ranking - agencies playing a role in the authorisation or the denial of entry into port (%)				
		Fisheries	Port authority	Customs	Maritime	Navy / Coast guard
Africa (19)	5.63	100.00	88.89	68.75	78.95	66.67
Asia (12)	4.67	91.67	75.00	66.67	41.67	36.36
Europe (7)	5.71	100.00	85.71	71.43	71.43	71.43
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	5.50	75.00	58.33	75.00	66.67	66.67
Near East (3)	7.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	66.67
Northern America (2)	7.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	50.00	100.00
Southwest Pacific (6)	5.17	83.33	66.67	66.67	66.67	50.00
Total (61) and averages	5.49	91.53	78.33	72.41	67.21	60.71

Other reported agencies were [Immigration: 45.61%], [Health: 40.35%], [Police: 38.60%], [Veterinary / Quarantine: 35.71%], [Labour: 18.18%], [Trade: 14.81%] and [Other: 14.55%]

Table 14

Risk assessment (Article 9) (%)

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties determining whether a vessel has engaged in IUU fishing after receiving an ARPE prior to authorising or denying entry into port	Parties with a standardised method for determining whether vessels requesting port entry have engaged in IUU fishing*	Parties reporting that the standardised method includes a risk assessment*
Africa (18)	100.00	88.89	87.50
Asia (12)	100.00	91.67	70.00
Europe (7)	100.00	100.00	85.71
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	83.33	70.00	85.71
Near East (3)	66.67	50.00	100.00
Northern America (2)	100.00	100.00	100.00
Southwest Pacific (6)	100.00	100.00	100.00
Total (60) and averages	95.00	87.72	84.00

*From those reporting positively to the previous question

Table 15

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

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Average number of agencies participating in process	Ranking - agencies participating in process determining whether to authorise port entry (%)				
		Fisheries	Port authority	Maritime	Navy / Coast guard	Customs
Africa (18)	4.61	100.00	88.89	61.11	53.33	31.25
Asia (12)	2.92	100.00	63.64	27.27	20.00	36.36
Europe (7)	5.57	100.00	71.43	57.14	71.43	57.14
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	4.33	91.67	41.67	58.33	58.33	41.67
Near East (3)	6.67	66.67	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Northern America (2)	6.00	100.00	100.00	50.00	100.00	100.00
Southwest Pacific (6)	5.83	100.00	66.67	66.67	33.33	66.67
Total (60) and averages	4.60	96.67	71.19	55.93	52.73	47.37

Other reported data / information sources were [Veterinary / Quarantine: 35.09%], [Immigration: 32.14%], [Police: 30.91%], [Health: 26.79%], [Other: 12.50%], [Labour: 9.26%] and [Trade: 9.09%]

Table 16

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

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Average number of agencies participating in process	Ranking - agencies participating in process of determining whether to deny port entry (%)				
		Fisheries	Port authority	Navy / Coast guard	Customs	Maritime
Africa (18)	5.11	100.00	83.33	66.67	53.33	64.71
Asia (12)	2.92	100.00	63.64	20.00	60.00	27.27
Europe (7)	5.00	100.00	57.14	57.14	57.14	42.86
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	4.50	83.33	50.00	66.67	41.67	58.33
Near East (3)	6.67	100.00	100.00	100.00	66.67	100.00
Northern America (2)	6.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	50.00
Southwest Pacific (6)	4.50	100.00	66.67	33.33	50.00	33.33
Total (60) and averages	4.58	96.67	69.49	56.36	54.55	51.72

Other reported data / information sources were [Police: 34.55%], [Immigration: 33.93%], [Health: 26.79%], [Veterinary / Quarantine: 26.79%], [Trade: 12.73%], [Other: 10.91%] and [Labour: 7.27%]

Table 17

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

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties that request cooperation of a vessel's flag State to determine whether to authorise entry into port	Parties that request cooperation with other coastal State requested before determining whether to authorize entry into port*	Parties that request cooperation to determine whether to authorize entry into port, is the cooperation of a vessel's flag State requested only when the risk assessment so determines*
Africa (17)	52.94	77.78	77.78
Asia (12)	50.00	83.33	66.67
Europe (7)	100.00	71.43	71.43
Latin America and the Caribbean (11)	63.64	57.14	71.43
Near East (3)	33.33	100.00	100.00
Northern America (2)	100.00	50.00	50.00
Southwest Pacific (6)	50.00	66.67	100.00
Total (58) and averages	60.34	71.43	74.29

