



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
الغذية والزراعة
للأمم المتحدة

Segunda reunión del Grupo de trabajo especial encargado de la estrategia para el Acuerdo sobre MERP¹

Busan, República de Corea, 21-25 de octubre de 2024

CUADROS DE LOS RESULTADOS DE LAS REUNIONES DE COORDINACIÓN REGIONAL

En este documento se presentan los cuadros elaborados por los participantes con los resultados de las reuniones de coordinación regional sobre el Acuerdo del MERP.

- Cuadro 1. Resultados de la reunión de coordinación regional para el Pacífico sobre el AMERP celebrada en Auckland, Nueva Zelandia, del 12 al 16 de febrero de 2024.
- Cuadro 2. Resultados de la reunión de coordinación regional para América Latina y el Caribe sobre el AMERP celebrada en San José, Costa Rica, del 13 al 17 de mayo de 2024 (cuadro 2a para los grupos hispanohablantes y cuadro 2b para los grupos angloparlantes)
- Cuadro 3. Resultados de la reunión de coordinación regional para África y el Cercano Oriente sobre el AMERP celebrada en Casablanca, Marruecos, del 27 al 31 de mayo de 2024.
- Cuadro 4. Resultados de la reunión de coordinación regional para Asia sobre el AMERP celebrada en Tokio, Japón, del 10 al 14 de junio de 2024.
- Cuadro 5. Resultados de la reunión de coordinación regional para Europa sobre el AMERP celebrada en Londres, Reino Unido, del 23 al 27 de septiembre de 2024.

¹ Se llevará a cabo en árabe, francés y español e inglés.

TABLE 1

ACHIEVEMENTS, CHALLENGES / GAPS AND PROPOSALS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PSMA BALI STRATEGY

ACHIEVEMENTS	CHALLENGES / GAPS	PROPOSALS	Group
A. INCREASING ADHERENCE TO AND PARTICIPATION IN THE PSMA			
<p>Numbers in Pacific signatories to the Agreement are increasing.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">i.e. PNG is in the process of signing & Kiribati is still considering.</p> <p>2nd Regional Coordination being conducted in Auckland.</p>	<p>Clarity needed on why countries need to sign onto the Agreement v/s just aligning to measures.</p> <p>Even though it is a Fisheries agreement other considerations need to be made. What are the benefits?</p> <p>Simplification of the reporting process under the Agreement.</p> <p>Integration of national systems (i.e. Fisheries, Customs etc.)</p> <p>More capacity development is needed to prepared non-Parties to sign.</p> <p>Lack of political will to sign on the Agreement.</p> <p>Lack of funding to implement the obligations of the</p>	<p>Acknowledging that national processes that are already in place, facilitating an analysis on existing national processes in comparison to the PSMA.</p> <p>Awareness raising on the benefits of 'signing' on to the Treaty rather than just aligning with the Measures.</p> <p>Development of a digital reporting template e.g. FFA Bojak</p> <p>More capacity development but to be meaningful maybe a baseline analysis on capacity development needs for the region.</p>	Group 1

TABLE 1

	Agreement and to fully comply.	Securing funding sources to assist developing countries. A Trust Fund for Capacity Building etc...(List)	
<p>At the Regional Level:</p> <p>The hosting of this Regional Consultation Meeting</p> <p>At Sub-regional level:</p> <p>FFA and FAO continuous support through number of awareness, workshops and training the the PSMA and importance of implementation of PSMA in the region.</p> <p>At National Level:</p> <p>More and more non-members countries are now acceding and in the process of becoming party to the agreement.</p>	<p>Regional Level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The WCPFC CMM on PSMA needs to be reviewed to encourage adherence and greater participation in the PSMA by member. - The incapacity, incapability and lack of skills in the areas of Port State Measures, compliance & Enforcement to EFFECTIVELY implement PSMA in country. <p>The Development of the ePSM system that can cater for different fisheries context also such as parties who vessels are operating and based in ports outside of FFA member countries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Misunderstanding of information on the scope of Port States including limitations of coastal states to get access and support from the flag states. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Party State to PSMA must encourage non-members who are also members of RFMOs such as WCPFC to accede or work towards becoming member to the agreement -FAO to engage in the development of capacity building for members and non-members and strengthen regional cooperation -Members and non-members may reach out to FAO to provide support on a case-by-case basis -More awareness on the scope of the application of PSM not only on Port States but Flag State and Coastal State. 	Group 2

TABLE 1

	<p>Some member countries do not know how to go about in sourcing or acquiring support and assistance from international organization such as FAO, FFA or WCPFC for effective implementation of PSMA. for effective implementation of the agreement</p>	<p>Proposal to promote Awareness and consultation to countries who are comfortable with their own national systems and reluctant to adopt systems develop by FAO and FFA.</p>	
<p>Development partners in the Pacific region have and continue to raise awareness about the benefits of the PSMA,</p> <p>Capacity building in port state measures in general continues to be carried out in non-parties domestic settings</p> <p>FFA have agreed to port state measures which are consistent with the PSMA and hold regular working groups</p>	<p>Geopolitical reasons continue to throw up significant challenges when it comes to reporting PSM inspection results to Chinese Taipei in particular as they are not party to the PSMA for some PICs</p> <p>Reporting burden continues put off potential parties who have small administrations who would struggle to adhere to reporting requirements.</p> <p>Large port states in the Pacific region view PSMA as adding to the burden of</p>	<p>For distant water fishing nations who have significant sized fleets to meet and improve their adherence to binding measures – to create more balance between the burden of MCS between port states and flag states</p> <p>FFA could potentially reach out to non-FFA countries such as Timor Leste to invite them to the annual MCS workshops therefore potentially improving the consistency of PSM/A implementation.</p>	<p>Group 3</p>

