

**Rev.1**

**REGIONAL STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES  
BY FAO MEMBERS TO THE 2010 QUESTIONNAIRE ON  
THE CODE OF CONDUCT FOR RESPONSIBLE  
FISHERIES IMPLEMENTATION**

**Note on Europe Region data**

The EU is mandated to respond to the Code questionnaire in the name of its member countries. This limits the responses from the Europe FAO region to 4 European non-EU member countries and the EU itself, except for questions relating to the legal frameworks in place for integrated coastal zone management, conflicts in coastal areas and resolution mechanisms, which are also replied to individually by EU member countries (table 21).

**REGIONAL STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES BY FAO MEMBERS TO THE 2010  
QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE CODE OF CONDUCT FOR RESPONSIBLE FISHERIES  
IMPLEMENTATION**

**TABLE 1**  
**FAO Members responding to the Questionnaire on**  
**the Code of Conduct in 2000, 2002, 2004, 2006 2008 and 2010 prior to**  
**the deadline for the submission of questionnaires**

Region	Country	Response in 2000	Response in 2002	Response in 2004	Response in 2006	Response in 2008	Response in 2010 <sup>1</sup>
Africa	Algeria				Yes		Yes
	Angola	Yes	Yes		Yes		
	Benin	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	
	Botswana		Yes				
	Burkina Faso	Yes	Yes		Yes		
	Burundi	Yes	Yes				Yes
	Cameroon	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Central African Republic				Yes		
	Cape Verde	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
	Chad	Yes	Yes		Yes		
	Comoros		Yes	Yes			
	Congo, DRC	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes
	Congo, Republic of	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	
	Côte d'Ivoire	Yes	Yes	Yes			
	Eritrea	Yes	Yes				
	Ethiopia	Yes	Yes			Yes	
	Gabon	Yes					
	The Gambia	Yes					
	Ghana	Yes	Yes				
	Guinea	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	
	Guinea-Bissau	Yes	Yes			Yes	
	Kenya	Yes	Yes			Yes	
	Lesotho						Yes
	Madagascar	Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes
	Malawi	Yes	Yes				
	Mali	Yes				Yes	
	Mauritania	Yes				Yes	Yes
	Mauritius	Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes
	Morocco	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Mozambique		Yes	Yes			Yes
	Namibia	Yes	Yes				
	Niger	Yes	Yes				
	Nigeria		Yes				Yes
	Rwanda	Yes				Yes	
	Senegal	Yes	Yes			Yes	
	Seychelles	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes
	Sierra Leone	Yes	Yes				
	South Africa	Yes	Yes				
	Swaziland	Yes				Yes	
	Tanzania		Yes				Yes
Togo		Yes			Yes	Yes	
Tunisia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Uganda	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Zambia		Yes					
Zimbabwe	Yes	Yes			Yes		

<sup>1</sup> Republic of Korea, Pakistan and Thailand submitted questionnaires after 30 June 2010, the deadline for submission of questionnaire and they are not reflected in the analysis for 2010. In addition, Japan submitted its questionnaire before the deadline but it was not received in the Fisheries and Aquaculture Department, Rome. The information therefore was not included in the analysis for 2010.

Region	Country	Response in 2000	Response in 2002	Response in 2004	Response in 2006	Response in 2008	Response in 2010 <sup>1</sup>
<b>Asia</b>	Bangladesh	Yes	Yes				Yes
	Bhutan		Yes				
	Cambodia	Yes	Yes	Yes			
	China	Yes			Yes		Yes
	India	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	
	Indonesia	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes
	Japan	Yes			Yes	Yes	
	Korea, DPR	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
	Korea, Rep. of	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
	Laos	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
	Malaysia	Yes	Yes				
	Myanmar	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Nepal			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Pakistan			Yes		Yes	Yes
	Philippines	Yes	Yes				Yes
	Sri Lanka	Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes
	Thailand	Yes					Yes
Vietnam	Yes						
<b>Europe</b>	Albania		Yes				
	Armenia				Yes		
	Austria	Yes		Yes		Yes	Yes
	Belgium				Yes		Yes
	Bulgaria					Yes	
	Cyprus	Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes
	Czech Republic	Yes	Yes			Yes	
	Denmark	Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes
	European Union	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
	Estonia		Yes				Yes
	Finland	Yes	Yes			Yes	
	France			Yes			
	Georgia			Yes			
	Germany	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes
	Greece	Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes
	Hungary		Yes			Yes	
	Iceland	Yes					Yes
	Italy					Yes	Yes
	Lithuania		Yes			Yes	Yes
	The Netherlands	Yes					
	Norway	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Poland		Yes				Yes
	Portugal	Yes					Yes
	Romania	Yes				Yes	Yes
	Russian Federation						
	Slovakia						Yes <sup>2</sup>
	Slovenia					Yes	
Spain			Yes		Yes	Yes	
Sweden			Yes				
Switzerland				Yes			
Turkey			Yes	Yes		Yes	
United Kingdom						Yes	
<b>Latin America and the Caribbean</b>	Antigua and Barbuda			Yes		Yes	Yes
	Argentina	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Barbados	Yes	Yes				
	Bahamas		Yes				
	Belize				Yes		
	Bolivia	Yes			Yes	Yes	
	Brazil	Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes

<sup>2</sup> Responded by email that the questionnaire was not relevant.

Region	Country	Response in 2000	Response in 2002	Response in 2004	Response in 2006	Response in 2008	Response in 2010 <sup>1</sup>
	Chile		Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes
	Colombia		Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
	Costa Rica	Yes		Yes			Yes
	Cuba	Yes					
	Dominica	Yes	Yes				
	Dominican Republic		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Ecuador	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	El Salvador		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
	Grenada	Yes					
	Guatemala	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Guyana		Yes				
	Haiti	Yes	Yes				
	Honduras	Yes	Yes				
	Jamaica	Yes					
	Mexico		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Nicaragua	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Panama	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes
	Paraguay	Yes					
	Peru	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Saint Lucia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
	Suriname	Yes			Yes		
	Trinidad and Tobago	Yes	Yes				
	Uruguay	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
	Venezuela		Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Near East</b>	Afghanistan					Yes	Yes
	Bahrain	Yes					Yes
	Egypt	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
	Iraq	Yes				Yes	Yes
	Iran, Islamic Republic of	Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes
	Jordan		Yes		Yes		
	Kuwait	Yes				Yes	Yes
	Kyrgyzstan					Yes	Yes
	Lebanon	Yes	Yes			Yes	
	Oman			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Qatar			Yes		Yes	
	Sudan	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes
	Syria		Yes				
	United Arab Emirates	Yes					
	Yemen	Yes		Yes			
<b>North America</b>	Canada	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes
	United States of America	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Southwest Pacific</b>	Australia	Yes	Yes		Yes		
	Cook Islands		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Fiji	Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes
	Marshall Islands	Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes
	Micronesia, FSM			Yes			Yes
	Nauru		Yes	Yes			
	New Zealand	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes
	Niue					Yes	Yes
	Palau			Yes			
	Papua New Guinea		Yes				Yes
	Samoa		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Solomon Islands		Yes				
	Tonga	Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes
	Tuvalu					Yes	Yes
	Vanuatu		Yes			Yes	

Note: Only FAO Members that responded at least once to the CCRF Questionnaire are listed

**TABLE 2**  
**Comparative response rates by FAO regions**

<b>FAO Region</b>	<b>Number of responding States* (2010)</b>	<b>Percentage response by FAO Region (2010)</b>	<b>Percentage response by FAO region (2008)</b>
Africa	11	22.9	35.4
Asia	4	17.4	43.5
Europe	18	37.5	22.9
Latin America & the Caribbean	15	45.5	39.4
Near East	9	42.9	33.3
North America	2	100	100
Southwest Pacific	10	62.5	50.0
<b>Total count and percentages</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>36.5</b>	<b>36.0</b>

\* counting EU members that submitted a filled questionnaire

**TABLE 3**  
**Ranking of the Objectives of the Code of Conduct by decreasing order of top priority**  
**(Ranking: 5=extremely relevant, 3=relevant, 1=not very relevant)**