*From those that request cooperation from the flag State

Table 18

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

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Ranking - Data / information sources used					
	Fishing license / authorizations	National records (including fisheries and other relevant ministries / agencies)	RFMO/A records	VMS	Compliance history	Data / information from the flag State
Africa (18)	100.00	94.44	87.50	76.47	93.75	76.47
Asia (12)	100.00	100.00	100.00	75.00	83.33	72.73
Europe (7)	100.00	85.71	100.00	100.00	57.14	100.00
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	100.00	91.67	83.33	63.64	66.67	83.33
Near East (3)	66.67	66.67	33.33	66.67	33.33	33.33
Northern America (2)	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Southwest Pacific (6)	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	83.33
Total (60) and averages	98.33	93.22	89.66	79.31	79.31	79.31

Other reported data / information sources were [Data / information from other relevant states (coastal and port States): 74.14%], [AIS: 73.21%], [Electronic logbook: 70.69%], [Global Record of Fishing Vessels, Refrigerated Transport Vessels and Supply Vessels: 70.69%], [Other regional or international vessel records: 62.71%] and [Other: 40.74%]

Documents can be consulted at <http://www.fao.org/port-state-measures/meetings/meetings-parties/en/NR300>

Table 19

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

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties with measures in place to deny entry into port when sufficient proof is present that a vessel has engaged in IUU fishing	Parties that have denied a vessel entry into port due to having sufficient proof that the vessel had conducted IUU fishing*
Africa (18)	83.33	20.00
Asia (12)	75.00	22.22
Europe (7)	100.00	28.57
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	83.33	20.00
Near East (3)	33.33	0.00
Northern America (2)	100.00	50.00
Southwest Pacific (6)	100.00	33.33
Total (60) and averages	83.33	24.00

*From those reporting to have such measure in place

Table 20

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

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	In the case of denial of use of port, Parties communicating to the extent possible to:			
	The flag State	Relevant coastal States	Relevant RFMO/A(s)	Other relevant international organizations
Africa (18)	88.89	82.35	77.78	64.71
Asia (12)	91.67	75.00	83.33	33.33
Europe (7)	100.00	57.14	85.71	28.57
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	83.33	75.00	83.33	41.67
Near East (3)	33.33	33.33	66.67	33.33
Northern America (2)	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00
Southwest Pacific (6)	83.33	83.33	83.33	100.00
Total (60) and averages	85.00	72.88	80.00	50.85

Table 21

Force Majeure (Article 10) (%)

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties with provisions in place to allow entry into port in accordance with international law for reasons of force majeure or distress
Africa (19)	89.47
Asia (12)	100.00
Europe (7)	100.00
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	100.00
Near East (3)	66.67
Northern America (2)	100.00
Southwest Pacific (6)	100.00
Total (61) and averages	95.08

Table 22

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

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Average number of agencies playing a role	Ranking - agencies playing a role in the authorisation or the denial of use of port (%)				
		Fisheries	Port authority	Maritime	Navy / Coast guard	Customs
Africa (18)	5.83	100.00	94.44	70.59	66.67	56.25
Asia (12)	5.00	91.67	91.67	41.67	54.55	63.64
Europe (7)	6.29	100.00	85.71	71.43	71.43	71.43
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	5.08	91.67	66.67	75.00	66.67	58.33
Near East (3)	5.33	66.67	100.00	66.67	66.67	66.67
Northern America (2)	7.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Southwest Pacific (6)	3.83	83.33	66.67	50.00	33.33	33.33
Total (60) and averages	5.38	93.22	85.00	64.41	62.50	59.65

Other reported agencies were [Police: 42.86%], [Immigration: 42.11%], [Veterinary / Quarantine: 36.84%], [Health: 31.58%], [Trade: 14.55%], [Labour: 14.55%] and [Other: 12.50%]

