



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  
Объединённых Наций

Organización de las  
Naciones Unidas para la  
Alimentación y la Agricultura

منظمة  
الأمم المتحدة  
للأغذية والزراعة

## First Meeting of the PSMA Strategy ad hoc Working Group<sup>1</sup>

Rome, Italy,<sup>2</sup> 3-7 April 2023

### OUTCOME OF THE FOUR PSMA REGIONAL COORDINATION MEETINGS

#### I. INTRODUCTION AND ARRANGEMENTS

1. The first meeting of the Parties to the PSMA (Oslo, Norway, 29-31 May 2017) agreed on the importance of convening regional meetings, in advance of meetings of the Parties, where concerned States can coordinate and monitor the implementation of the Agreement. At their second meeting (Santiago, Chile, 3-6 June 2019), the Parties noted that the effective implementation of the PSMA requires further uptake, and called on additional States to adhere to the Agreement. The third meeting of the Parties (Virtual meeting hosted by the European Union, 31 May-4 June), which aimed to review and assess the effectiveness of the Agreement in achieving its objective, requested that discussions around developing a strategy to improve the effectiveness of the PSMA be deferred to an ad hoc working group, the PSMA Strategy Ad Hoc Working Group, and that regional and/or sub-regional discussions in support of this ad hoc working group be considered.

2. In the light of these recommendations, the Secretariat convened four PSMA Regional Coordination Meetings throughout 2022 namely in (1) the South West and East Pacific region; (2) Asia; (3) Latin America and the Caribbean, and (4) the region Africa, the Near East and the Mediterranean. Eighty FAO Member countries and the European Union participated in the four meetings (**Annex 1**), of which two-thirds (53) were Parties and one third (28) non-Parties. Eight Regional Fishery Bodies (RFBs), five regional fisheries management organizations (RFMOs) and three Regional Fishery Advisory Bodies, also participated. A total of 235 participants attended the four Regional Coordination Meetings - senior officials and technical experts from the FAO Members, along with those from relevant international and regional intergovernmental organizations, and other concerned States. The meetings were held with financial support of Germany and Norway.

<sup>1</sup> To be held in Arabic, Chinese English, French, Russian and Spanish.

<sup>2</sup> FAO Headquarters, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy.

3. The objectives of the four meetings were to take stock of the status of the PSMA and its application in the respective regions, to address the general and region-specific achievements and challenges in the implementation of the PSMA, to discuss regional port State measures implementation strategies, including through Regional Fishery Bodies, and to coordinate preparations in relation to the PSMA *ad hoc* Working Group on Strategy (WGS), as well as the Fourth Meeting of the Parties to the PSMA (MOP4), to be held from 8 -12 May 2023 in Bali, Indonesia.
4. The first of these PSMA Regional Coordination Meetings was held in Nadi, Fiji, for the South West and East Pacific (Pacific) from 2 - 6 May 2022. The meeting was attended by a total of 72 participants (in presence and virtual) from 16 countries (Australia, Chile, Ecuador, Fiji, Republic of Korea, Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Nauru, New Zealand, Palau, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu) and the European Union. Two RFMOs, the South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organization (SPRFMO) and the Western Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) also participated in the meeting.
5. The second PSMA Regional Coordination Meeting was held for Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) from 20 - 24 June 2022 in Panama City, Panama. The meeting was attended by a total of 42 participants (27 in presence, 15 virtual) from 19 FAO Members (Belize, Brazil, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, United States of America, Uruguay and Trinidad and Tobago).
6. The Republic of Korea hosted the third PSMA Regional Coordination Meeting for Asia from 11 - 15 July 2022 in Seoul. The meeting was attended by 55 participants (31 in presence, 24 virtual) from 14 Asian countries (Australia, Bangladesh, Cambodia, China, India, Indonesia, Japan, Republic of Korea, Malaysia, Maldives, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Thailand, and Viet Nam). Two RFBs, the Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center (SEAFDEC) and the Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem Project (BOBLME), also attended the meeting. Six Members and the RFBs attended virtually.
7. The fourth PSMA Regional Coordination Meeting was held for the regions Africa, Near East and the Mediterranean together (Africa/NE/Med) from 3 - 7 October 2022 in Dakar, Senegal. The meeting was attended by 61 participants (41 in presence, 20 virtual) from 37 FAO Members and the European Union (Algeria, Angola, Benin, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, European Union, France, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Iran, Kenya, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Oman, Russia, Sao Tomé, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Togo, United Arab Emirates). In addition, five participants from four RFBs also attended the meeting: from the Fisheries Committee for the West Central Gulf of Guinea (FCWC), the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM), the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT) and the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC).