<b>Objectives</b>	<b>Region (number of responses in brackets)</b>	<b>5 (%)</b>	<b>4 (%)</b>	<b>3 (%)</b>	<b>2 (%)</b>	<b>1 (%)</b>
Objective A: Establish principles for responsible fisheries considering all their relevant biological, technical, economic, social environmental and commercial aspects.	<b>Africa (11)</b>	63.6	9.1	18.2	9.1	
	<b>Asia (4)</b>	25.0	50.0	25.0		
	<b>Europe (5)</b>	40.0	40.0	20.0		
	<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean (15)</b>	86.7	13.3			
	<b>Near East (9)</b>	66.7		22.2		11.1
	<b>North America (2)</b>	100				
	<b>Southwest Pacific (10)</b>	60.0	40.0			
	<b>Total (56)</b>	<b>66.1</b>	<b>19.6</b>	<b>10.7</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.8</b>
Objective B: Establish principles and criteria to implement policies for the conservation of fishery resources and fisheries management and development.	<b>Africa (11)</b>	54.6	9.1	36.4		
	<b>Asia (4)</b>	50.0	25.0	25.0		
	<b>Europe (5)</b>	40.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	
	<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean (15)</b>	86.7	6.7	6.7		
	<b>Near East (9)</b>	44.4	33.3	11.1		11.1
	<b>North America (2)</b>	100				
	<b>Southwest Pacific (10)</b>	50.0	50.0			
	<b>Total (56)</b>	<b>60.7</b>	<b>21.4</b>	<b>14.3</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.8</b>
Objective G: Promote protection of living aquatic resources and their environments and coastal areas.	<b>Africa (11)</b>	72.7	27.3			
	<b>Asia (4)</b>	25.0	50.0			25.0
	<b>Europe (5)</b>		60.0	20.0	20.0	
	<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean (15)</b>	66.7	13.3	20.0		
	<b>Near East (9)</b>	22.2	33.3	33.3		11.1
	<b>North America (2)</b>	100				
	<b>Southwest Pacific (10)</b>	40.0	50.0	10.0		
	<b>Total (56)</b>	<b>48.2</b>	<b>32.1</b>	<b>14.3</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>3.6</b>
Objective I: Promote research on fisheries as well as on associated ecosystems and relevant environmental factors.	<b>Africa (11)</b>	63.6		36.4		
	<b>Asia (4)</b>	25.0	50.0	25.0		
	<b>Europe (5)</b>	20.0	20.0	40.0	20.0	
	<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean (15)</b>	60.0	26.7	13.3		
	<b>Near East (9)</b>	33.3	11.1	33.3	11.1	11.1
	<b>North America (2)</b>	100				
	<b>Southwest Pacific (10)</b>	40.0	50.0	10.0		
	<b>Total (56)</b>	<b>48.2</b>	<b>23.2</b>	<b>23.2</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>1.8</b>

<b>Objectives</b>	<b>Region (number of responses in brackets)</b>	<b>5 (%)</b>	<b>4 (%)</b>	<b>3 (%)</b>	<b>2 (%)</b>	<b>1 (%)</b>
Objective F: Promote the contribution of fisheries to food security and food quality giving priority to the nutritional needs of local communities.	<b>Africa</b> (11)	72.7		9.1	18.2	
	<b>Asia</b> (4)	75.0	25.0			
	<b>Europe</b> (5)		60.0		40.0	
	<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b> (15)	53.4	20.0	26.7		
	<b>Near East</b> (9)	33.3	33.3	11.1		22.2
	<b>North America</b> (2)	50.0	50.0			
	<b>Southwest Pacific</b> (10)	30.0	60.0	10.0		
	<b>Total (56)</b>	<b>46.4</b>	<b>30.4</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>7.1</b>	<b>3.6</b>
Objective E: Facilitate and promote cooperation in the conservation of fishery resources, fisheries management and development.	<b>Africa</b> (11)	54.6	18.2	9.1	9.1	9.1
	<b>Asia</b> (4)	50.0	50.0			
	<b>Europe</b> (5)		40.0	60.0		
	<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b> (15)	53.3	26.7	20.0		
	<b>Near East</b> (9)	33.3	11.1	44.4		11.1
	<b>North America</b> (2)	100				
	<b>Southwest Pacific</b> (10)	40.0	60.0			
	<b>Total (56)</b>	<b>44.6</b>	<b>30.4</b>	<b>19.6</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>3.6</b>
Objective J: Provide standards of conduct for all involved in the fisheries sector.	<b>Africa</b> (11)	81.8		9.1	9.1	
	<b>Asia</b> (4)	25.0	25.0	50.0		
	<b>Europe</b> (5)		40.0	60.0		
	<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b> (15)	60.0	20.0	20.0		
	<b>Near East</b> (9)	11.1	22.2	55.6		11.1
	<b>North America</b> (2)	50.0	50.0			
	<b>Southwest Pacific</b> (10)	30.0	60.0	10.0		
	<b>Total (56)</b>	<b>42.9</b>	<b>26.8</b>	<b>26.8</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.8</b>
Objective C: Serve as an instrument of reference to improve legal and institutional framework for appropriate management measures.	<b>Africa</b> (11)	45.5	9.1	45.5		
	<b>Asia</b> (4)	50.0	50.0			
	<b>Europe</b> (5)		40.0	40.0	20.0	
	<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b> (15)	60.0	6.7	33.3		
	<b>Near East</b> (9)	11.1	44.4	44.4		
	<b>North America</b> (2)	100				
	<b>Southwest Pacific</b> (10)	50.0	50.0			
	<b>Total (56)</b>	<b>39.3</b>	<b>30.4</b>	<b>28.6</b>	<b>1.8</b>	
Objective D: Provide guidance to formulate and implement international agreements and other legal instruments.	<b>Africa</b> (11)	27.3	18.2	45.5	9.1	
	<b>Asia</b> (4)	25.0	50.0	25.0		
	<b>Europe</b> (5)		60.0	20.0	20.0	
	<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b> (15)	53.3	20.0	26.7		
	<b>Near East</b> (9)	33.3	33.3	33.3		
	<b>North America</b> (2)	50.0	50.0			
	<b>Southwest Pacific</b> (10)	50.0	40.0	10.0		
	<b>Total (56)</b>	<b>37.5</b>	<b>32.1</b>	<b>26.8</b>	<b>3.6</b>	
Objective H: Promote trade in fish and fishery products in conformity with relevant international rules.	<b>Africa</b> (11)	54.6	18.2	27.3		
	<b>Asia</b> (4)		75.0		25.0	
	<b>Europe</b> (5)		60.0	40.0		
	<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b> (15)	33.3	26.7	40.0		
	<b>Near East</b> (9)		33.3	33.3	11.1	22.2
	<b>North America</b> (2)	100				
	<b>Southwest Pacific</b> (10)	40.0	50.0	10.0		
	<b>Total (56)</b>	<b>30.4</b>	<b>35.7</b>	<b>26.8</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.6</b>

**TABLE 4**  
**Ranking of themes in the Code of Conduct by decreasing order of top priority**

<b>Theme</b>	<b>Region (number of responses in brackets)</b>	<b>Top Priority (%)</b>	<b>Priority (%)</b>	<b>Low Priority (%)</b>
Fisheries Management	<b>Africa (11)</b>	90.9		9.1
	<b>Asia (4)</b>	75.0	25.0	
	<b>Europe (5)</b>	80.0	20.0	
	<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean (15)</b>	86.7	13.3	
	<b>Near East (9)</b>	66.7	33.3	
	<b>North America (2)</b>	100		
	<b>Southwest Pacific (10)</b>	100		
	<b>Total (56)</b>	<b>85.7</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>1.8</b>
Aquaculture Development	<b>Africa (11)</b>	81.8	18.2	
	<b>Asia (4)</b>	50.0	50.0	
	<b>Europe (5)</b>	20.0	80.0	
	<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean (15)</b>	60.0	33.3	6.7
	<b>Near East (9)</b>	55.6	22.2	22.2
	<b>North America (2)</b>		100	
	<b>Southwest Pacific (10)</b>	70.0	20.0	10.0
	<b>Total (56)</b>	<b>58.9</b>	<b>33.9</b>	<b>7.1</b>
Fisheries Research	<b>Africa (11)</b>	54.5	27.3	18.2
	<b>Asia (4)</b>	50.0	50.0	
	<b>Europe (5)</b>	40.0	40.0	20.0
	<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean (15)</b>	46.7	40.0	13.3
	<b>Near East (9)</b>	66.7	22.2	11.1
	<b>North America (2)</b>	100		
	<b>Southwest Pacific (10)</b>	50.0	40.0	10.0
	<b>Total (56)</b>	<b>53.6</b>	<b>33.9</b>	<b>12.5</b>
Fishing Operations	<b>Africa (11)</b>	54.5	36.4	9.1
	<b>Asia (4)</b>	50.0	25.0	25.0
	<b>Europe (5)</b>	20.0	80.0	
	<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean (15)</b>	26.7	66.7	6.7
	<b>Near East (9)</b>	33.3	55.6	11.1
	<b>North America (2)</b>	100		
	<b>Southwest Pacific (10)</b>	70.0	30.0	
	<b>Total (56)</b>	<b>44.6</b>	<b>48.2</b>	<b>7.1</b>
Post-harvest Practices	<b>Africa (11)</b>	45.5	45.5	9.1
	<b>Asia (4)</b>	25.0	75.0	
	<b>Europe (5)</b>	40.0	60.0	
	<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean (15)</b>	53.3	46.7	
	<b>Near East (9)</b>	11.1	55.6	33.3
	<b>North America (2)</b>		100	
	<b>Southwest Pacific (10)</b>	60.0	30.0	10.0
	<b>Total (56)</b>	<b>44.6</b>	<b>46.4</b>	<b>8.9</b>