Table 23

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

Situation	Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Once a vessel has entered its ports, Parties with measures in place to deny use of port if:
The vessel does not have a valid and applicable authorization to engage in fishing and fishing activities required by its flag State	Africa (18)	83.33
	Asia (12)	91.67
	Europe (7)	100.00
	Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	91.67
	Near East (3)	66.67
	Northern America (2)	100.00
	Southwest Pacific (6)	100.00
	Total (60) and averages	90.00
The vessel does not have a valid and applicable authorization to engage in fishing and fishing activities required by the coastal State with respect to areas under the national jurisdiction of that State	Africa (18)	83.33
	Asia (12)	91.67
	Europe (7)	100.00
	Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	83.33
	Near East (3)	66.67
	Northern America (2)	100.00
	Southwest Pacific (6)	100.00
	Total (60) and averages	88.33
There is clear evidence that the fish onboard was taken in contravention of the applicable requirements of a coastal State with respect to areas under the national jurisdiction of that State	Africa (18)	83.33
	Asia (12)	91.67
	Europe (7)	100.00
	Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	83.33
	Near East (3)	66.67
	Northern America (2)	100.00
	Southwest Pacific (6)	100.00
	Total (60) and averages	88.33
The flag State does not confirm within a reasonable time that the fish on board the vessel was taken in accordance with the applicable requirements of a relevant RFMO	Africa (18)	77.78
	Asia (12)	75.00
	Europe (7)	100.00
	Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	83.33
	Near East (3)	33.33
	Northern America (2)	100.00
	Southwest Pacific (6)	66.67
	Total (60) and averages	78.33
There are reasonable grounds to believe that the vessel was otherwise engaged in IUU fishing or fishing-related activities in support of such fishing	Africa (18)	88.89
	Asia (12)	91.67
	Europe (7)	100.00
	Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	91.67
	Near East (3)	66.67
	Northern America (2)	100.00
	Southwest Pacific (6)	100.00
	Total (60) and averages	91.67

Table 24

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

Situation	Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties who have denied use of port due to:
The vessel not having a valid and applicable authorization to engage in fishing and fishing activities required by its flag State	Africa (18)	22.22
	Asia (12)	16.67
	Europe (7)	28.57
	Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	16.67
	Near East (3)	33.33
	Northern America (2)	0.00
	Southwest Pacific (6)	50.00
Total (60) and averages	23.33	
The vessel not having a valid and applicable authorization to engage in fishing and fishing activities required by the coastal State with respect to areas under the national jurisdiction of that State	Africa (18)	16.67
	Asia (12)	16.67
	Europe (7)	0.00
	Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	25.00
	Near East (3)	33.33
	Northern America (2)	0.00
	Southwest Pacific (6)	50.00
Total (60) and averages	20.00	
Having clear evidence that the fish onboard was taken in contravention of the applicable requirements of a coastal State with respect to areas under the national jurisdiction of that State	Africa (18)	11.11
	Asia (12)	16.67
	Europe (7)	0.00
	Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	8.33
	Near East (3)	33.33
	Northern America (2)	50.00
	Southwest Pacific (6)	50.00
Total (60) and averages	16.67	
The flag State not confirm within a reasonable time that the fish on board the vessel was taken in accordance with the applicable requirements of a relevant RFMO	Africa (17)	5.88
	Asia (12)	25.00
	Europe (7)	42.86
	Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	16.67
	Near East (3)	0.00
	Northern America (2)	50.00
	Southwest Pacific (6)	33.33
Total (59) and averages	20.34	
Having reasonable grounds to believe that the vessel was otherwise engaged in IUU fishing or fishing-related activities in support of such fishing	Africa (18)	27.78
	Asia (12)	16.67
	Europe (7)	28.57
	Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	16.67
	Near East (3)	33.33
	Northern America (2)	0.00
	Southwest Pacific (6)	50.00
Total (60) and averages	25.00	

Table 25

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

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	In the case of denial of use of port, Parties communicating to the extent possible to:			
	The flag State	Relevant coastal States when appropriate	Relevant RFMO/A(s) when appropriate	Other relevant international organizations
Africa (18)	83.33	82.35	82.35	56.25
Asia (12)	83.33	66.67	58.33	33.33
Europe (7)	100.00	57.14	85.71	28.57
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	75.00	75.00	83.33	36.36
Near East (3)	33.33	33.33	66.67	33.33
Northern America (2)	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00
Southwest Pacific (6)	100.00	83.33	83.33	66.67
Total (60) and averages	81.67	71.19	76.27	43.86

Table 26

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

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties that withdraw its denial of the use of its port, if there is sufficient proof that the grounds on which use was denied were inadequate or erroneous or that such grounds no longer apply	Parties that promptly notify those to whom the notification was issued*
Africa (18)	72.22	100.00
Asia (12)	83.33	90.00
Europe (7)	100.00	100.00
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	66.67	100.00
Near East (3)	33.33	100.00
Northern America (2)	50.00	100.00
Southwest Pacific (6)	83.33	100.00
Total (60) and averages	75.00	97.78

*From those reporting positively to the previous question

Table 27

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

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties with a minimum level of inspection which they consider to be required to achieve the objectives of this Agreement	Inspection rate specified by Parties to reach the level which they consider to be required to achieve the objectives of this Agreement*	Parties having a requirement to reach this annual minimum level of inspection that is sufficient to achieve the objective of this Agreement	Has this minimum level of inspection been attained*
Africa (19)	57.89	59.55	52.63	90.00
Asia (12)	50.00	45.00	41.67	100.00
Europe (7)	85.71	21.67	85.71	100.00
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	50.00	47.50	41.67	100.00
Near East (3)	33.33	70.00	33.33	100.00
Northern America (2)	50.00	15.00	100.00	50.00
Southwest Pacific (6)	66.67	87.50	16.67	100.00
Total (61) and averages	57.38	50.71	49.18	93.33