TABLE 1

	<p>monitoring vessels flagged to distant water fishing nations who are not taking responsibility for their own vessels – in accordance with binding instruments such as UNCLOS, UNFSA and FAO Compliance Agreement.</p> <p>For Parties, communicating the benefits to all agencies (Customs, Immigration, Maritime) is challenging .</p>		
<i>FULFILMENT OF RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PARTIES FOR EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PSMA</i>			
<i>B1. Strengthening the policy, legal, institutional frameworks and operational mechanisms</i>			
<p>Inter-agency coordination is happening at national level for some countries.</p> <p>Convening of regional coordination meetings help countries share experiences.</p>	<p>Inter-Agency coordination can be difficult if there's no mandate or political will.</p> <p>Lack of Awareness amongst agencies needed for better coordination.</p> <p>Legal Review process can be lengthy</p> <p>Consultation process is costly</p> <p>Implementation needs to be a coordinated effort amongst</p>	<p>More sub regional/regional workshops/meetings needed to encourage coordination.</p> <p>Need for assistance in legal review of national legislation e.g. FFA/WCPFC</p> <p>Need funding support for national consultations to be convened to raise awareness.</p>	Group 1

TABLE 1

	agencies e.g. PSMA Inspection Form.		
<p>-Both members and non-members are implementing the PSM</p> <p>-Legal achievements in-terms of development of legislations to cater for smooth implementation of PSM in country</p> <p>-GIES being used and by some members and feedback is provided to help improve the system</p> <p>-Some members have begun preparation for the implementation of the ePSM including putting in place the proper legislation and training specific to ePSMA</p> <p>-Continuous assistance and support from FFA (for SI) on the review of the MCS Strategy to support the implementation of the PSM and also by other organizations such as World fish (Timor Lester) on the review of</p>	<p>-Countries need to understand that Port State measures covers a wide range of activities and not only concentrates on national port activities who work in isolation but rather the need to allow for members to understand that PSMA covers a wider scope</p> <p>-Lack of understanding on international processes and inability to counter challenges when implementing PSMA in country.</p>	<p>-The need for training to allow members the capacity to identify Indicators to assess their IUU status</p> <p>-Sharing of experiences and skills among parties through working arrangements and exchange programs to upskill and keeping each other on the same phase in implementation of the PSM.</p> <p>-Technical and legal assistance from international organization such as FAO to carry out national stakeholder consultation to support the implementation of PSM</p> <p>- FAO to carry out scoping exercises and assessments on the processes implemented by countries and identify areas of needs and improvement and how to improve by identifying what is missing and what are the areas of need and</p>	<p>Group 2</p>

TABLE 1

<p>legislations that support the implementation of PSM</p> <p>-Agreement signed by FAO and CPLP (Community Portuguese Language Countries; representing 8 countries) in Lisbon to support the development of Legislations and Policies for the countries which includes PSM activities</p>		<p>support and be able to provide the appropriate support in terms of legislation development arrangements to encouragement collaboration between parties and those carrying out activities on behalf of others.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parties have recently updated their respective legislation to implement the provisions of PSMA. - Parties have also developed Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) to further strengthen implementation of the PSMA. - For non-Parties they have developed a national SOP for all relevant port state agencies and the creation of a working group. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Big challenge was 'turf protection' from port authorities, fisheries inspectors have had to convince the port authorities that they are not 'taking over' . For non-parties , fisheries regulate 'port use' , but port authorities regulate 'port entry' . - In many parties and non-parties , non-fisheries (Customs) will often board a vessel first , then followed by fisheries , quite often many 	<p>Proposals could include thinking alternatively around the framing of PSMA – more work should be done to help parties use the implementation phase to inform policy setting.</p> <p>More work needs to be done to implement operational provisions first, which then inform Policy and Legal implementation – this concept of the 'bottom up' approach where operational reality is driving PSMA is often at odds with current thinking but this is the reality – you don't know</p>	<p>Group 3</p>

TABLE 1

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Non-parties have also amended their relevant legislation in order to be able to fulfil the requirements of the PSMA - Non-parties have implemented provisions of the PSMA through SOPs , which complement existing legislative provisions such as the authority of the Fishery Officers. - For non-parties they are working together in implementing PSM , - MoU between key processing states such as Thailand / Ecuador and port states such RMI - Again , non-parties work together to share experiences - Development partners (through FFA) are funding the promotion of PSM between non-parties , 	<p>agencies will have an interest .</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cultural issues , such as the expectation of receiving fish product prior to inspection can create issues. - For some Parties , they currently do not have a working port facility - For non-parties , they do not have their flagged vessels landing into their own port , but they land into other ports in the region therefor pushing burden onto other port states. - - One of the biggest challenges in ‘follow up actions’ is the lack of engagement from flag states when compliance issues are identified , this is particularly challenging for small administration with 	<p>what the changes you need to enact until you actually start undertaking PSM .</p>	
--	---	--	--