**TABLE 4 (continued)**  
**Ranking of themes in the Code of Conduct by decreasing order of top priority**

<b>Theme</b>	<b>Region (number of specified responses in brackets)</b>	<b>Top Priority (%)</b>	<b>Priority (%)</b>	<b>Low Priority (%)</b>
Integration of Fisheries into Coastal and Basin Area Management	<b>Africa (10)</b>	50.0	50.0	
	<b>Asia (4)</b>	25.0	50.0	25.0
	<b>Europe (5)</b>	20.0	40.0	40.0
	<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean (15)</b>	60.0	40.0	
	<b>Near East (9)</b>	33.3	11.1	55.6
	<b>North America (2)</b>	100		
	<b>Southwest Pacific (10)</b>	30.0	70.0	
	<b>Total (55)</b>	<b>43.6</b>	<b>41.8</b>	<b>14.5</b>
Trade	<b>Africa (11)</b>	36.4	45.5	18.2
	<b>Asia (4)</b>	25.0	75.0	
	<b>Europe (5)</b>	40.0	20.0	40.0
	<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean (15)</b>	40.0	53.3	6.7
	<b>Near East (9)</b>	22.2	22.2	55.6
	<b>North America (2)</b>	50.0	50.0	
	<b>Southwest Pacific (10)</b>	60.0	20.0	20.0
	<b>Total (56)</b>	<b>39.3</b>	<b>39.3</b>	<b>21.4</b>
Inland Fisheries Development	<b>Africa (11)</b>	54.5	36.4	9.1
	<b>Asia (4)</b>	75.0	25.0	
	<b>Europe (5)</b>		60.0	40.0
	<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean (15)</b>	13.3	53.3	33.3
	<b>Near East (7)</b>	42.9	42.9	14.3
	<b>North America (2)</b>		100	
	<b>Southwest Pacific (9)</b>	11.1	33.3	55.6
	<b>Total (53)</b>	<b>28.3</b>	<b>45.3</b>	<b>26.4</b>

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

<b>Region (number of specified responses in brackets)</b>	<b>Yes (intending to conform in brackets*)</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Partially</b>
<b>Africa (11)</b>	54.6 (40.0)		45.5
<b>Asia (3)</b>	100 (n.a.)		
<b>Europe (5)</b>	60.0 (50.0)		40.0
<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean (15)</b>	66.7 (0)		33.3
<b>Near East (7)</b>	42.9 (25.0)	14.3	42.9
<b>North America (2)</b>	100 (n.a.)		
<b>Southwest Pacific (10)</b>	80.0 (50.0)		20.0
<b>Total (53) and averages</b>	<b>66.0 (27.8)</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>32.1</b>

\* referring only to those countries only partially or not in line with the Code

**TABLE 6**  
**Most commonly used mechanisms to raise awareness about the CCRF (figures in %)**

<b>Region</b> (number of specified responses in brackets)	<b>Meetings, workshops and seminars</b> (31.9%)	<b>Policy and Legal framework improvements</b> (28.6%)	<b>Publishing and distributing Code documents</b> (15.4%)	<b>Translating the Code &amp; developing local guidelines</b> (9.9%)
<b>Africa</b> (10)	80.0	20.0	30.0	20.0
<b>Asia</b> (4)	25.0	25.0	100	25.0
<b>Europe</b> (5)	20.0	40.0		20.0
<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b> (13)	76.9	69.2	30.8	30.8
<b>Near East</b> (8)	75.0	50.0	25.0	12.5
<b>North America</b> (2)		50.0		
<b>Southwest Pacific</b> (10)	30.0	70.0	10.0	

*Legend to table headers:* The percentage value indicated below each mechanism represents the overall percentage of countries that reported to use the awareness raising mechanism indicated. The tabulated mechanisms embody a cumulative 85.7 percent of all awareness raising mechanisms reported. Other reported mechanisms included Media and Internet dissemination and training of staff (4.4% respectively); and the creation of national committees and other groups to discuss Code implementation measures (2.2%) [percentages as per table header].

**TABLE 7**  
**Number of fishery management plans reported to have been developed and implemented by FAO Members for marine and inland capture fisheries in accordance with the Code of Conduct**

<b>Region</b> (number of specified responses in brackets)	<b>Countries with no management plans (in %)</b>	<b>Number of plans developed (count)</b>		<b>Percentage of plans implemented</b>	
		<b>Marine</b>	<b>Inland</b>	<b>Marine</b>	<b>Inland</b>
<b>Africa</b> (7)	28.6	16	46	68.8	73.9
<b>Asia</b> (4)		6	2	16.7	
<b>Europe</b> (5)		32	1	100	100
<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b> (15)	13.3	112	55	77.7	47.3
<b>Near East</b> (7)	14.3	9	15	77.8	86.7
<b>North America</b> (2)		351	60	100	100
<b>Southwest Pacific</b> (8)		103	2	93.2	100
<b>Totals</b> (48) <i>and averages</i>	<b>10.4</b>	<b>629</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>93.0</b>	<b>75.1</b>

**TABLE 8**  
**Measures implemented in marine and inland fishery management plans, designed to promote responsible resource use in accordance with the Code of Conduct (in decreasing order)**

<b>Measures</b>	<b>Region</b> (number of specified responses in brackets for both marine and inland fisheries)	<b>Marine Fisheries Management Plans (in %)</b>	<b>Inland Fisheries Management Plans (in %)</b>
Prohibiting destructive fishing methods and practices	<b>Africa</b> (5) (7)	100	100
	<b>Asia</b> (3) (4)	66.7	75.0
	<b>Europe</b> (4) (4)	100	100
	<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b> (14) (12)	100	100
	<b>Near East</b> (7) (5)	100	80.0
	<b>North America</b> (2) (2)	100	100
	<b>Southwest Pacific</b> (10) (3)	100	100
	<b>Total</b> (46) (37)	<b>97.8</b>	<b>94.6</b>
Addressing the interests of small-scale fishers	<b>Africa</b> (5) (6)	100	66.7
	<b>Asia</b> (3) (4)	100	75.0
	<b>Europe</b> (5) (4)	100	100
	<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b> (14) (12)	100	91.7
	<b>Near East</b> (6) (5)	100	80.0
	<b>North America</b> (2) (2)	100	100
	<b>Southwest Pacific</b> (10) (3)	90.0	100
	<b>Total</b> (45) (36)	<b>97.8</b>	<b>86.1</b>
Providing for stakeholder participation in determining management decisions	<b>Africa</b> (5) (6)	100	100
	<b>Asia</b> (3) (4)	100	75.0
	<b>Europe</b> (5) (4)	100	100
	<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b> (14) (12)	92.9	91.7
	<b>Near East</b> (7) (5)	71.4	60.0
	<b>North America</b> (2) (2)	100	100
	<b>Southwest Pacific</b> (10) (3)	90.0	100
	<b>Total</b> (46) (36)	<b>91.3</b>	<b>88.9</b>
Ensuring the level of fishing is commensurate with the state of fisheries resources	<b>Africa</b> (5) (6)	80.0	83.3
	<b>Asia</b> (3) (4)	66.7	75.0
	<b>Europe</b> (5) (4)	100	100
	<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b> (14) (12)	85.7	83.3
	<b>Near East</b> (7) (5)	100	80.0
	<b>North America</b> (2) (2)	100	100
	<b>Southwest Pacific</b> (10) (3)	100	100
	<b>Total</b> (46) (36)	<b>91.3</b>	<b>86.1</b>
Providing for the protection of endangered species	<b>Africa</b> (5) (6)	100	83.3
	<b>Asia</b> (3) (4)	100	75.0
	<b>Europe</b> (5) (4)	100	100
	<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b> (13) (11)	84.6	90.9
	<b>Near East</b> (7) (5)	85.7	60.0
	<b>North America</b> (2) (2)	100	100
	<b>Southwest Pacific</b> (10) (3)	90.0	100
	<b>Total</b> (45) (35)	<b>91.1</b>	<b>85.7</b>

**TABLE 8 (continued)**  
**Measures implemented in marine and inland fishery management plans, designed to promote responsible resource use in accordance with the Code of Conduct (in decreasing order)**