## **II. ACHIEVEMENTS**

8. Generally, participants from all four meetings stated as major achievement that many States have become Parties to the Agreement since its adoption in 2009 and that among the States that have

not yet done so, many States have started the process toward ratification or accession. States in all four world regions recognized the importance of transposing the provisions of the Agreement into their national legislations, and many have already started to do so.

9. There was broad agreement about the importance of effective cooperation and information exchange among the Parties to the PSMA and relevant States, FAO, other international organizations and RFMOs to ensure the effective implementation of the Agreement. To this end, various information exchange tools have been developed, including the Global Record of Fishing Vessels, Refrigerated Transport Vessels and Supply Vessels (Global Record) and the FAO Global Information Exchange System (GIES).

10. Many countries have designated national contact points (NCPs) and ports for foreign flagged fishing vessels under the PSMA and have made this information available on the FAO PSMA Application. However, different levels of completeness with regards to the information provided were reported from the four regions.

11. Participants reported different levels of implementation with regards to the advance request for entry into port (AREP), including the information requirements outlined in Annex A of the Agreement. Most States in the three regions Asia, Africa/NE/Med and LAC, reported to have regulations and procedures in place consistent with the minimum standard and with sufficient time to verify all information provided and to carry out a risk assessment for an informed decision on authorization or denial of entry into port.

12. Many States conduct inspections of foreign flagged vessels in port, have procedures in place and meet the levels as required by relevant RFMOs. Participating States in the Pacific reported a good level of implementation with regards to the conduct of inspections following MCS standards that even go beyond those outlined in Annex B of the Agreement. In Asia and LAC most countries conducted inspections, while in the Africa/NE/Med region many States still faced challenges to conduct inspections in line with the requirements of the PSMA, mainly due to the shortage of trained inspectors. Generally, few countries had set levels for inspections based on risk analysis.

13. Parties are obliged to deny the use of port if there are reasons to believe that the foreign flagged vessel in port has been engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing or for other reasons as listed in Article 11 of the Agreement. Most States in Africa/NE/Med and in LAC as well as in some States in Asia reported to have procedures in place to deny the use of port in such cases for landing, transshipping, packaging and/or processing of fish that have not been previously landed or for other port services, including refueling and resupplying.

14. Most States from Asia and LAC reported that they are committed to fulfil their obligations as flag States under the Agreement. They reported to require their flagged vessels to cooperate with port States as outlined in Article 20 of the PSMA and encourage their vessels to use ports strictly implementing port State measures consistent with the PSMA. While States from Africa/NE/Med reported to not have achieved the requirements of the PSMA related to the role of flag States yet, these States also expressed the commitment to prioritize their obligations as a flag State under the PSMA as a matter of priority.

15. There was a general emphasis on the special requirements of developing State Parties in implementing the PSMA in all four Regional Coordination Meetings. Many States reported progress in developing capacity to effectively implement the port State measures consistent with the Agreement through technical assistance provided by FAO, RFMOs, NGOs or through bilateral projects.

### **III. IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES**

16. Generally, most participants from FAO Members in all four regions emphasized the need to review and revise their national legal frameworks to be in line with the requirements of the PSMA. This applied both to Parties and non-Parties of the PSMA.

17. There was a broad agreement that country-specific technical assistance needed to be provided to developing States and small island developing States (SIDS) to develop capacity related to policy and legal frameworks, institutional arrangements and systems for monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) to effectively implement the PSMA.

18. Many States, especially in the Pacific, Asia and in the Africa/NE/Med region, reported to have achieved some level of interagency cooperation to effectively implement port State measures, including through the integration into the broader system of port State control. However, this cooperation was rarely formalized through an interagency mechanism or supported by standard operation procedures with clear roles and responsibilities of the agencies involved.