TABLE 1

<p>- Regional agreements such as the RPOA (Regional plan of Action) are promoting the training and capacity building in PSMA Parties such as Timor Leste – including formal qualifications from Na Trang University (6 week short course).</p>	<p>large amount of port inspections</p>		
B2. Integration and coordination at national and regional levels			
<p>Development of the FFA EPSM. Annual Regional Meetings e.g. MCS WG, TCC... Development of the WCPFC Inspection Form, consistent with FFA's.</p>	<p>Sharing of data (FAO – GIES) needs to be improved to avoid duplication. Internet connectivity is an issue in some countries and can hinder exchange of information online & other required resources/tools (technology).</p>	<p>Data sharing to be better facilitated between FAO databases and other databases. Technology Transfer to be facilitated.</p>	Group 1
<p>-Some member and non-member countries have some sort of national technical Working group arrangement among national agencies to collaborate and cooperate on</p>	<p>Recognize that some members to do not share the same experience and achievements as others do again in the effective implementation of PSMA</p>	<p>General awareness of the PSM be carried out and undertake a scoping exercise of the PSM for countries as PSM is not only about addressing market</p>	Group 2

TABLE 1

<p>effective implementation on PSM.</p> <p>-Coordination at regional level working with FFA and FFA members and obtaining some support such as capacity building and cooperation through FFA</p> <p>MOUs and agreements are signed with distant water nations who are members of RFMOs such as WCPFC to allow for the better coordination of PSM and improve the application of PSM and also addressing areas such as crew and labour standards</p> <p>The Value of PSMA can be identified and practiced by current mechanisms in place such as the Tui Moana, Kurukuru etc, these are all PSM activities so basically everything that we do in national level is also in a way implementing the PSM</p>	<p>There is a split between those that are ahead and those behind so not all countries are in the same level of implementation</p> <p>Commissions such as RFMOs (WCPFC) still have some work to do with improving PSM at regional level</p> <p>Countries are already implementing the PSM at national level however, there is still a need to strengthen cooperation and collaboration for other parties such as coastal states and flag states to come onboard and support this port states in these responsibilities thus requiring more countries to become a member of the PSM</p>	<p>priorities but also by taking ownership of the catch and looking at a wider range measure</p>	
--	--	--	--

TABLE 1

<p>The best example and achievement in the Pacific region is the work that the FFA and its members undertake to MCS , including implementation of port state measures</p>	<p>The PSMA does not anticipate the role of regional agencies and architecture in the implementation of port state measures – it only considers the role of states and RFMOs and ignores the key role regional agencies such as FFA , RPOA ,</p>	<p>More global cooperation between regional agencies such as West African cooperative measures (FCWC) and the FFA - to learn from each others.</p>	<p>Group 3</p>
<p><i>B3. Cooperation and exchange of information</i></p>			
<p>Self review of obligations i.e. submission of NCP & DPs by end of 2023.</p> <p>Development of the FFA EPSM and recognition of existing sub regional EPSM tools.</p> <p>Development of the WCPFC Inspection Form, consistent with FFA’s.</p>	<p>Clarity needed on number of users of GIES to encourage others to also start using it.</p> <p>Sharing of data (FAO – GIES) needs to be improved to avoid duplication.</p> <p>Internet connectivity is an issue in some countries and can hinder exchange of information online & other required resources/tools (technology).</p>		<p>Group 1</p>
<p>National</p> <p>-Sharing of information with other national line agencies and allowing the inclusion of other line agencies and stake holders</p>	<p>Challenges:</p> <p>Lack of cooperation and exchange of information between flag states and coastal state</p>	<p>Proposal:</p> <p>Discussion is needed to properly understanding what systems are in place nationally by countries and</p>	<p>Group 2</p>

TABLE 1

<p>to be part of fisheries training and capacities building initiatives in order to understand the roles for fisheries and support delivery of PSM activities</p> <p>-The development of MOA with Fisheries Authorities to share sensitive and confidential information for effective implementation of PSM</p> <p>-Some members are using their own systems that caters for data fields that are under the PSM forms so the outcome of the inspections of vessels gets fed into the ePSM and notifications are sent to the flag state providing information such as Decision of Exit and Entry So countries who are using the GIES can access the information from others using the system if they update their points of contacts</p> <p>Regional</p>	<p>requirements to support the PSM</p> <p>Challenge – using the GIES can be an administration burden with another officer carrying out inspection of the vessel on a 4-page report and providing them to someone else to record them into the GIES in a summary form</p> <p>Some members currently have systems in place nationally to submit Port state information so there is a need for the integration of systems currently in place with the GIES to avoid duplication and workload.</p> <p>Challenge – Sometimes domestic privacy protection or confidentiality that you won't be able to share</p>	<p>what minimum fields are currently collected and develop processes for the systems to be integrated with the GIES to avoid double entry of reports</p>	
---	--	--	--