<b>Measures</b>	<b>Region</b> (number of specified responses in brackets for both marine and inland fisheries)	<b>Marine Fisheries Management Plans (in %)</b>	<b>Inland Fisheries Management Plans (in %)</b>
Addressing selectivity of fishing gear	<b>Africa</b> (5) (7)	80.0	100
	<b>Asia</b> (3) (4)	100	75.0
	<b>Europe</b> (5) (4)	60.0	100
	<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b> (14) (12)	100	83.3
	<b>Near East</b> (7) (5)	71.4	80.0
	<b>North America</b> (2) (2)	100	100
	<b>Southwest Pacific</b> (10) (3)	90.0	100
	<b>Total</b> (46) (37)	<b>87.0</b>	<b>89.2</b>
Addressing biodiversity of aquatic habitats and ecosystems, including the identification of essential fish habitats	<b>Africa</b> (5) (6)	80.0	50.0
	<b>Asia</b> (3) (4)	100	75.0
	<b>Europe</b> (5) (4)	100	75.0
	<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b> (14) (12)	85.7	91.7
	<b>Near East</b> (7) (5)	85.7	60.0
	<b>North America</b> (2) (2)	100	100
	<b>Southwest Pacific</b> (9) (3)	77.8	100
	<b>Total</b> (45) (36)	<b>86.7</b>	<b>77.8</b>
Allowing depleted stocks to recover	<b>Africa</b> (5) (7)	80.0	85.7
	<b>Asia</b> (3) (4)	66.7	75.0
	<b>Europe</b> (5) (4)	100	100
	<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b> (14) (12)	78.6	75.0
	<b>Near East</b> (6) (5)	66.7	60.0
	<b>North America</b> (2) (2)	100	100
	<b>Southwest Pacific</b> (10) (3)	90.0	100
	<b>Total</b> (45) (37)	<b>82.2</b>	<b>81.1</b>
Addressing fishing capacity, including the economic conditions under which the industry operates	<b>Africa</b> (5) (6)	60.0	66.7
	<b>Asia</b> (3) (4)	66.7	50.0
	<b>Europe</b> (5) (4)	80.0	100
	<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b> (14) (12)	71.4	83.3
	<b>Near East</b> (6) (5)	83.3	
	<b>North America</b> (2) (2)	100	100
	<b>Southwest Pacific</b> (10) (3)	100	66.7
	<b>Total</b> (45) (36)	<b>80.0</b>	<b>66.7</b>
Making use of stock specific target reference points	<b>Africa</b> (5) (5)	60.0	20.0
	<b>Asia</b> (3) (4)	66.7	50.0
	<b>Europe</b> (5) (4)	100	100
	<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b> (14) (12)	57.1	50.0
	<b>Near East</b> (6) (5)	33.3	40.0
	<b>North America</b> (2) (2)	100	100
	<b>Southwest Pacific</b> (10) (3)	40.0	33.3
	<b>Total</b> (45) (35)	<b>57.8</b>	<b>51.4</b>

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

**TABLE 9**  
**Stock specific target reference points (figures in %)**

Region (number of responses in brackets)	Countries having developed stock specific target reference points	For countries having developed stock specific target reference points:	
		Have they been exceeded?	Are they being approached?
<b>Africa (9)</b>	22.2	100	
<b>Asia (4)</b>	50.0	100	50.0
<b>Europe (5)</b>	80.0	100	100
<b>Latin America &amp; the Caribbean (14)</b>	78.6	63.6	45.5
<b>Near East (8)</b>	62.5	40.0	20.0
<b>North America (2)</b>	100	100	100
<b>Southwest Pacific (10)</b>	30.0	100	66.7
<b>Total (57) and averages</b>	<b>55.8</b>	<b>75.9</b>	<b>51.7</b>

**TABLE 10**  
**Indicators other than stock-specific target reference points used for managing stocks (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Catch & effort indic. (CPUE, etc.) (70.6%)	Catch & stock assessm. (biological) (29.4%)	Fishing gear & methods controls (5.9%)
<b>Africa (6)</b>	83.3	16.7	16.7
<b>Asia (2)</b>		50.00	
<b>Europe (0)</b>	-	-	-
<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean (3)</b>	100	66.7	
<b>Near East (0)</b>	-	-	-
<b>North America (0)</b>	-	-	-
<b>Southwest Pacific (6)</b>	66.7	16.7	

**Note:** This table specifically refers to countries that have not developed stock-specific target reference points.

**Legend to table headers:** The percentage value indicated below each indicator represents the overall percentage of countries that reported to use it for stock management. The tabulated indicators embody a cumulative 100 percent of all indicators reported.

**TABLE 11**  
**Action taken when stock specific target reference points are exceeded (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Regulating fishing effort (56.3%)	Closed areas & seasons (43.8%)	Implementing TAC & Quota system (31.3%)	Closing the fishery (25.0%)
<b>Africa (0)</b>	-	-	-	-
<b>Asia (2)</b>		50.0	50.0	
<b>Europe (4)</b>	50.0	25.0	25.0	50.0
<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean (6)</b>	83.3	66.7	50.0	16.7
<b>Near East (1)</b>	100	100		
<b>North America (1)</b>				
<b>Southwest Pacific (2)</b>	50.0			50.0

**Legend to table headers:** The percentage value indicated below each action represents the overall percentage of countries that reported to use it for countering the exceeding of stock-specific target reference points. The tabulated remedial actions embody a cumulative 75.8 percent of all actions reported. Other reported actions were recovery programs (18.8%), strengthening MCS (12.5%), gear prohibitions (12.5%) and improving management frameworks (6.3%) [percentages as per table header].

**TABLE 12**  
**Mechanisms used by countries applying the precautionary principle to fisheries management**  
**(figures in %)**

<b>Region</b> (number of specified responses in brackets)	<b>Closed areas &amp; seasons</b> (27.1%)	<b>Gear standardization &amp; regulation</b> (20.8%)	<b>Limiting /freezing fishing capacity</b> (18.8%)	<b>Taking into account scientific advice</b> (16.7%)
<b>Africa</b> (7)	28.6	28.6	28.6	
<b>Asia</b> (4)	25.0	25.0	50.0	
<b>Europe</b> (5)	40.0	40.0		80.0
<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b> (15)	33.3	13.3	20.0	13.3
<b>Near East</b> (6)	33.3	50.0	16.7	16.7
<b>North America</b> (2)	50.0			50.0
<b>Southwest Pacific</b> (9)			11.1	

Note: 90.7% of responding FAO Members reported to apply the precautionary principle to fisheries management. Percentage values in this table only apply to this pool of nations.

Legend to table headers: The percentage value indicated below each mechanism represents the overall percentage of countries that reported to use it as a precautionary tool for fisheries management. The tabulated mechanisms embody a cumulative 44.0 percent of all mechanisms reported. Other mechanisms include (by descending order of importance) applying precautionary approach where data are insufficient (14.6%); the putting in place of MPAs (14.6%), TAC and quota control (12.5%) and improving the legal framework for fisheries (10.4%) ( $\Sigma = 31.5\%$ ).

**TABLE 13**  
**Steps taken to ensure fishing operations within the EEZ comply with license provisions (figures in %)**

<b>Region</b> (number of specified responses in brackets)	<b>Improving MCS*</b> arrangements (84.3%)	<b>Mandatory licensing system**</b> (41.2%)	<b>Strengthening legal framework &amp; fines</b> (23.5%)
<b>Africa</b> (9)	88.9	33.3	11.11
<b>Asia</b> (4)	75.0	50.0	
<b>Europe</b> (5)	80.0	40.0	60.0
<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b> (14)	85.7	42.9	14.3
<b>Near East</b> (7)	71.4	28.6	14.3
<b>North America</b> (2)	100		50.0
<b>Southwest Pacific</b> (10)	90.0	60.0	40.0

Note: 94.1% of responding FAO Members reported to have taken steps taken to ensure fishing operations within the EEZ do comply with license provisions. Percentage values in this table only apply to this pool of nations.

Legend to table headers: \* refers particularly to surveillance and enforcement aspects. \*\* including authorization schemes for transshipments. The percentage value indicated below each measure represents the overall percentage of countries that reported to apply the same measure. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 71.0 percent of all reported measures. Other reported measures include (by descending order of importance) observer programme, running of a vessel registry; port state control measures; and cooperation between countries and fishing authorities (incl. access agreements) ( $\Sigma = 18.7\%$ ).

**TABLE 14**  
**Steps taken to ensure fishing operations outside national jurisdiction are reported, monitored and carried out in a presensible manner (figures in %)**

<b>Region</b> (number of specified responses in brackets)	<b>Improving MCS* arrangements</b> (65.2%)	<b>Mandatory licencing system**</b> (28.3%)	<b>Mandatory logbook / reporting</b> (28.3%)	<b>Cooperation between countries and with RFMOs</b> (28.3%)	<b>Observer programmes</b> (26.1%)
<b>Africa</b> (7)	57.1	14.3			14.3
<b>Asia</b> (3)	66.7	66.7	66.7		
<b>Europe</b> (5)	60.0	40.0	20.0	60.0	
<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b> (13)	61.5	15.4	38.5	30.8	38.5
<b>Near East</b> (7)	57.1		14.3	14.3	
<b>North America</b> (2)	50.0	50.0		100	
<b>Southwest Pacific</b> (9)	88.9	55.6	44.4	33.3	66.7

Note: 89.1% of responding FAO Members reported to have taken steps to ensure fishing operations outside national jurisdiction are reported, monitored and carried out in a presensible manner. Percentage values in this table only apply to this pool of nations.  
 Legend to table headers: \* refers particularly to surveillance and enforcement aspects. \*\* for Distant Water Fishing. The percentage value indicated below each measure represents the overall percentage of countries that reported to use the same as an implementation measure. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 78.6 percent of all mechanisms reported. Other steps taken include the enacting of laws regulating fishing beyond the EEZ (15.2%); complying with foreign laws and the compliance agreement (13.0%), or simply not allowing nationally flagged vessels to operate beyond national waters (6.5%) [percentages as per table header].