*From those reporting positively to the previous question

Table 28

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

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	In determining which vessels to inspect, Parties with measures in place to prioritise:		
	Vessels denied entry or use of port in accordance with this Agreement	Request from other relevant Parties, States or RFMO/A requesting that a particular vessel be inspected, particularly where such requests are supported by evidence of IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing	Other vessels with clear grounds for suspecting that they have engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing
Africa (19)	78.95	78.95	84.21
Asia (12)	50.00	66.67	58.33
Europe (7)	57.14	71.43	71.43
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	50.00	58.33	66.67
Near East (3)	0.00	33.33	33.33
Northern America (2)	100.00	100.00	100.00
Southwest Pacific (6)	83.33	100.00	100.00
Total (61) and averages	77.55	88.00	84.91

Table 29

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

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Occurrence of inspection being carried out on a vessel due to information obtained on:		
	Vessels denied entry or use of port in accordance with this Agreement	Request from other relevant Parties, States or RFMO/A requesting that a particular vessel be inspected, particularly where such requests are supported by evidence of IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing	Other vessels with clear grounds for suspecting that they have engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing
Africa (19)	21.05	42.11	26.32
Asia (12)	16.67	25.00	25.00
Europe (7)	28.57	14.29	42.86
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	33.33	33.33	25.00
Near East (3)	66.67	33.33	66.67
Northern America (2)	0.00	50.00	50.00
Southwest Pacific (6)	16.67	50.00	50.00
Total (61) and averages	24.59	34.43	32.79

Table 30

Agencies involved in conducting inspections at port (Article 13)

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Average number of agencies playing a role	Ranking - agencies involved in conducting inspections at port (%)				
		Fisheries	Customs	Maritime	Port authority	Navy / Coast guard
Africa (18)	4.56	94.44	40.00	62.50	46.67	56.25
Asia (12)	4.75	100.00	80.00	54.55	72.73	10.00
Europe (7)	5.86	100.00	71.43	57.14	71.43	85.71
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	5.58	100.00	75.00	58.33	41.67	75.00
Near East (3)	5.67	66.67	66.67	100.00	100.00	66.67
Northern America (2)	6.00	100.00	100.00	50.00	50.00	100.00
Southwest Pacific (6)	5.50	100.00	66.67	66.67	50.00	33.33
Total (60) and averages	5.15	96.67	65.45	61.40	57.14	55.36

Other reported agencies were [Immigration: 51.79%], [Veterinary / Quarantine: 45.61%], [Health: 42.86%], [Police: 33.93%], [Labour: 16.36%], [Other: 10.71%] and [Trade: 7.27%]

Table 31

Inspection procedures (Article 13)

Procedures	Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties whose inspection procedures: (%)	Average extent to which Parties inspection procedures (1-5)*:
include the functions outlined in Annex B as a minimum standard	Africa (18)	-	4.00
	Asia (12)	-	3.92
	Europe (6)	-	4.83
	Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	-	3.75
	Near East (3)	-	3.00
	Northern America (2)	-	5.00
	Southwest Pacific (6)	-	4.67
	Total (59) and averages	-	4.07
ensure that properly qualified inspectors carried out inspections and are authorized for this purpose, taking into account the guidelines set out in Annex E of the Agreement for the training of inspectors	Africa (18)	-	4.11
	Asia (12)	-	4.00
	Europe (6)	-	4.83
	Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	-	3.58
	Near East (3)	-	3.00
	Northern America (2)	-	5.00
	Southwest Pacific (6)	-	4.33
	Total (59) and averages	-	4.05
require inspectors, before an inspection, to present to the master of the vessel an appropriate document identifying the inspector as such	Africa (18)	94.44	-
	Asia (12)	83.33	-
	Europe (6)	100.00	-
	Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	91.67	-
	Near East (3)	66.67	-
	Northern America (2)	100.00	-
	Southwest Pacific (6)	100.00	-
	Total (59) and averages	91.53	-
ensure that its inspectors examine all relevant areas on board, the nets and any other gear, equipment, and any other document or record on board that is relevant to verifying compliance with the applicable conservation and management measures	Africa (18)	-	4.44
	Asia (12)	-	4.33
	Europe (6)	-	4.83
	Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	-	3.58
	Near East (3)	-	2.33
	Northern America (2)	-	5.00
	Southwest Pacific (6)	-	4.33
	Total (59) and averages	-	4.19
examine the fish, including by sampling, to determine its quantity and composition before the landing or transshipment begins	Africa (18)	83.33	-
	Asia (12)	66.67	-
	Europe (6)	100.00	-
	Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	50.00	-