TABLE 1

<p>-The NTSA and the NTIS system that allows for sharing of information by members</p> <p>-Bilateral and sharing of information with FFA members</p> <p>-Normal working arrangements with some members if we don't have agreements to share information freely with such as with (High trust arrangements)</p> <p>Must follow certain level of custody to allow for sharing of information.</p> <p>International</p> <p>Cooperation and exchange of information with members who are not members of RFMOs and also members of RFMOs through</p>	<p>Challenge:</p> <p>Not easy to collect information from Ghost vessels who are not members or PSMA or RFMOs etc</p>		
<p>all parties and non-parties at this table have advised their NCP and DPs to the FAO at the time of this workshop</p> <p>The facilitation of information exchange is carried out</p>	<p>- No challenges were identified in this process of designation of NCPs and CPs , however political challenges were identified where outlying provinces wanted their own ports designated ,</p>	<p>The GIES needs to connect with existing regional systems – the Pacific regional systems have been in existence for some time now – the FAO should be working more to connect the GIES with these systems – we don't always agree that</p>	<p>Group 3</p>

TABLE 1

<p>efficiently through the FFA IMS systems , including the confidential exchange of data</p> <p>The FFA also has set up a policy and legal framework which facilitates the sharing of sensitive information amongst the FFA membership – this also includes PSM data</p> <p>Some parties are working with PSMA Sec to test to improve the GIES</p>	<p>but operationally this was not feasible.</p> <p>- The sharing of information used to be a challenge for legal and IMS reasons, however this has been overcome by the work that the FFA has done in giving members comfort that their data is being shared securely</p>	<p>that the burden should be only on the members to connect -</p>	
<p><i>B4. Entry and use of Ports</i></p>			
<p>Countries have some form of entry/denial process in line with the PSMA.</p> <p>Countries have similar processes for ARPE.</p> <p>Standardized procedures for force majeure</p>	<p>Coordination needs to be improved between agencies.</p>	<p>Recognize existing processes being adopted by non-members and its complementarity to the PSMA</p>	<p><i>Group 1</i></p>
<p>-Well covered by countries under the Port Entry requirements to use ports</p>	<p>-For Force majeure vessels are not required to be inspected unless they are not on the RFV of RFMOs unless there is information and</p>	<p>Scoping exercise for countries who do not have ports to carry out exercise and identify needs and provide advice and support</p>	<p><i>Group 2</i></p>

TABLE 1

<p>Port State have control over vessels that come into the port and have the power to exercise the right to withhold unloading of any fish species until the proper documentations are provided</p>	<p>evidence of information that they are not</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Most vessels would be permitted to enter ports however; it is the quality checking the needs to be effective to ensure that they qualify for port entry <p>The request for information from port states to flag states to support Entry requests take time and delays the process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Most countries do not provide information on their processes of Entry and use of their ports 	<p>Use websites to publish or through publications your steps of how to use your ports for foreign vessels to have access to the information</p> <p>Flag states need to cooperate with port states in providing information and obtaining information also on the outcomes of their vessels inspections to improve their vessels performance</p>	
<p>There are concrete examples of where vessels have been denied port use or entry , examples include maritime police ,</p> <p>In other examples , vessels have been prohibited from unloading shark species due to the lack of capacity in the port state to adequately assess compliance with binding measures</p>	<p>Denial of port entry can often result political fallout , operational personnel can have pressure put on them from higher up to reverse a decision , vessel operators often have a lot of influence .</p> <p>Information sharing restrictions can often result in important information</p>	<p>Development of clear regional processes , including SOPS for FFA members to adopt so that consistency is achieved around the denial of port entry/usage</p>	<p>Group 3</p>

TABLE 1

	<p>about a vessel not being shared with other port states resulting in port entry being approved where it probably shouldn't have been.</p>		
<i>B5. Inspections and follow-up actions</i>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% rate of inspections for most countries and the data obtained. • Processes in place to define potential risks. • Processes in place for enforcement. • FFA RIMF established to assist region. 	<p>Training of inspectors needed so they know what they're looking for when it comes to evidence – not just fisheries related but other areas.</p> <p>Need to categorize what type of inspection has occurred e.g. PNG- food safety, traceability, compliance.</p> <p>Lack of SOPs to standardize inspection process in accordance with PSMA.</p> <p>Non- cooperation of Flag States with the exchange of information.</p> <p>Lack of records on Skippers who have a history of non-compliance etc. (POI)</p> <p>Lack of clarity on the accepted Risk assessment criteria in line with PSMA.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More trainings need to be organized and exchange programmes to be facilitated. • Inspection Categories need to be made clearer so there's clarity in what kind of inspection took place. • Development of sample SOPs for Inspection that Countries may wish to adopt. • Port State to enter information in the GIES System... • GIES system to include not only vessel search but person search. • FAO to clarify risk criteria. • Establish guidelines for inspecting fishing gear. 	<p><i>Group 1</i></p>

TABLE 1

<p>National and Regional</p> <p>There is a Standard in place through a regional manual for training officers in boardings and inspection. The standard speaks directly to measure under the WCPFC and PSMA</p>	<p>Difficulty in implementing inspections for members whose vessels operate out of their ports and who require MOAs to implement the work of inspections with other port authorities</p> <p>Inspection forms are not provided to the vessel operators after an inspection</p> <p>Some members do not have a robust pre-inspection, needs better mechanisms on identifying before hand what the status of the vessel is whether the vessel is a VOI vessel, etc, before the vessels come into their ports. Little capacity and time constraints are seen here while carrying out this extra bit of work prior to inspections of vessels</p>	<p>Stream lining and standardizing of inspection process to include broader port state control</p> <p>Leaving a copy of the inspection form on board vessel operator to have access to inspection report done so they are able to understand the issues that were identified.</p> <p>There has to be regular training and refresher trainings to ensure that inspections and enforcement activities continue to be maintained to ensure that the quality of the assessment/ inspections undertaken by officers remains</p>	<p>Group 2</p>
<p>While not prescribed in the PSMA, parties and non-Parties</p>	<p>- it has been said many times, the role of the flag</p>	<p>more effort needs to undertaken to include</p>	<p>Group 3</p>