19. Many States, especially from the Pacific, Asia and LAC, reported that information-sharing and cooperation existed among Parties as well as with other relevant States, RFMOs, the FAO and other international organizations consistent with the requirements of the PSMA. However, this cooperation could still be improved to ensure the effective implementation of the Agreement, e.g., through the designation of national contact points, through overcoming communication challenges such as language barriers and through the full operationalization and use of global and regional tools for information exchange. Participants from the LAC and Africa/NE/Med regions also discussed the challenge of insufficient access to real-time information for MCS purposes. Two of the four regions, Asia and Africa/NE/Med, referred to the challenge of confidentiality of information.

20. In all regions but Asia, most States faced the challenge that their ports designated under the PSMA, or their ports receiving foreign flagged vessels without being designated yet, did not provide the capacity and meet the requirements to effectively implement port State measures consistent the PSMA.

21. The advance request for entry into port (AREP) is a key process for the effective implementation of port State measures. The information provided with the AREP well in advance of entry into port provides a basis for risk assessment as to whether a vessel has been engaged in IUU fishing activities or in related activities in support of such fishing. Many States, especially in Asia, LAC and Africa/NE/Med, reported that States faced difficulties in carrying out these risk assessments, e.g., when receiving insufficient information, especially from vessels flagged to non-Parties, in the process of verifying and analyzing information provided by vessel operators, and in assessing the risk of a vessel within the given time.

22. All four meetings emphasized the challenge of clearly identifying a case of force majeure and distress, in which case port entry needs to be permitted to a vessel exclusively for the purpose of rendering assistance to persons or the vessel.

23. States in most regions mentioned challenges when denying of use of port in the case of vessels have been found to be engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing, or for other reasons as listed in Article 11 of the Agreement. These challenges for example to insufficient interagency cooperation (Asia, Africa/NE/Med) or the absence of protocols on costs and custody of the cargo in the sanctioning process. (LAC).

24. Most States, especially in the Pacific, Asia and LAC, have improved the procedures for the conduct of inspections to meet the requirements of the PSMA, although challenges remain, for instance with regards to inadequate infrastructure and equipment, a low number of trained inspectors, the need to develop standard operating procedures in line with the requirements of the PSMA, insufficient coordination among inspection teams, low standards of inspection reports and difficulties in handling specific situations due to language barriers. States from two regions, from Asia and Africa/NE/Med, highlighted challenges in completing inspection reports pursuant to Annex C of the Agreement, e.g., difficulties in collecting evidence supporting the status of high risk vessels, technical issues, language barriers and difficulties to verify information.

25. The process of transmitting inspection results for relevant States is considered burdensome and difficult in many States across all regions. Reasons provided were for instance missing information on national contact points of flag States, or that methods of transmission were not used. However, there was broad agreement that many of the challenges could be overcome after the introduction of the GIES, which should be linked to regional systems. States from the Pacific raised some concerns with confidentiality safeguards.

26. A sufficient number of trained inspectors was generally considered crucial for the effective implementation of the PSMA. In some regions, especially in Africa/NE/Med, LAC or Asia, many States were in need of trained inspectors and States in all regions stated that they relied on training provided through projects. Participating States from Asia and the Pacific also highlighted the issue that training activities had been interrupted during the COVID-19 pandemic with consequences for inspection capacities in ports.

27. Insufficient communication and cooperation between port States and flag States was considered a major challenge in most world regions, significantly limiting the effectiveness of the PSMA. This challenge was often exacerbated if relevant flag States were not Parties to the PSMA.

28. There was a general understanding in all four Regional Coordination Meetings that the PSMA will only achieve its ultimate objective if all port States effectively implement the Agreement. Article 21 of the PSMA gives full recognition to the special requirements of developing State Parties in this regard. Many participating States reported that technical assistance provided by the FAO, RFMOs, NGOs or through bilateral projects had contributed to developing capacity in this regard. However, many States, especially in the Africa/NE/Med region, still lack the capacity to effectively implement the Agreement and require further technical assistance to reform their policy and legal frameworks, establish institutional arrangements and develop operational procedures. Furthermore, participants

from all regions added that technical assistance was required to support the effective use the global information tools, the Global Record and the GIES.