Procedures	Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties whose inspection procedures: (%)	Average extent to which Parties inspection procedures (1-5)*:
	Near East (3)	66.67	-
	Northern America (2)	100.00	-
	Southwest Pacific (6)	83.33	-
	Total (59) and averages	74.58	-
inspect the landing or transshipment to determine the quantity and composition of the catch	Africa (18)	100.00	-
	Asia (12)	91.67	-
	Europe (6)	100.00	-
	Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	83.33	-
	Near East (3)	66.67	-
	Northern America (2)	100.00	-
	Southwest Pacific (6)	100.00	-
Total (59) and averages	93.22	-	
determine the quantity and composition of the catch, from landings and transshipments**	Africa (18)	-	4.28
	Asia (11)	-	3.91
	Europe (6)	-	5.00
	Latin America and the Caribbean (10)	-	4.10
	Near East (2)	-	3.50
	Northern America (2)	-	4.00
	Southwest Pacific (6)	-	4.83
Total (55) and averages	-	4.27	
require the master of the vessel to give inspectors all necessary assistance and information, and to present relevant material and document as may be required, or certified copies there of	Africa (18)	100.00	-
	Asia (12)	100.00	-
	Europe (7)	100.00	-
	Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	83.33	-
	Near East (3)	66.67	-
	Northern America (2)	100.00	-
	Southwest Pacific (6)	100.00	-
Total (60) and averages	95.00	-	
in case of appropriate arrangements, invite the vessel's flag State to participate in the inspection	Africa (18)	50.00	-
	Asia (12)	41.67	-
	Europe (6)	50.00	-
	Latin America and the Caribbean (11)	45.45	-
	Near East (3)	0.00	-
	Northern America (2)	100.00	-
	Southwest Pacific (6)	66.67	-
Total (58) and averages	48.28	-	
make all possible efforts to avoid unduly delaying the vessel and to minimize interference and inconvenience, including any unnecessary presence of inspectors onboard, and to avoid action that would adversely affect the quality of the fish on board	Africa (18)	88.89	-
	Asia (12)	91.67	-
	Europe (6)	100.00	-
	Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	91.67	-
	Near East (3)	66.67	-
	Southwest Pacific (6)	100.00	-

Procedures	Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties whose inspection procedures: (%)	Average extent to which Parties inspection procedures (1-5)*:
	Total (59) and averages	91.53	-
make all possible efforts to facilitate communication with the master or senior crew members of the vessel, including where possible and where needed an interpreter accompanies the inspector	Africa (18)	88.89	-
	Asia (12)	91.67	-
	Europe (6)	100.00	-
	Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	66.67	-
	Near East (3)	66.67	-
	Northern America (2)	100.00	-
	Southwest Pacific (6)	83.33	-
	Total (59) and averages	84.75	-
ensure that inspections are conducted in a fair, transparent and non-discriminatory manner and would not constitute harassment of any vessel	Africa (18)	94.44	-
	Asia (12)	100.00	-
	Europe (6)	100.00	-
	Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	91.67	-
	Near East (3)	66.67	-
	Northern America (2)	100.00	-
	Southwest Pacific (6)	100.00	-
	Total (59) and averages	94.92	-
not interfere with the master's ability, in conformity with international law, to communicate with the authorities of the flag State	Africa (18)	94.44	-
	Asia (12)	75.00	-
	Europe (6)	100.00	-
	Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	83.33	-
	Near East (3)	0.00	-
	Northern America (2)	100.00	-
	Southwest Pacific (6)	100.00	-
	Total (59) and averages	84.75	-

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

** From those that responded positively to the previous question.

Table 32

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

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties that, as a minimum standard, include the information set out in Annex C of the Agreement in the written report of the results of each inspection	Parties who's written reports go beyond the information set out in Annex C*	Parties with a reporting system in place on IUU fishing detected following an inspection	Parties who's reporting system works efficiently*
Africa (18)	88.89	56.25	72.22	91.67
Asia (12)	83.33	40.00	75.00	100.00
Europe (7)	85.71	50.00	100.00	100.00
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	91.67	54.55	33.33	100.00
Near East (3)	33.33	0.00	66.67	50.00
Northern America (2)	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Southwest Pacific (6)	100.00	83.33	83.33	100.00
Total (60) and averages	86.67	55.77	70.00	95.12