TABLE 1

<p>are encouraged to reach as a higher possible inspection rate as possible through the FFA PSM Framework</p> <p>Follow up actions with flag states is challenging but personnel in the region still achieve results</p> <p>Regular training has been undertaken in the Pacific region on inspection procedures</p> <p>FFA has also developed electronic tools that assist inspectors in reducing time for inputting of inspection results.</p>	<p>state is not well understood by DWFNs, where non-compliance is identified flag states often do not respond to requests for investigation – port states cannot enforce legislation against foreign flagged vessels.</p> <p>Level of training needs to be better aligned for practical experience , many inspectors do not have the practical skills or confidence to adequately assess compliance</p>	<p>regional agencies and their role in improving inspections and follow up actions</p> <p>there needs to be a more defined career pathway for fishery inspectors, this should also include opportunities for fisheries observers to become inspectors – they know how the fishery works and how the vessel operates – this is invaluable experience .</p>	
<i>B6. Role of flag States</i>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of the GIES System to simplify the entry process. • Utilization of the PSMA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater emphasis on Flag States obligations with GIES and Port States. • Lack of records on Flag States and their inspection of their fishing gears etc. • Communication between Port State 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require FS to comply with actions taken in GIES. • Flag States to be held accountable for the inspection for their own fishing gears. 	Group 1

TABLE 1

	Measures and Flag State can be hindered.		
<p>Control and monitored VMS activities by members whose vessels are flagged and fishing in other states</p> <p>Sharing of information from ports and flag states</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<p>Frustrations when flag states do not respond in a timely manner on issues identified by port states.</p> <p>Flag state must take responsibility of their vessels by understanding how the vessels are operating and the results of the inspections in order to be able to manage their vessels well</p>	<p>Proper GIES training from countries on the system is needed to allow them to better use the system and capture information shared by port states on their vessels</p> <p>Proper alignment of systems should be done so that countries do not duplicate the work of entry of information from their national systems onto the GIES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flag states can better manage their vessels by designating the use of ports for their vessels who are members of PSM or RFMOs so some sharing of information can be achieved 	Group 2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - everyone around the table are flag states , we 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The equivalent amount of monitoring 	<p>-while we have workshops in assisting port states</p>	Group 3

TABLE 1

<p>all implement binding conditions to control out flagged vessels</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<p>effort that is carried out by port states should also be carried out by flag states , unfortunately this is not occurring and this is very challenging for port states – port states are seen as the ambulance at the bottom of the cliff .</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There needs to be more effort by the flag state to be at the top of the cliff - The GIES is not yet fully implemented and this is impacting on the ability for flag states to receive important information regarding their flagged vessels compliance issues 	<p>implementing PSMA, but there should be the same effort in assisting flag states meeting their binding obligations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • -RFMOs have a key role in this work but often requires consensus among the members to agree to this work 	
<p><i>B7. Capacity development</i></p>			
<p>Some trainings have occurred for better implementation of PSMA (FAO, FFA, MPI).</p>	<p>Capacity Development is needed across the region from policy, legal, institutional, technical and</p>	<p>Capacity Development assessment needed to see needs in the region.</p>	<p>Group 1</p>

TABLE 1

Existing online materials to assist PSMA implementation.	<p>operational areas for better implementation of the PSMA.</p> <p>Need to improve Donor Coordination when it comes to support being offered for Capacity Development.</p>	<p>Facilitation of 'exchange programmes' (also applicable for Non-Parties).</p> <p>Convening of Regional Competency Based Trainings e.g. High Seas etc.</p> <p>Funding needed for more capacity development programmes.</p> <p>Encouraging contributions into the Trust Fund via High Level.</p>	
	<p>In terms of parties, there's work that's been done, but there are recognized areas for opportunities for more work to occur in that space not only for parties but also non parties</p>	<p>Parties that have just acceded to the PSM require capacity building support</p> <p>Use some of the existing platforms to recognize what exists and provide coordination of</p> <p>Institutional arrangements and developments</p> <p>Platforms outside of the FFA to make use of the systems in place and request for the capacity that is available</p>	Group 2
- Development partners in the region contribute	- One of the biggest challenges in capacity	A significant gap still remains in the training of	Group 3

TABLE 1

<p>significantly to capacity building in the Pacific region , including focus on PSM/A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In addition to this , the FFA also carry out significant amount of capability building for its members . - The University of the South Pacific (USP) also carry out an ‘MCS Foundation’ course which also have a focus on PSM • RFMOs such as WCPFC have a fund but it is underutilized 	<p>building in the Pacific region is where multiple doners and capacity building programs are working in the same country often delivering very similar packages – however , Aust , NZ and FFA have started working together and sharing to avoid this duplication, however , this is not the case for new entrants into the region .</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current financial constraints in doner countries are inhibiting voluntary contributions to the Part 6 fund . Looming financial disruption could further impact on doners ability to contribute to the part 6 fund. 	<p>fisheries operations i.e how a vessels actually works , this could be inserted into existing programs but would require additional funding .</p>	
--	--	---	--