**TABLE 15**  
**Measures taken to limit bycatch and discards (figures in %)**

<b>Region</b> (number of specified responses in brackets)	<b>Gear restrictions and controls</b> (69.8%)	<b>Season &amp; area closures</b> (22.6%)	<b>Minimum species catch sizes</b> (20.8%)	<b>Banning of discards</b> (15.1%)
<b>Africa</b> (9)	55.6	22.2	33.3	
<b>Asia</b> (4)	75.0	25.0	25.0	
<b>Europe</b> (5)	80.0	60.0	40.0	40.0
<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b> (15)	86.7	26.7	26.7	13.3
<b>Near East</b> (8)	75.0	12.5		12.5
<b>North America</b> (2)	100	100		
<b>Southwest Pacific</b> (10)	40.0		10.0	30.0

Note: 86.8% of responding FAO Members reported to have taken measures to limit bycatch and discards. Percentage values in this table only apply to this pool of nations.

Legend to table headers: The percentage value indicated below each measure represents the overall percentage of countries that reported to use the same as mitigation measure. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 59.7 percent of all mechanisms reported. Other mechanisms include (by descending order of importance) By-catch reduction regulations, setting quotas for no-target species and % of bycatch; inspections and stricter fines; monitoring schemes, and landing and logbook controls and declarations ( $\Sigma = 25.4\%$ ).

**TABLE 16**  
**VMS implementation (figures in %)**

<b>Region</b> (number of specified responses in brackets)	<b>Has VMS been implemented?</b> (for countries not having [fully] implemented VMS as yet, percentage planning to do so in brackets)		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Partially</b>
<b>Africa</b> (9)	22.2 (42.9)	33.3	44.4
<b>Asia</b> (4)	(25.0)	50.0	50.0
<b>Europe</b> (5)	40.0 (33.3)		60.0
<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b> (15)	20.0 (41.7)	26.7	53.3
<b>Near East</b> (9)	33.3 (50.0)	55.6	11.1
<b>North America</b> (2)			100
<b>Southwest Pacific</b> (10)	60.0		40.0
<b>Total</b> (54) <i>and averages</i>	<b>29.6</b> (34.2)	<b>25.9</b>	<b>44.4</b>

**TABLE 17 a)**  
**Countries that have developed a legal framework for the  
 development of responsible aquaculture (figures in %)**

<b>Region</b> (number of specified responses in brackets)	<b>Legal framework in place</b>
<b>Africa</b> (11)	63.6
<b>Asia</b> (4)	75.0
<b>Europe</b> (5)	80.0
<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b> (15)	93.3
<b>Near East</b> (7)	71.4
<b>North America</b> (2)	50.0
<b>Southwest Pacific</b> (9)	44.4
<b>Total</b> (53) <i>and averages</i>	<b>71.70</b>

**TABLE 17 b)**  
**Public and civil society elements that have developed or adopted a code or instrument of  
 best practices for aquaculture in accordance with the Code of Conduct (figures in %)**

<b>Region</b> (number of specified responses in brackets)	<b>Government</b>	<b>Producers</b>	<b>Suppliers</b>	<b>Manufacturers</b>	<b>Others</b>
<b>Africa</b> (11)	45.5	9.1	9.1	9.1	9.1
<b>Asia</b> (4)	100	75.0	75.0	50.0	50.0
<b>Europe</b> (5)	80.0	60.0	40.0	40.0	20.0
<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b> (14)	92.9	64.3	42.9	28.6	14.3
<b>Near East</b> (9)	77.8	33.3	22.2	22.2	22.2
<b>North America</b> (2)	50.0	100			
<b>Southwest Pacific</b> (9)	44.4	22.2			
<b>Total</b> (54) <i>and averages</i>	<b>61.1</b>	<b>42.6</b>	<b>25.9</b>	<b>20.4</b>	<b>14.8</b>

**TABLE 18**  
**Implementation rates of three core procedures for aquaculture, in accordance with  
 the Code of Conduct (figures in %)**

<b>Region</b> (number of specified responses in brackets)	<b>Environmental assessments of aquaculture operations</b>	<b>Monitoring of aquaculture operations</b>	<b>Minimizing harmful effects of alien<sup>*</sup> species introductions</b>
<b>Africa</b> (11)	81.8	81.8	72.7
<b>Asia</b> (3)	100	100	100
<b>Europe</b> (5)	100	100	100
<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b> (15)	93.3	86.7	100
<b>Near East</b> (9)	66.7	66.7	75.0
<b>North America</b> (2)	100	100	100
<b>Southwest Pacific</b> (8)	100	87.5	57.1
<b>Total</b> (53) <i>and averages</i>	<b>88.7</b>	<b>84.6</b>	<b>84.3</b>

\* alien: includes non-native and genetically altered stocks



**TABLE 19**  
**Identified needs for improvement in three critical domains of aquaculture operations**  
**(by descending order of importance)**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Environmental assessments of aquaculture operations</b>	<b>Monitoring of aquaculture operations</b>	<b>Minimizing harmful effects of alien* species introductions</b>
1	Improvement of environmental assessment (scope & techniques) (19.2%)	Monitoring (coverage; species; facilities) (20.5%)	Improving technical capacity (23.3%)
2	Legal framework improvement (14.9%)	Improvements needed (generic) (13.6%)	Strengthening the legal framework (11.6%)
3	Monitoring (frequency and/or coverage) (8.5%)	Legal framework improvement (9.1%)	Assessments (frequency and/or coverage) (7.0%)
4	Strengthening of technical capacity (8.5%)	Institutional strengthening (6.8%)	-
5	Institutional strengthening (8.5%)	-	-

\* alien: includes non-native and genetically altered stocks

**Note:** The percentage value indicated after each tabulated issue represents the fraction of all countries having put a particular mechanism in place (see table 18), and identifying it as a need. The tabulated issues cover needs identified by >3% of responding countries.

**TABLE 20**  
**Measures taken to promote responsible aquaculture practices in support of rural communities, producer organisations and fish farmers (figures in %)**

<b>Region (number of specified responses in brackets)</b>	<b>Extension programmes &amp; awareness campaigns (38.0%)</b>	<b>Legal framework improvement (34.0%)</b>	<b>EIA and environmental management (28.0%)</b>	<b>National aquaculture policies and/or sectoral plans (24.0%)</b>	<b>Improved institutional capacity / dedicated department (18.0%)</b>
<b>Africa (11)</b>	36.4	9.1	27.3	27.3	18.2
<b>Asia (3)</b>					
<b>Europe (5)</b>	20.0	60.0	60.0	60.0	
<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean (15)</b>	60.0	46.7	6.7	26.7	13.3
<b>Near East (8)</b>	50.0	25.0	32.5		25.0
<b>North America (2)</b>		100	100		50.0
<b>Southw. Pacific (6)</b>	16.7	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3

**Note:** 96.0% of responding FAO Members reported to have taken measures in this direction.

**Legend to table headers:** The percentage value indicated below each measure represents the overall percentage of responding countries that reported to use it as a support mechanism. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 54.6 percent of all mechanisms reported. Other reported mechanisms included a list of another 27 items, covering a very broad spectrum of sectoral interventions at all levels. The most important included the management of alien species introductions (8.0%), providing access to land (8.0%), organising producers into associations (8.0%) developing hatcheries and providing fry (8.0%), and including industry actors in the management of the sector (8.0%). All remaining issues scored ≤ 6.0% each. [percentages as per table header].