#### **IV. SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STRENGTHENED IMPLEMENTATION**

29. Participants recommended that technical assistance be further provided to developing States and SIDS, based on the specific capacity needs of the respective States, to develop their capacity to effectively implement the PSMA and to cooperate with other relevant States as well as relevant regional and international organizations in this regard. The region Africa/NE/Med reported to have the greatest need for capacity development to fulfil their international obligations to combat IUU fishing.

30. Regarding the application of the Agreement, most participants emphasized the need to not only focus on foreign fishing vessels engaged in fishing activities but also on those engaged in fishing related activities, including on container vessels carrying fish not previously landed.

31. It was further recommended that all States become Parties to relevant regional fisheries management organizations (RFMOs), actively engage in RFMO meetings and processes and effectively implement conservation and management measures (CMMs).

32. Participating States in all four PSMA Regional Coordination Meetings emphasized the need to establish formalized interagency mechanisms for all relevant agencies involved in the implementation of the PSMA with clear objectives as well as roles and responsibilities of agencies. These interagency mechanisms should be and complemented with standard operating procedures, including on risk assessment related to foreign flagged vessels entering port.

33. To improve information-sharing and cooperation of Parties with relevant States, RFMOs, FAO and other international organizations, participants strongly encouraged Parties, if they have not yet done so, to designate national focal points to be published in FAO's PSMA Application, to upload information on the global information exchange tools, the Global Record and the GIES once operational, to actively use these tools, to engage in the information-sharing mechanisms of relevant RFBs and to request technical assistance in the case of difficulties with information exchange and cooperation.

34. All four PSMA Regional Coordination Meetings recommended that States, if they have not yet done so, designate ports for foreign flagged fishing vessels and to develop capacity in these ports to effectively implement port State measures consistent with the PSMA. It was further recommended by one Regional Coordination Meeting that FAO develop criteria for the designation of ports and that FAO continue the cooperation with the International Labour Organization (ILO) and International Maritime Organization (IMO) to integrate the implementation of port State measures into the broach system of port State control.

35. Many States, especially in Asia and the Africa/NE/Med region, requested further technical assistance to improve their capacity for risk assessment, particularly on the basis of information provided with the AREP to support decisions on authorization or denial of entry into port and on a

prioritization for inspection in port. States emphasized the role of global information exchange tools, the Global Record and the GIES in this regard.

36. Many States across all four regions, especially from Africa/NE, Med, Asia and LAC, recommended that further technical assistance be provided, including under FAO's *PSMA Global Capacity Development Program* to develop regulations and procedures on: advance request for port entry with information requirements in Annex A; port entry, authorization or denial; *force majeure*, use of ports; level and priorities for inspections; conduct of inspection following Annex B; results of inspections in line with Annex C; transmittal of inspection results; and port State actions following inspections. States in the Pacific further recommended to review Annex B and possibly revise it reflecting the developments of advanced PSM assessment tools.

37. Three of the four Regional Coordination Meetings explicitly encouraged States to use the GIES, once fully operational, for the transmittal of inspection report, so as to support effective information exchange and cooperation among States, RFMOs and the FAO and to ensure the effective implementation of the PSMA. FAO was encouraged to provide technical assistance and training for States to use the GIES effectively.

38. Continued training for inspectors, taking into account the specific requirements of the PSMA and the guidelines for the training of inspectors in Annex E was considered key across all four Regional Coordination Meetings. It was further recommended to strengthen bilateral or regional exchange of experiences and to establish regional or subregional training hubs with appropriate certificates.

39. While most States in three of the four Regional Coordination Meetings reported to have procedures in place for port State action following inspections in cases there were clear grounds for believing that a vessel had engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing, the practice of taking port State action was often problematic. The most prominent challenges reported were: difficulties in the communication with flag States as well as decisions on how and when to take the specific action. The region that reported that procedures for port State action still needed to be developed, the region Africa/NE/Med, expressed a need for technical assistance in this regard, especially to develop standard operating procedures and to raise awareness for the objectives of the PSMA altogether.