B8. Relationship with international law and other international instruments

TABLE 1

<p>Parties to relevant international laws (UNCLOS, CA, Fish Stock Agreement)</p> <p>Regardless of PSMA, port inspections are already imbedded in current MCS processes.</p> <p>Being a party to the PSMA, we're reinforcing other international laws and instruments.</p>	<p>Need to ensure national processes are in line with international law and instruments can be challenging.</p> <p>Lack of recognition of existing regional instruments and efforts.</p>	<p>Facilitate capacity development for improving legal expertise in this area.</p> <p>Increasing onus on FAO to recognize regional instruments and efforts.</p>	<p>Group 1</p>
<p>Some members have this in place and line with international instruments</p>	<p>Some national legislation is outdated and needs review to cater for international law and international instrument to fully implement the requirement of these international laws and instruments at national level. Voluntary guidelines are always pushing towards best practices and therefore must be in line with FAO</p>	<p>Having these meetings continue to support countries in their relationship in aligning their national legislation with international law and other instruments</p> <p>Some members have requested to FAO to provide legal assistance to harmonize the review of their legislations to incorporate international law into their national legislations</p>	<p>Group 2</p>
<p>There is a good opportunity for the FAO Voluntary Guidelines on Transshipment to be further</p>	<p>With respect to CITIES , the fishery officers are not always trained in the CITIES</p>	<p>-CITIES training could be inserted into existing</p>	<p>Group 3</p>

TABLE 1

<p>implemented and integrated with the PSMA , this has yet to happen but some FFA members have taken steps to achieve this .</p> <p>RFMOs such as SPRFMO have just recently made amendments to the TS CMM to implement FAO VG on TS.</p> <p>CITIES – there is a big focus on implementing the provisions of CITIES at the PSM level , this is normally undertaken by conservation/environmental officers so not always fisheries</p>	<p>provisions , this can make detection of CITIES offences challenging,</p>	<p>training courses such as USP MCS Foundation Course (Suva).</p> <p>Opportunities to implement the FAO VG TS guidelines will always exist at the RFMO level where members are able to propose amendments to the relevant TS CMM.</p>	
<p>MECHANISMS FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF PART 9 (MONITORING, REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT)</p>			
<p>PSMA Questionnaire is useful tool for Parties to complete to help identify our gaps/challenges/capacity development needs/risks etc. that can be developed into indicators.</p> <p>The FAO Indicators can guide countries.</p> <p>Establishment of the FFA EPSM (Inspection).</p>	<p>Difficulty in completing the Questionnaire because of the lack of coordination amongst agencies.</p> <p>Self-evaluation can be inaccurate/lack objectivity</p> <p>Consistent reporting an issue because of lack of capacity and man power.</p> <p>Clarity needed on the use of ‘FAO Indicators’ and the use relevant indicators.</p>	<p>Awareness programmes on the FAO Indicators.</p>	<p>Group 1</p>

TABLE 1

	Qualitative v/s quantitative indicators needed.		
Some members have implemented and carried out assessment through the PSMA self- assessment questionnaire		<p>Parties to come together and to present the results of their assessments and also to discuss and come up with proposal of how to better streamline the process</p> <p>Learn from RFMOs or learn from existing treaties on how they have developed their systems so in that way even new members will find it easy to tap in as they will understand how the commission works</p>	Group 2
<p>-whilst the self-assessment questionnaire can be useful in gaining a snap shot of implementation levels/challenges, other data sources can also be used.</p> <p>-the use and analysis of data for IUU indicators is valuable in this respect.</p>	<p>Self report questionnaires can often be misleading as it not backed up by actual evidence of implementation.</p> <p>RFMO reporting obligations are also assessed through a self reporting process , again , this is not often backed up by evidence or</p>	<p>CMMs on the compliance monitoring scheme could be further strengthened by more robust analysis of the self reports by requiring evidence of implementation.</p>	Group 3

TABLE 1

<p>'Part 2' reporting to the WCPFC is a useful dataset which could potentially be shared with the FAO who could then use this as an indicator of potential IUU indicators.</p>	<p>documentation showing that a certain measure has been implemented.</p>		
B. ENSURING EFFICIENT AND SUSTAINABLE FUNCTIONING OF THE AGREEMENT			
<p>Refer to 'Capacity Development'</p>			Group 1
<p>-</p>	<p>Having a proper functioning system where issues are discussed at a regional level before being brought up to the secretariate level. whether the issue lies with Human resourcing, finance etc, the set-up has to be for members to really discuss their issues well.</p>	<p>Parties need to keep refreshing and promoting and putting it in the back of existing work</p> <p>Meetings need to be set up in regional levels effectively addressing issues and the outcomes.</p>	- Group 2
<p>There is a possibility for the RFMO style model to be followed whereby Parties are required to pay fees based on GDP etc.</p> <p>Port states in the Pacific region do cost recover from operators</p>	<p>Sustainable financing is a big issue for the financing of the PSMA meetings / Secretariat.</p> <p>-often the revenue from operators does not necessarily make it back to the front line inspectors ,</p>	<p>more robust cost recovery mechanisms could be included in legislation , FAO could have a role in assisting Parties in amending legislation so cost recovery can be implemented effectively , with revenue being used to</p>	Group 3