**TABLE 21**  
**Conflicts within the fisheries sector, and between fisheries and other sectors (figures in %)**

Type of conflict between	Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Strong	Mode-rate	Light	None	Conflict resolution mechanisms in place
Gear types in coastal areas	Africa (9) (9)	33.3	22.2	44.4		88.9
	Asia (3) (3)		33.3	66.7		100
	Europe (16) (16)	18.8	31.3	37.5	12.5	93.8
	Latin America & Caribbean (15) (15)	33.3	40.0	20.0	6.7	86.7
	Near East (7) (7)	14.3	57.1	14.3	14.3	42.9
	North America (2) (2)		100			100
	Southwest Pacific (10) (9)	10.0	10.0	40.0	40.0	66.7
	<b>Total (62) (61)</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>33.9</b>	<b>32.3</b>	<b>12.9</b>	<b>82.0</b>
Coastal and industrial fisheries	Africa (9) (9)	33.3	44.4		22.2	77.8
	Asia (3) (3)		33.3	66.7		100
	Europe (16) (16)	6.3	56.3	37.5		87.5
	Latin America & Caribbean (15) (15)	26.7	40.0	13.3	20.0	86.7
	Near East (7) (6)	14.3	14.3	28.6	42.9	50.0
	North America (2) (2)		50.0	50.0		100
	Southwest Pacific (10) (8)		40.0	20.0	40.0	62.5
	<b>Total (62) (59)</b>	<b>14.5</b>	<b>41.9</b>	<b>24.2</b>	<b>19.4</b>	<b>79.7</b>
Coastal fisheries and coastal aquaculture	Africa (9) (9)		11.1	11.1	77.8	22.2
	Asia (3) (3)			33.3	66.7	100
	Europe (16) (16)		6.3	50.0	43.8	75.0
	Latin America & Caribbean (15) (15)	6.7	26.7	26.7	40.0	80.0
	Near East (6) (6)		33.3	16.7	50.0	50.0
	North America (2) (2)		50.0	50.0		100
	Southwest Pacific (10) (8)	10.0	10.0	50.0	30.0	75.0
	<b>Total (61) (59)</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>16.4</b>	<b>34.4</b>	<b>45.9</b>	<b>67.8</b>
Fisheries and mining activities	Africa (8) (9)	12.5	25.0	25.0	37.5	55.6
	Asia (3) (3)	33.3		66.7		100
	Europe (16) (16)		12.5	50.0	37.5	68.8
	Latin America & Caribbean (14) (15)	14.3	28.6	21.4	35.7	53.3
	Near East (6) (7)	16.7	16.7	33.3	33.3	42.9
	North America (2) (2)			100		100
	Southwest Pacific (9) (9)		11.1	11.1	77.8	33.3
	<b>Total (58) (61)</b>	<b>8.6</b>	<b>17.2</b>	<b>34.5</b>	<b>39.7</b>	<b>57.4</b>
Fisheries and recreational activities	Africa (9) (9)		33.3	44.4	22.2	44.4
	Asia (3) (3)			66.7	33.3	100
	Europe (16) (16)	6.3	43.8	31.3	18.8	81.3
	Latin America & Caribbean (15) (15)	6.7	60.0	26.7	6.7	60.0
	Near East (7) (7)	28.6	28.6	28.6	14.3	28.6
	North America (2) (2)		100			100
	Southwest Pacific (10) (9)	10.0	20.0	40.0	30.0	44.4
	<b>Total (62) (61)</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>40.3</b>	<b>33.9</b>	<b>17.7</b>	<b>60.7</b>
Fisheries and port development	Africa (9) (9)		22.2	33.3	44.4	55.6
	Asia (3) (3)			33.3	66.7	100
	Europe (16) (16)		25.0	43.8	31.3	81.3
	Latin America & Caribbean (15) (15)	6.7	40.0	26.7	26.7	46.7
	Near East (7) (7)	14.3		42.9	42.9	57.1
	North America (2) (2)		50.0	50.0		100
	Southwest Pacific (10) (9)		20.0	50.0	30.0	55.6
	<b>Total (62) (61)</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>24.2</b>	<b>38.7</b>	<b>33.9</b>	<b>63.9</b>

54.4 percent of responding FAO members indicated to have in place a legal framework for the integrated management of coastal resources. Note: The first bracketed number following the FAO Region indicates the number of answers to the question summarized in the first four columns, while the number in the second bracket indicates the number of answers summarized in the last column.

**TABLE 22**  
**FAO Members and effective food safety and quality assurance system for fish and fisheries products**  
**(figures in %)**

Region (number of responses in brackets)	Countries with effective food safety & quality assurance systems in place
Africa (8)	75.0
Asia (4)	100
Europe (5)	100
Latin America & Caribbean (15)	93.3
Near East (7)	42.9
North America (2)	100.0
Southwest Pacific (9)	88.9
<b>Total (50) and average</b>	<b>84.0</b>

**TABLE 23**  
**Most effective measures taken to promote the reduction of post-harvest losses**  
**in fish processing, distribution and marketing (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Food-safety regulations, procedures, standards & codes (30.6%)	Improvement of handling & conservation methods (26.5%)	Awareness raising & training (24.5%)	HACCP implementation & training (22.5%)
Africa (10)	20.0	70.0	20.0	20.0
Asia (3)		33.3	33.3	
Europe (5)	60.0			40.0
Latin America & Caribbean (12)	50.0	8.3	58.3	16.7
Near East (8)	12.5	25.0		
North America (2)	50.0	50.0		50.0
Southwest Pacific (9)	22.2	11.1	22.2	44.4

Note: 87.8% of responding FAO Members reported to have taken steps to promote the reduction of post-harvest losses in fish processing, distribution and marketing. Percentage values in this table only apply to this pool of nations.

Legend to table headers: The percentage value indicated below each measure represents the overall percentage of countries that reported to use this as a mechanism. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 55.4 percent of all mechanisms reported. Other reported mechanisms included a list of another 15 items, covering a very broad spectrum of interventions within this field. The most important included provision of infrastructure (markets, cold storage, etc.) (16.3%), Research and Development initiatives (12.2%), monitoring, control and inspections (12.5%), by-product utilization and production / diversification of product use (10.2%), and provision of incentives and subsidies (6.1%). All remaining issues scored  $\leq$  4.1% each. [percentages as per table header].

**TABLE 24**  
**Most effective measures taken to promote the improved use of bycatch**  
**in fish processing, distribution and marketing (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	R&D & pilot projects (25.6%)	Distribution & bycatch value addition (15.4%)	Awareness raising & training (12.8%)	Promotion of new technology (10.3%)
Africa (4)	25.0			
Asia (2)	50.0	100		50.0
Europe (5)	60.0			20.0
Latin America & Caribbean (9)	22.2	22.2	22.2	22.2
Near East (7)			14.3	
North America (2)	50.0			
Southwest Pacific (10)	20.0	20.0	20.0	

Note: 66.7% of responding FAO Members reported to have taken steps to promote the improved use of bycatch in fish processing, distribution and marketing. Percentage values in this table only apply to this pool of nations.

Legend to table headers: The percentage value indicated below each measure represents the overall percentage of countries that reported to use this as a mechanism. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 64.1 percent of all mechanisms reported. Other reported mechanisms included a list of another 9 items. The most important included allowing the landing and processing of bycatch (7.7%), efforts to minimize bycatch at sea (7.7%), the improvement of processing facilities (5.1%), and the diversification of by-product usage (5.1%). All remaining issues scored  $\leq$  2.6% each. [percentages as per table header].

**TABLE 25**  
**FAO Members that can identify the origin of fish and fisheries products (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Processors (in%)	Consumers (in%)
<b>Africa (9)</b>	77.8	11.1
<b>Asia (3)</b>	100.0	33.3
<b>Europe (5)</b>	100	20.0
<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean (15)</b>	100	13.3
<b>Near East (5)</b>	62.5	37.5
<b>North America (2)</b>	100	50.0
<b>Southwest Pacific (8)</b>	80.0	50.0
<b>Total (52) and average</b>	<b>86.5</b>	<b>26.9</b>

**TABLE 26**  
**Measures taken to eliminate processing and trading in illegally harvested fisheries resources (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Control and inspections (56.3%)	Product traceability & certificate of origin (43.8%)	Legal framework improvement (14.6%)	Port access and landing controls (10.4%)
<b>Africa (7)</b>	14.3	28.6	14.3	
<b>Asia (3)</b>	66.7	66.7		
<b>Europe (5)</b>	80.0	60.0	20.0	20.0
<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean (14)</b>	64.3	50.0	14.3	7.1
<b>Near East (9)</b>	44.4	33.3	22.2	11.1
<b>North America (2)</b>	50.0	100	50.0	50.0
<b>Southwest Pacific (8)</b>	75.0	25.0		12.5

**Note:** 85.4% of responding FAO Members reported to eliminate processing and trading in illegally harvested fisheries resources. Percentage values in this table only apply to this pool of nations.

**Legend to table headers:** The percentage value indicated below each measure represents the overall percentage of countries that reported to use this as a mechanism. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 65.2 percent of all mechanisms reported. Other reported mechanisms included a list of another 12 items, covering a broad spectrum of interventions within this field. The most important included prohibition of processing and marketing illegally caught fish (8.3%), tougher fines (8.3%), trade measures and restrictions / controls (8.3%), mandatory data / information submissions (6.3%) and running a register of licensed sellers and buyers (6.3%). All remaining issues scored  $\leq 4.2\%$  each. [percentages as per table header].