40. To improve the communication and cooperation between port States and flag States and to support flag States in fulfilling their obligations in line with the PSMA, participating States at the Regional Coordination Meetings in Asia, Africa/NE/Med and LAC made the following recommendations: (i) revise policy and legal frameworks to ensure flag States meet their obligations; (ii) technical assistance for flag States to develop their MCS capacities to exercise full control over their flagged vessels and to meet their international obligations including those under the PSMA; (iii) strengthen communication and cooperation among States through RFBs and regional initiatives; and, importantly, (iv) ensure active participation and use of the global information exchange tools, the Global Record and the GIES once fully functional.

## V. CONCLUDING REMARKS

41. Participants of all four PSMA Regional Coordination Meetings viewed the meeting as a useful and valuable exercise which, in addition to achieving the objective of identifying implementation challenges and suggesting solutions to inform the PSMA *ad hoc* Working Group on Strategy, offered a forum for representatives from States within a region, both Parties and non-Parties, to exchange experiences, share information, discuss common challenges, learn about those that others were facing, and find ways to approach implementation challenges individually and together.

42. States from two Regional Coordination Meetings made suggestions to improve the PSMA questionnaire for the review and assessment of the effectiveness of the Agreement as adopted during MOP2. This questionnaire was used in the four PSMA Regional Coordination Meetings. More concretely, these participants recommended to work on the language and increase clarity of the language in selected questions.

43. The importance of technical assistance for developing States and SIDS was highlighted in all four meetings. Article 21 of the Agreement recognizes the special requirements of developing State Parties in relation to the effective implementation of port State measures consistent with the PSMA. FAO was commended for the support already provided to developing States and SIDS under the *PSMA Global Capacity Development Program*. States emphasized that further capacity development, especially on policy and legal frameworks, institutional arrangements, MCS systems and information exchange, would be required to achieve the effective implementation of the PSMA in all port States.

44. During COVID-19 pandemic, participating States reported that capacity development and training activities have had to be interrupted with possibly negative effects on the level of implementation of the PSMA. This additional challenge was currently being addressed in many port States, and States expressed a need for intensified training activities on-site.

45. Some States, particular in the Pacific, highlighted the importance of integrating the implementation of port State measures into the broader system of port State controls, also considering matters such as maritime safety and security, pollution and biosecurity.

46. Participants highlighted the important role of RFBs to achieve the broad and effective implementation of port State measures consistent with the PSMA. Among the RFBs, RFMOs have a crucial role to play in providing capacity development, facilitating the sharing of information and cooperation among States and setting up compliance mechanisms for the effective implementation of adopted port State measures. Participants also noted the role of other RFBs that encourage information-sharing and cooperation, especially on MCS, or can document positive case studies and benefits of effectively implemented port State measures.

47. While the rate of adherence to the PSMA has been exceptionally high when compared with other international instruments, participating States, particularly from Asia, recommended that FAO and RFBs continue to encourage and support non-Parties to become Parties to the Agreement, including through specific workshops for non-Parties.



48. Participating States from Asia supported the concept of developing regional MCS training centers or hubs with associated formal qualifications and certificates. It was emphasized by States in all four regions that improving the knowledge and competencies of inspectors was crucial for the effective implementation of the PSMA. Participating States from the Pacific added that there was a need to improve capabilities for MCS personnel to monitor so-called dark vessels.

49. Three of the four PSMA Regional Coordination Meetings, in Asia, LAC and Africa/NE/Med, recommended that a compliance monitoring mechanism be set up by the Parties to ensure that the provisions of the Agreement are effectively being implemented.