*From those that responded positively to the previous question

Table 33

Transmittal of inspection results (Article 15) (%)

Entities	Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties Transmitting inspection results to:
The flag State of the inspected vessel	Africa (17)	35.29
	Asia (8)	87.50
	Europe (5)	100.00
	Latin America and the Caribbean (7)	57.14
	Near East (1)	0.00
	Northern America (2)	100.00
	Southwest Pacific (6)	66.67
	Total (46) and averages	60.87
Those states for which there is evidence through inspection that the vessel has engaged in IUU fishing or fishing-related activities in support of such fishing within waters under their national jurisdiction	Africa (18)	61.11
	Asia (12)	75.00
	Europe (6)	66.67
	Latin America and the Caribbean (11)	45.45
	Near East (3)	33.33
	Northern America (2)	100.00
	Southwest Pacific (6)	83.33
	Total (58) and averages	63.79
The state in which the vessel's master is a national	Africa (17)	23.53
	Asia (12)	50.00
	Europe (6)	33.33
	Latin America and the Caribbean (11)	36.36
	Near East (3)	33.33
	Northern America (2)	50.00
	Southwest Pacific (6)	66.67
	Total (57) and averages	38.60
RFMO/A(s)	Africa (17)	64.71
	Asia (12)	75.00
	Europe (6)	83.33
	Latin America and the Caribbean (11)	45.45
	Near East (3)	66.67
	Northern America (2)	100.00
	Southwest Pacific (6)	66.67
	Total (57) and averages	66.67
FAO	Africa (17)	41.18
	Asia (12)	75.00
	Europe (6)	16.67
	Latin America and the Caribbean (11)	36.36
	Near East (3)	66.67
	Northern America (2)	100.00
	Southwest Pacific (6)	66.67
	Total (57) and averages	50.88

Entities	Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties Transmitting inspection results to:
Other relevant international organizations (specify)	Africa (17)	17.65
	Asia (11)	18.18
	Europe (6)	0.00
	Latin America and the Caribbean (11)	9.09
	Near East (3)	33.33
	Northern America (2)	50.00
	Southwest Pacific (6)	50.00
	Total (56) and averages	19.64

Table 34

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

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties that have designated an authority that shall act as contact point for the exchange of information under this Agreement	Parties with a national communication mechanism that allows for direct electronic sharing of information relevant to this Agreement
Africa (19)	94.74	68.42
Asia (12)	100.00	58.33
Europe (7)	100.00	85.71
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	91.67	83.33
Near East (3)	66.67	66.67
Northern America (2)	100.00	100.00
Southwest Pacific (6)	100.00	83.33
Total (61) and averages	95.08	73.77

Table 35

Electronic exchange of information (Article 16) - II (%)

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties that use electronic information exchange mechanisms to communicate with a flag State, or other port or coastal States	Types of electronic information mechanisms used by Parties*		Extent to which information transmitted through information exchange mechanisms is consistent with Annex D of the Agreement**
		Bilateral electronic information exchange mechanisms	Regional electronic information exchange mechanisms	
Africa (19)	57.89	54.55	81.82	3.16
Asia (12)	66.67	50.00	75.00	3.83
Europe (7)	100.00	71.43	85.71	4.71
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	75.00	55.56	66.67	3.50
Near East (3)	33.33	100.00	100.00	3.00
Northern America (2)	100.00	100.00	100.00	4.50
Southwest Pacific (6)	83.33	100.00	80.00	3.83
Total (61) and averages	70.49	65.12	79.07	3.64

*From those who reported use of electronic information exchange mechanisms

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

Table 36

Training of national inspectors (Article 17)

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Extent to which Parties have trained its inspectors, considering the guidelines for the training of inspectors outlined in Annex E of the Agreement*	Parties who's national inspectors participated in PSM training courses conducted by other states/organizations (%)	Ranking – entities delivering trainings (%): **				
			Other Parties	Non Parties	FAO	RFMO/A(s)	Other
Africa (19)	3.95	94.74	46.67	6.67	94.44	83.33	33.33
Asia (12)	3.75	83.33	44.44	12.50	80.00	44.44	70.00
Europe (7)	4.86	50.00	33.33	0.00	33.33	66.67	33.33
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	3.58	75.00	44.44	11.11	100.00	22.22	22.22
Near East (3)	3.00	33.33	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.00
Northern America (2)	5.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00
Southwest Pacific (6)	3.83	83.33	80.00	0.00	40.00	40.00	75.00
Total (61) and averages	3.92	78.33	48.84	7.32	82.98	56.52	44.19