TABLE 1

when undertaking PSM/A activities , in some cases , levies are charged based on the tonnage of fish transshipped.	often there are expectations for officers to undertake additional tools . Commercial arrangements / negotiations around fishing access / port access is not always consistent in terms of the cost recovery , and this results in non-uniform application of PSM.	build capacity at the operational level,.	
<i>C. MONITORING AND REVIEW OF THE STRATEGY</i>			
First review of the strategy ongoing.			Group 1
The Bali Strategy has been informative and is a good document starting the work of PSM. It also looks at identifying the gaps that exist in this work The Strategy also tends to linking the PSM with the existing treaties and arrangements	-	Set up specific timeline and work program for the 4-year period and when to review There should at least be a mid-term review during the specific timeline	Group 2
MoP should reviewed every four years , the Regional Coordination Workshops	-good information based on a number of sources (regional workshops, questionnaires, academic	The next MoP should start the initial steps in reviewing the data/information collected from the Regional	Group 3

TABLE 1

<p>completed this week will be a useful input into this process.</p>	<p>studies) needs to be used to inform the review of the Bali Strategy – without this data the review will not be well informed .</p> <p>-Parties and non-Parties should have ample time to input into any review and this should be done well in advance of the following MOP</p>	<p>Coordination workshops. This could be done in a dedicated session.</p>	
--	--	---	--



Table 2a – Consolidated Outcomes of Spanish-speaking Groups

LOGROS, DESAFÍOS Y PROPUESTAS EN LA IMPLEMENTACIÓN DE LA ESTRATEGIA DE BALI DEL AMERP		
LOGROS	DESAFIOS	PROPUESTAS
A. MAYOR ADHESIÓN AL AMERP Y PARTICIPACIÓN EN EL		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adhesión de nuevas partes al AMERP, incluyendo un nuevo miembro Algunos Estados en proceso de adhesión se encuentran progresivamente implementando controles alineados con el AMERP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conseguir la adhesión y/o ratificación de Estados de la Región de Latinoamérica y el Caribe en el corto plazo. Lograr que las Autoridades identifiquen y valoren las oportunidades y/o beneficios que para cada Estado por la adhesión y/o ratificación del AMERP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intercambiar experiencias entre Estados de la Región de Latinoamérica y el Caribe para destacar los beneficios de la adhesión y/o ratificación Involucrar más a las Organizaciones Regionales de Ordenación Pesquera (OROP) para incentivar la adhesión. Ofrecer mayor asistencia técnica y capacitación por parte de la FAO para acelerar la aplicación de procedimientos.
B. CUMPLIMIENTO DE LAS RESPONSABILIDADES DE LAS PARTES PARA LA APLICACIÓN EFICAZ DEL AMERP		

Table 2a – Consolidated Outcomes of Spanish-speaking Groups (cont.)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementación y aplicación efectiva de medidas de control alineadas con los estándares mínimos del AMERP • Algunos Estados han efectuado la designación de puntos de contacto en GIES. • Se ha empezado progresivamente a implementar el registro de buques y adoptar herramientas como el GIES. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designar y/o actualizar puntos de contacto de Estados de la Región de Latinoamérica y el Caribe para el cumplimiento del AMERP. • Designar y/o actualizar puertos designados de Estados de la Región de Latinoamérica y el Caribe para el cumplimiento del AMERP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incentivar la designación oportuna de puertos y puntos focales por parte de los Estados de la Región de Latinoamérica y el Caribe. • Crear una plataforma online de comunicación (chat) entre los puntos de contacto en el GIES.
<p><i>B.1 Fortalecimiento de los marcos normativos, jurídicos e institucionales y de mecanismos operacionales</i></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • La mayoría de los Estados partes han actualizado la normativa para alinearse con las disposiciones del AMERP. • Existen algunos Estados no parte del AMERP en proceso de adaptación de su normativa nacional. • Implementación de talleres FAO para compartir experiencias y fortalecer la legislación nacional. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acordar estandares a nivel regional que orienten a los Estados de la Región de Latinoamérica y el Caribe a adoptar, revisar y/o actualizar su normativa nacional y procedimientos internos • Actualizar la normativa nacional y procedimientos internos para el control y autorización de embarcaciones pesqueras, tanto en Estados partes como no partes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crear grupos de trabajo a nivel regional para desarrollar estandares para los Estados partes y no partes de la Región de Latinoamérica y el Caribe. • Implementar los estandares acordados en la normativa de aplicación del AMERP • Implementar un protocolo regional con lineamientos y procedimientos para la incautación de productos de pesca IUU. • Obtener mayor asistencia técnica y acompañamiento de FAO en el desarrollo e implementación de procedimientos.
<p><i>B.2 Integración y coordinaciones en los planos nacional y regional</i></p>		