### 1. Annex 1: Participating States in the four PSMA Regional Coordination Meetings

No.	Country/Party	Region	Party	Africa/ Near East/Med	Pacific	Latin America/ Caribbean	Asia
1	Algeria	Africa		✓			
2	Angola	Africa		✓			
3	Australia	Asia-Pacific	yes		✓		✓
4	Bangladesh	Asia-Pacific	yes				✓
5	Belize	Latin America/Caribbean				✓	
6	Benin	Africa	yes	✓			
7	Brazil	Latin America/Caribbean				✓	
8	Cabo Verde	Africa	yes	✓			
9	Cambodia	Asia-Pacific	yes				✓
10	Cameroon	Africa		✓			
11	Chile	Latin America/Caribbean	yes		✓	✓	
12	China	Asia-Pacific				✓	✓
13	Comoros	Africa		✓			
14	Costa Rica	Latin America/Caribbean	yes			✓	
15	Cote d'Ivoire	Africa	yes	✓			
16	Cuba	Latin America/Caribbean	yes			✓	
17	Djibouti	Near East	yes	✓			
18	Dominica	Latin America/Caribbean	yes			✓	
19	Dominican Republic	Latin America/Caribbean				✓	
20	Ecuador	Latin America/Caribbean	yes		✓	✓	
21	El Salvador	Latin America/Caribbean				✓	
22	Equatorial Guinea	Africa		✓			
23	Eritrea	Africa	yes	✓			
24	European Union	Europe	yes	✓	✓		
25	Federated States of Micronesia	Asia-Pacific			✓		
26	Fiji	Asia-Pacific	yes		✓		

27	France (in respect of OT)	Europe	yes	✓			
28	Gabon	Africa	yes	✓			
29	Gambia	Africa	yes	✓			
30	Ghana	Africa	yes	✓			
31	Guatemala	Latin America/Caribbean				✓	
32	Guinea.	Africa	yes	✓			
33	Guinea-Bissau	Africa		✓			
34	Honduras	Latin America/Caribbean				✓	
35	India	Asia-Pacific					✓
36	Indonesia	Asia-Pacific	yes				✓
37	Iran	Near East		✓			
38	Japan	Asia-Pacific	yes				✓
39	Kenya	Africa	yes	✓			
40	Lebanon	Near East		✓			
41	Liberia	Africa	yes	✓			
42	Lybia	Near East	yes	✓			
43	Madagascar	Africa	yes	✓			
44	Malaysia	Asia-Pacific					✓
45	Maldives	Asia-Pacific	yes				✓
46	Marshall Islands	Asia-Pacific			✓		
47	Mauritania	Africa	yes	✓			
48	Mauritius	Africa	yes	✓			
49	Mexico	Latin America/Caribbean				✓	
50	Morocco	Africa	yes	✓			
51	Mozambique	Africa	yes	✓			
52	Nauru	Asia-Pacific			✓		
53	New Zealand	Asia-Pacific	yes		✓		
54	Nigeria	Africa	yes	✓			
55	Oman	Near East	yes	✓			
56	Palau	Asia-Pacific	yes		✓		
57	Panama	Latin America/Caribbean	yes			✓	
58	Peru	Latin America/Caribbean	yes			✓	

59	Republic of Korea	Asia-Pacific	yes		✓		✓
60	Russian Federation	Europe	yes	✓			
61	Samoa	Asia-Pacific			✓		
62	Sao Tomé and Príncipe	Africa	yes	✓			
63	Saudi Arabia	Near East	yes	✓			
64	Senegal	Africa	yes	✓			
65	Seychelles	Africa	yes	✓			
66	Sierra Leone	Africa	yes	✓			
67	Singapore	Asia-Pacific					✓
68	Solomon Islands	Asia-Pacific			✓		
69	Sri Lanka	Asia-Pacific	yes				✓
70	Sudan	Near East	yes	✓			
71	Thailand	Asia-Pacific	yes				✓
72	Timor-Leste	Asia-Pacific			✓		
73	Togo	Africa	yes	✓			
74	Tonga	Asia-Pacific			✓		
75	Trinidad and Tobago	Latin America/Caribbean	yes			✓	
76	Tuvalu	Asia-Pacific			✓		
77	United Arab Emirates	Near East		✓			
78	United States of America	North America	yes			✓	
79	Uruguay	Latin America/Caribbean	yes			✓	
80	Vanuatu	Asia-Pacific	yes		✓		
81	Viet Nam	Asia-Pacific	yes				✓
	<b>Total</b>		<b>53</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>14</b>