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

** From those who reported to have received training from other States or organizations

Table 37

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

Entity	Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties where, following an inspection, there are clear grounds for believing that a vessel has engaged in IUU fishing or fishing-related activities in support of such fishing, have a process in place to promptly notify its findings to:
The flag State	Africa (18)	88.89
	Asia (12)	88.89
	Europe (7)	100.00
	Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	66.67
	Near East (3)	50.00
	Northern America (2)	100.00
	Southwest Pacific (6)	83.33
	Total (60) and averages	83.93
Relevant coastal States	Africa (16)	81.25
	Asia (12)	66.67
	Europe (7)	71.43
	Latin America and the Caribbean (11)	81.82
	Near East (3)	66.67
	Northern America (2)	100.00
	Southwest Pacific (6)	83.33
	Total (57) and averages	77.19
Relevant RFMO/As	Africa (17)	82.35
	Asia (12)	66.67
	Europe (7)	100.00
	Latin America and the Caribbean (11)	81.82
	Near East (3)	66.67
	Northern America (2)	100.00
	Southwest Pacific (6)	83.33
	Total (58) and averages	81.03
Other international organizations	Africa (15)	40.00
	Asia (12)	50.00
	Europe (7)	14.29
	Latin America and the Caribbean (11)	27.27
	Near East (3)	0.00
	Northern America (2)	100.00
	Southwest Pacific (6)	83.33
	Total (56) and averages	41.07

Table 38

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

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	In cases where, following an inspection, there are clear grounds for believing that a vessel has engaged in IUU fishing or fishing-related activities in support of such fishing	
	Parties with a process in place to deny the vessel use of its port	Having had such cases whereby a Party has denied a vessel use of its port
Africa (18)	83.33	11.11
Asia (12)	91.67	25.00
Europe (7)	100.00	42.86
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	66.67	16.67
Near East (3)	33.33	0.00
Northern America (2)	100.00	0.00
Southwest Pacific (6)	100.00	16.67
Total (60) and averages	83.33	18.33

Table 39

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

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties with a process in place to maintain the relevant information on recourse available to the public in accordance with the Agreement, with regard to PSMs taken pursuant to:			
	Article 9 - Port entry, authorization and denial	Article 11 - Use of ports	Article 13 - Conduct of inspections	Article 18 - Port State action following inspection
Africa (19)	31.58	31.58	36.84	36.84
Asia (12)	75.00	75.00	66.67	66.67
Europe (5)	80.00	80.00	80.00	80.00
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	50.00	50.00	33.33	50.00
Near East (3)	66.67	66.67	66.67	66.67
Northern America (2)	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Southwest Pacific (6)	66.67	66.67	66.67	66.67
Total (59) and averages	55.93	55.93	52.54	55.93

Table 40

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

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties that have a process in place to provide information on recourse to the owner, operator, master or representative, as appropriate:			
	Article 9 - Port entry, authorization and denial	Article 11 - Use of ports	Article 13 - Conduct of inspections	Article 18 - Port State action following inspection
Africa (19)	52.63	52.63	50.00	52.63
Asia (12)	75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00
Europe (5)	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	66.67	66.67	66.67	58.33
Near East (3)	66.67	66.67	66.67	66.67
Northern America (2)	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Southwest Pacific (6)	83.33	83.33	83.33	83.33
Total (59) and averages	69.49	69.49	68.97	67.80

Table 41

Information provided on recourse (Article 19) (%)

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties that have provided information on recourse to the owner, operator, master or representative of a vessel with regard to PSMs taken pursuant to:			
	Article 9 - Port entry, authorization and denial	Article 11 - Use of ports	Article 13 - Conduct of inspections	Article 18 - Port State action following inspection
Africa (19)	52.63	52.63	52.63	52.63
Asia (12)	58.33	58.33	58.33	58.33
Europe (5)	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	58.33	58.33	50.00	50.00
Near East (3)	66.67	66.67	66.67	66.67
Northern America (2)	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00
Southwest Pacific (6)	83.33	83.33	83.33	83.33
Total (59) and averages	59.32	59.32	57.63	57.63

Table 42

Outcome of recourse (Article 19) (%)