**TABLE 27**  
**Summary information relating to the status of fisheries research in FAO Members**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Stock Assessment		FAO Members, where timely, complete & reliable statistics on catch and fishing effort are collected (in %)	FAO Members that have enough qualified personnel to generate data in support of sustainable fisheries management (in %)
	Stocks for which reliable estimates are available	Fraction of main national stocks (in %)		
<b>Africa (5) (10) (10)</b>	52	76.5	80.0	60.0
<b>Asia (2) (4) (4)</b>	0		75.0	50.0
<b>Europe (3) (5) (5)</b>	275	84.9	80.0	80.0
<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean (13) (15) (15)</b>	241	64.3	80.0	66.7
<b>Near East (2) (9) (9)</b>	19	54.3	66.7	66.7
<b>North America (2) (2) (2)</b>	269	46.4	50.0	50.0
<b>Southwest Pacific (9) (10) (10)</b>	148	74.4	80.0	70.0
<b>Total (36) (55) (55) and averages</b>	<b>1004</b>	<b>63.5</b>	<b>76.4</b>	<b>65.5</b>

**Note:** The 3 numbers in brackets refer to the n° of responses for Stock assessment, for timely, complete & reliable statistics on catch and fishing, and for enough qualified personnel to generate data in support of sustainable fisheries management respectively.

**TABLE 28**  
**Data sources for the development of fishery management plans in FAO Members (figures in %)**

Region (number of responses in brackets)	Catch & effort data from com. & art. fisheries (94.5%)	In-port sampling surveys (74.5%)	Research vessel surveys (65.5%)	On-board sampling on com. f.v. (65.5%)	Other (41.8%)
<b>Africa</b> (10)	100	50.0	80.0	30.0	20.0
<b>Asia</b> (4)	100	75.0	50.0	50.0	25.0
<b>Europe</b> (5)	100	80.0	80.0	100	40.0
<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b> (15)	100	100	73.3	73.3	73.3
<b>Near East</b> (9)	66.7	33.3	44.4	55.6	22.2
<b>North America</b> (2)	100	100	100	100	100
<b>Southwest Pacific</b> (10)	100	90.0	50.0	80.0	30.0

Note: The five tabulated data sources represent a cumulative 100 percent of all reported sources. The 5 most important data sources under "Other" included data gathered from markets and processing plants (16.7%); research fishing and socio-economic data (11.9% each), and frame survey data (9.5%), making up a cumulative 50.0% of all other reported data sources.

**TABLE 29**  
**Key data gaps in managing fisheries resources, remedial action and constraints**

Rank	Key data gaps	Most common remedial action	Most common constraints
1	Stock status data (incl. all biological parameters) (48.8%)	Developing research programs, training personnel, working with industry for sampling	Funding, HR, and logistics (e.g. RV availability)
2	Catch and effort data (44.2%)	Improving sampling programs, launching observer programs	Funding, HR and industry resilience in submitting data
3	Ecosystem data (incl. climate change issues) (14.0%)	Developing research programs	Funding, HR, knowledge gaps and size of undertaking
4	- Artisanal fisheries data - Long term data series (trends) - Not landed data (IUU, transhiped, discarded, etc.) (9.5%)	Developing sampling programs, data-bases & updating records (if data available) cooperation with industry	HR, funding and number of landing sites

Note: 76.8% of all countries responding to the questionnaire reported key data gaps. The percentage value indicated after each data gap represents the overall percentage of responding countries that reported the issue.

**TABLE 30**  
**Routine monitoring of the state of the marine environment and bycatch/discards (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries monitoring the state of the marine environment on a regular basis (77.6%)	Countries monitoring bycatch and discards on a regular basis (62.5%)
<b>Africa</b> (8) (9)	50.0	33.3
<b>Asia</b> (3) (3)	66.7	66.7
<b>Europe</b> (5) (5)	100	80.0
<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b> (14) (14)	78.6	71.4
<b>Near East</b> (7) (8)	71.4	25.0
<b>North America</b> (2) (2)	100	100
<b>Southwest Pacific</b> (10) (10)	90.0	90.0

Note: Landlocked countries are excluded from question on monitoring the state of the marine environment. The first bracketed number following the FAO Region indicates the number of answers to the question summarized in the first column, while the number in the second bracket indicates the number of answers summarized in the second column.

**TABLE 31**  
Summary information relating to the status of national IPOA Capacity implementation (figures in %)

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries having launched the preliminary fishing capacity assessment	Status of the assessment*			Countries not yet started, but planning to commence the assessment
		Preliminary phase	On-going	Finished	
<b>Africa (9)</b>	55.6	40.0	40.0		25.0
<b>Asia (3)</b>	33.3		100.0		50.0
<b>Europe (5)</b>	80.0		75.0	25.0	100
<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean (14)</b>	92.9	30.8	38.5	23.1	100
<b>Near East (8)</b>	37.5	33.3	33.3		20.0
<b>North America (2)</b>	100		50.0	50.0	
<b>Southwest Pacific (9)</b>	22.2		50.0	50.0	42.9
<b>Total (50) &amp; averages</b>	<b>60.0</b>	<b>23.3</b>	<b>46.7</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>35.0</b>

\* only for countries having launched the preliminary fishing capacity assessment

**TABLE 32**  
IPOA Capacity: Methods used to measure capacity (figures in %)

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Assessment of technical fleet capacity (68.2%)	Catch and effort assessment (40.9%)	Analysis of capacity utilization (22.7%)	Frame surveys and censuses (18.2%)	Estimating capacity through stock modelling (4.6%)
<b>Africa (5)</b>	80.0	40.0		40.0	
<b>Asia (2)</b>	50.0		50.0	50.0	
<b>Europe (4)</b>	100	25.0	25.0	25.0	
<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean (7)</b>	85.7	57.1	14.3		14.3
<b>Near East (2)</b>		100			
<b>North America (2)</b>			100		
<b>Southwest Pacific (0)</b>					

Note: 63.5% of responding FAO Members reported to have begun the preliminary assessment of national fishing capacity (see table 31). Percentage values in this table only apply to this pool of nations.

Legend to table headers: The percentage value indicated below each method represents the overall percentage of countries that reported to use this as a mechanism to measure capacity. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 100% percent of all mechanisms reported.

**TABLE 33**  
Summary information relating to the status of national IPOA Sharks implementation (figures in %)

Region (number of responses in brackets)	Countries that have conducted an assessment of shark stocks in order to determine the needs for a shark plan	For those countries having conducted the assessment; countries that have a national Shark plan in place	For those countries not yet having a national Shark-plan in place; countries intending to do so
<b>Africa (5)</b>		n.a.	75.0
<b>Asia (3)</b>	66.7	100	n.a.
<b>Europe (4)</b>	100	25.0	33.3
<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean (14)</b>	100	66.7	83.3
<b>Near East (2)</b>	100		100
<b>North America (2)</b>	100	100	
<b>Southwest Pacific (8)</b>	50.0	75.0	100
<b>Total (38) and averages</b>	<b>72.2</b>	<b>65.4</b>	<b>85.7</b>

Note: 78.3% of responding FAO Members indicated that sharks were caught in waters under their jurisdiction, or caught by national fishing units on the high seas, as target species, or as bycatch. Percentage values in this table refer only to those concerned FAO Members, where sharks are caught.

**TABLE 34**  
Summary information relating to the status of national IPOA Seabirds implementation (figures in %)

Region (number of responses in brackets)	Countries that have assessed longline fisheries to evaluate the incidental catch of seabirds problems	For those countries having conducted the assessment; countries that concluded a plan of action is needed	For those countries needing a plan; countries that have put in place a plan (intention to do so in brackets)
<b>Africa (7)</b>	16.7		
<b>Asia (2)</b>	50.0		
<b>Europe (4)</b>	100	25.0	(100)
<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean (14)</b>	61.5	62.5	80.0 (80.0)
<b>Near East (4)</b>		n.a.	
<b>North America (2)</b>	100	100	100
<b>Southwest Pacific (9)</b>	77.8	28.6	100
<b>Total (42) and averages</b>	<b>59.0</b>	<b>43.5</b>	<b>80.0</b>

Note: 78% of responding FAO Members indicated that longline fisheries were conducted in waters under their jurisdiction, or by national fishing units on the high seas or in waters of third States. Percentage values in this table only refer to those concerned FAO Members, where longlining is conducted.

**TABLE 35**  
IPOA Seabirds: Mitigation measures applied to longline fisheries (figures in %)

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Bird scaring devices (52.9%)	Deploying sets at night (29.4%)	Complying with RFMO rules (29.4%)	Optimising lure sinking rates (23.5%)
<b>Africa (1)</b>				
<b>Asia (1)</b>	100		100.0	
<b>Europe (3)</b>	33.3		66.7	
<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean (8)</b>	50.0	50.0		25.0
<b>Near East (0)</b>				
<b>North America (2)</b>	100			50.0
<b>Southwest Pacific (2)</b>	50.0	50.0	100	50.0

Note: 78% of responding FAO Members reported to conduct longline fisheries (see table 34). Percentage values in this table only apply to this pool of nations.

Legend to table headers: The percentage value indicated below each measure represents the overall percentage of countries that reported to have applied it as an incidental bycatch reduction measure. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 54.8% of all mechanisms reported. Other reported mechanisms included a list of 11 more items, covering a broad spectrum of techniques within this field. The most important included strategic discarding of refuse (11.8%), conducting preliminary research (11.8%), observer programs (11.8%), training and awareness raising (11.8%), mandatory release of birds provisions (11.8%) and the use of defrozen and blue-dyed bait (11.8%). All remaining issues scored  $\leq$  5.9% each. [percentages as per table header].

**TABLE 36**  
Summary information relating to the status of national IPOA – IUU implementation (figures in %)

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Countries having taken steps to develop a national plan of action (NPOA) to combat IUU*	Developing an NPOA-IUU	
		Plan finished**	Intention to develop plan***
<b>Africa (9)</b>	77.8	71.4	100
<b>Asia (4)</b>	100	66.7	
<b>Europe (5)</b>	100	60.0	
<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean (14)</b>	90.9	80.0	100
<b>Near East (9)</b>	50.0	66.7	50.0
<b>North America (2)</b>	100	100	n.a.
<b>Southwest Pacific (10)</b>	100	57.1	66.7
<b>Total (53) and averages</b>	<b>90.2</b>	<b>70.3</b>	<b>87.5</b>

\*For countries having identified IUU as a problem; \*\* For countries having started to develop a plan; \*\*\* For countries having not yet started to develop a plan. Note: 80.4% of responding FAO Members indicated that IUU fishing was a problem in their waters. Percentage values in this table refer only to the concerned FAO Members, where IUU has been identified as a problem.

**TABLE 37**  
**IPOA-IUU: Measures taken to prevent, deter and eliminate IUU fishing (figures in %)**

<b>Region</b> (number of specified responses in brackets)	<b>Improvement of MCS (67.5%)</b>	<b>Cooperation between countries &amp; authorities (22.5%)</b>	<b>Legal framework improvement (22.5%)</b>	<b>NPOA-IUU development / Compliance Agreement (22.5%)</b>	<b>Implementing Port State Measures (17.5%)</b>
<b>Africa</b> (9)	66.7	11.1	11.1	11.1	11.1
<b>Asia</b> (2)	100				
<b>Europe</b> (5)	60.0	20.0	60.0	20.0	20.0
<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b> (11)	63.6	18.2	9.1	36.4	9.1
<b>Near East</b> (7)	71.4		28.6		14.3
<b>North America</b> (2)	50.0	100		100	100
<b>Southwest Pacific</b> (4)	75.0	75.0	50.0	25.0	25.0

Note: 80.4% of responding FAO Members reported to have identified IUU fishing as a problem (see table 36). Percentage values in this table only apply to this pool of nations.

Legend to table headers: The percentage value indicated below each measure represents the overall percentage of countries that reported to have applied it as a measure to combat IUU fishing. The tabulated measures embody a cumulative 62.9% of all measures reported. Other reported measures included a list of 14 more measures. The most important included traceability and certification systems (15.0%), more effective penalties (12.5%), training and awareness raising (12.5%), and the putting in place of a licensing system and a register of authorized vessel (10%). All remaining issues scored  $\leq 5.0\%$  each. [percentages as per table header].

**TABLE 38 a)**  
**FAO Strategy for Improving Information on Status and Trends in Capture Fisheries (Strategy-STF) (figures in %)**

<b>Region</b> (number of specified responses in brackets)	<b>Countries in which relevant authorities are aware of the strategy (72.0%)</b>	<b>Countries in which Strategy-STF plans and programmes are being elaborated* (75.0%)</b>
<b>Africa</b> (8)	100	87.5
<b>Asia</b> (4)	100	75.0
<b>Europe</b> (5)	80.0	75.0
<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b> (12)	75.0	77.8
<b>Near East</b> (9)	66.7	66.7
<b>North America</b> (2)	100	50.0
<b>Southwest Pacific</b> (10)	30.0	66.7

\* only for the countries aware of the Strategy-STF

**TABLE 38 b)**  
**FAO Strategy for Improving Information on Status and Trends in Aquaculture (Strategy-STA) (figures in %)**

<b>Region</b> (number of specified responses in brackets)	<b>Countries in which relevant authorities are aware of the strategy (46.5%)</b>	<b>Countries in which Strategy-STA plans and programmes are being elaborated* (75.0%)</b>
<b>Africa</b> (8)	50.0	25.0
<b>Asia</b> (2)	100	100
<b>Europe</b> (5)	60.0	100
<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b> (10)	40.0	75.0
<b>Near East</b> (8)	50.0	75.0
<b>North America</b> (2)	50.0	100
<b>Southwest Pacific</b> (8)	25.0	100

\* only for the countries aware of the Strategy-STA



**TABLE 39**  
**Ratification, accession or acceptance of the 1993 FAO Compliance Agreement**  
**and the 1995 UN Fish Stocks Agreement by FAO Members (figures in %)**

Region (number of responses in brackets)	1993 FAO Compliance Agreement		1995 UN Fish Stocks Agreement	
	Yes	Intention to do so*	Yes	Intention to do so**
<b>Africa</b> (5) (7)	60.0	50.0	85.7	100
<b>Asia</b> (3) (3)	33.3		66.7	
<b>Europe</b> (5) (5)	40.0	33.3	80.0	
<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b> (10) (11)	50.0	20.0	27.3	
<b>Near East</b> (8) (8)	50.0		37.5	20.0
<b>North America</b> (2) (2)	100	n.a.	100	n.a.
<b>Southwest Pacific</b> (8) (10)	75.0		100	n.a.
<b>Total</b> (41) (46) <i>and averages</i>	<b>56.1</b>	<b>16.7</b>	<b>65.2</b>	<b>12.5</b>

\*for countries not having ratified, acceded or accepted the 1993 FAO Compliance Agreement; \*\* for countries not having ratified, acceded or accepted the 1995 UN Fish Stocks Agreement.

Note: The two numbers in brackets following the FAO region refer to the 1993 FAO Compliance Agreement and to the 1995 UN Fish Stocks Agreement responses, respectively.

**TABLE 40**  
**Constraints reported by FAO Members to the implementation of the**  
**Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Financial (47.1%)	Human resources (37.3%)	Institutional weaknesses (27.5%)	Legal needs (27.5%)	Awareness, and information needs (25.5%)
<b>Africa</b> (11)	54.6	36.4	36.4	18.2	27.3
<b>Asia</b> (3)	33.3	33.3		33.3	33.3
<b>Europe</b> (5)			20.0	20.0	20.0
<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b> (14)	57.1	42.9	28.6	28.6	35.7
<b>Near East</b> (8)	37.5	50.0	37.5	37.5	12.5
<b>North America</b> (2)	100				
<b>Southwest Pacific</b> (8)	50.0	50.0	25.0	37.5	25.0

Legend to table headers: The percentage value indicated below each constraint represents the overall percentage of countries that reported it. The tabulated issues embody a cumulative 56.8% of all constraints reported. Other reported constraints include a list of 20 items, of which the most important are inadequate MCS (17.6%), insufficient scientific research (15.7%), fishing overcapacity (13.7), socio-economic weaknesses of primary stakeholders (11.8%). All remaining issues scored ≤ 7.8% each [percentages as per table header].

**TABLE 40 b)**  
**Solutions proposed by FAO Members to overcome constraints in the implementation**  
**of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (figures in %)**

Region (number of specified responses in brackets)	Training & awareness (Govt. & stakeholders) (56.3%)	Align legal framework with the Code (39.6%)	Improve MCS (31.3%)	More financial & human resources (29.2%)	International cooperation (29.2%)
<b>Africa</b> (11)	72.7	27.3	54.6	18.2	27.3
<b>Asia</b> (3)	66.7	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3
<b>Europe</b> (3)	33.3	66.7	33.3		
<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b> (14)	50.0	50.0	21.4	42.9	21.4
<b>Near East</b> (8)	37.5	25.0	37.5	12.5	50.0
<b>North America</b> (2)	50.0	50.0		50.0	
<b>Southwest Pacific</b> (7)	71.4	42.9	14.3	42.9	42.9

Legend to table headers: The percentage value indicated below each solution represents the overall percentage of countries that reported it. The tabulated issues embody a cumulative 57.1% of all constraints reported. Other reported constraints include a list of 18 items, of which the most important are improving institutional and organizational structures (25.0%), developing fisheries and/or aquaculture policies (16.7%), improving the fisheries management framework (14.6%), and improving research and statistics (12.5%). All remaining issues scored ≤ 8.3% each [percentages as per table header].