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties that have measures in place to report the outcome of recourse to the flag State and the owner, operator, master or representative, as appropriate	Parties that have reported the outcome of recourse to the flag State and the owner, operator, master or representative, as appropriate	In cases where other Parties, States or international organisations have been informed of the prior decision pursuant to Articles 9, 11, 13 or 18:	
			Parties that have a process in place to inform them of any change in this decision	Parties that have informed them of any change in this decision
Africa (19)	52.63	52.63	52.63	47.37
Asia (12)	66.67	33.33	58.33	33.33
Europe (6)	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	66.67	50.00	58.33	41.67
Near East (3)	66.67	66.67	66.67	66.67
Northern America (2)	100.00	50.00	100.00	50.00
Southwest Pacific (6)	83.33	66.67	66.67	50.00
Total (60) and averages	68.33	55.00	63.33	50.00

Table 43

Role of flag State (Article 20) (%)

Measures	Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties that, in their capacity as flag States:
Require the vessels entitled to fly its flag to cooperate with the port State in inspections carried out pursuant to this Agreement	Africa (18)	94.44
	Asia (12)	83.33
	Europe (7)	85.71
	Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	75.00
	Near East (3)	33.33
	Northern America (2)	100.00
	Southwest Pacific (6)	100.00
	Total (60) and averages	85.00
In accordance with Article 20 paragraph 2 of the Agreement, as appropriate, request that State to inspect the vessel or to take other measures consistent with this Agreement	Africa (18)	92.31
	Asia (12)	75.00
	Europe (7)	100.00
	Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	71.43
	Near East (3)	100.00
	Northern America (2)	100.00
	Southwest Pacific (6)	83.33
	Total (60) and averages	85.37
Encourage vessels entitled to fly its flag to land, transship, package and process fish, and use other port services, in ports of States that are acting in accordance with, or in a manner consistent with the Agreement	Africa (18)	88.89
	Asia (12)	58.33
	Europe (7)	71.43
	Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	66.67
	Near East (3)	33.33
	Northern America (2)	100.00
	Southwest Pacific (6)	100.00
	Total (60) and averages	75.00
In cases where, following port State inspection, the Party receives an inspection report indicating that there are clear grounds to believe that a vessel entitled to fly its flag has engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing, immediately and fully investigate the matter and, upon sufficient evidence, take enforcement action without delay in accordance with its laws and regulations	Africa (18)	94.44
	Asia (11)	90.91
	Europe (7)	100.00
	Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	83.33
	Near East (3)	33.33
	Northern America (2)	100.00
	Southwest Pacific (6)	100.00
	Total (59) and averages	89.83
Report to other parties, relevant port and other states, regional fisheries management organizations and FAO on actions it has taken in respect of vessels entitled to fly its flag that, as a result of port State measures taken pursuant to this Agreement, have been determined to have engaged in IUU fishing or fishing-related activities in support of such fishing	Africa (18)	88.89
	Asia (11)	90.91
	Europe (7)	100.00
	Latin America and the Caribbean (11)	90.91
	Near East (3)	33.33
	Northern America (2)	100.00
	Southwest Pacific (6)	100.00
	Total (58) and averages	79.66

Measures	Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties that, in their capacity as flag States:
Ensure that measures applied to vessels entitled to fly its flag are at least as effective in preventing, deterring, and eliminating IUU fishing and fishing related activities in support of such fishing as measures applied to vessels referred to in paragraph 1 of Article 3	Africa (18)	77.78
	Asia (11)	81.82
	Europe (7)	100.00
	Latin America and the Caribbean (11)	75.00
	Near East (3)	33.33
	Northern America (2)	100.00
	Southwest Pacific (6)	83.33
	Total (58) and averages	89.66

Table 44

Requirements of developing States (Article 21) (%)

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties that have obtained external assistance on PSMA implementation*	Actors providing external assistance**			
		Other States	FAO	RFMO/A(s)	Other
Africa (19)	78.95	33.33	100.00	61.54	45.45
Asia (12)	63.64	66.67	100.00	28.57	100.00
Europe (7)	16.67	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.00
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	91.67	27.27	100.00	0.00	18.18
Near East (3)	50.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
Northern America (2)	-	-	-	-	-
Southwest Pacific (6)	80.00	75.00	75.00	50.00	50.00
Total (61) and averages	68.42	40.00	97.44	35.14	35.14

* 4 parties reported that this question was not applicable and were not considered within this column

** From those Parties reporting that they have obtained external assistance on PSMA implementation

Table 45

Allocation of UN/LOCODE for designated ports under the Agreement

Region (number of respondents in brackets)	Parties who's designated ports have been allocated a UN/LOCODE
Africa (17)	82.35
Asia (12)	75.00
Europe (7)	85.71
Latin America and the Caribbean (12)	58.33
Near East (3)	33.33
Northern America (2)	50.00
Southwest Pacific (6)	83.33
Total (59) and averages	72.88