Table 2a – Consolidated Outcomes of Spanish-speaking Groups (cont.)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Algunos países han incorporado en su normativa nacional el cumplimiento de acuerdos internacionales para eliminar la pesca IUU. Existen algunas normativas regionales con protocolos de intercambio de información, así como memorandos de entendimiento para fortalecer capacidades institucionales. Algunos Estados han desarrollado mecanismos de coordinación interinstitucional para el cumplimiento del AMERP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establecer grupos de trabajo regionales de intercambio de experiencia, complementarios a la aplicación del GIES. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alentar a los estados para que la aplicación del AMERP sea obligatoria en las OROP. Intercambio de experiencias entre Estados con procedimientos interinstitucionales establecidos. Promover la interacción y el intercambio de información sobre la legislación pesquera entre Estados, incluyendo la firma de Memorandos de Entendimiento.
<p><i>B.3 Cooperación e intercambio de información</i></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementación y operación de la plataforma GIES como medio oficial del AMERP. La mayor parte de los Estados han colaborado en la integración de puntos de contacto y puertos autorizados, y conectividad entre el RMDB y el GIES. Eficiente intercambio de información entre Estados parte y no parte a nivel regional. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Convertir el GIES en la plataforma principal para todas las fases de ingreso a puerto de buques de pabellón extranjero. Mantener un intercambio de información activo y permanente (24/7) entre Estados partes y no partes, y OROPs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desarrollar un plan de mejora para que el GIES pueda interoperar con herramientas de las OROP y otros Estados. Integrar un chat dentro del GIES para mejorar la comunicación en tiempo real. Alentar a los Estados a utilizar el GIES y compartir sus sistemas de información ante peticiones específicas.
<p><i>B.4. Entrada y uso de puertos</i></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> La mayoría de los Estados parte han designado puertos en cumplimiento del AMERP. Algunos Estados, aunque no sean partes del AMERP, ya han establecido requisitos y evalúan actividades de embarcaciones antes de emitir autorizaciones de entrada y uso del puerto. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Todos los Estados partes y no partes de la Región de Latinoamérica y el Caribe debieran designar puertos autorizados para el AMERP Todos los Estados partes y no partes de la Región de Latinoamérica y el Caribe debieran propender a efectuar el control previo al ingreso basado en análisis de riesgo de las embarcaciones. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Estandarizar los criterios para el análisis de riesgo de las embarcaciones y establecer un mínimo requerido de cumplimiento para el ingreso. Intercambiar experiencias entre los Estados partes y no partes de la Región de Latinoamérica y el Caribe sobre implementación de acuerdos interinstitucionales que pueden servir de modelo para otros Estados.

Table 2a – Consolidated Outcomes of Spanish-speaking Groups (cont.)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establecer criterios estandarizados para los Estados partes y no partes de la Región de Latinoamérica y el Caribe para el acceso en casos de fuerza mayor, enfermedad, o reparaciones. • Todos los Estados avancen en el establecimiento de acuerdos interinstitucionales para los procedimientos de la entrada y uso de los puertos. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estandarizar los criterios utilizados en los Estados partes y no partes de la Región de Latinoamérica y el Caribe para emitir autorizaciones de entrada y uso de puerto en caso de fuerza mayor. • Adopción de los Estados partes y no partes de la Región de Latinoamérica y el Caribe de acuerdos interinstitucionales y de protocolos establecidos por organismos internacionales para la regulación de la entrada y uso de puertos. • Desarrollar un modulo de entrada y uso del puerto con la información previa al arribo en GIES (ANEXO A)
<i>B.5. Inspecciones y medidas de seguimiento.</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cumplimiento del mínimo de inspecciones requeridas por las OROP. • Aplicación de protocolos de inspección y procedimientos similares al AMERP en varios Estados de la región, aun no siendo Estados partes. • Normativa ajustada a los requisitos del AMERP y mecanismos de capacitación de inspectores en algunos Estados de la región, aún no siendo Estados partes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unificar los porcentajes mínimos de inspecciones requeridos por todas las OROPs basados en análisis de riesgos. • Aumentar el conocimiento, capacitación y número de inspectores, y la disponibilidad de herramientas tecnológicas adecuadas. • Establecer criterios nacionales y regionales para la evaluación de riesgos y estandarizar la capacitación de inspectores. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establecer en todos los Estados partes y no partes de la Región de Latinoamérica y el Caribe criterios de priorización para las inspecciones de embarcaciones de alto riesgo según análisis de riesgos. • FAO debiera brindar talleres de formación y capacitaciones regionales para fortalecer capacidades técnicas y aplicar criterios unificados. • Exigir la publicación de resultados de inspecciones en el GIES y compartir información entre Estados para seguimiento. • Contar con un listado mundial de buques que hayan participado en pesca IUU, actualizada, unificada y certificada por las OROPs.
<i>B.6. Papel de los Estados del pabellón</i>		

Table 2a – Consolidated Outcomes of Spanish-speaking Groups (cont.)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avances progresivos en la incorporación de información en el Registro Mundial de Buques y en el GIES. • Utilización de herramientas proporcionadas por la FAO para inspecciones de buques de bandera extranjera. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lograr la corresponsabilidad de los Estados del pabellón de la Región de Latinoamérica y el Caribe en el control para la eliminación de la pesca INDR a nivel nacional e internacional. • Lograr el 100% de incorporación de la información en el Registro Mundial de Buques y en el GIES. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fortalecer el cumplimiento de las obligaciones de los Estados del pabellón de la Región de Latinoamérica y el Caribe, tanto en el control de las actividades de pesca de la flota nacional e internacional • Mantener actualizada la información de buques de su pabellón dentro del GIES y Registro Mundial de Buques.
<p><i>B.7. Desarrollo de capacidad</i></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participación en espacios de coordinación regional e internacional para compartir experiencias en la implementación del AMERP, tanto por Estados parte como no Partes de la Región de Latinoamérica y el Caribe. • Realización de reuniones de socialización y talleres AMERP para apoyar a los Estados no parte de la Región de Latinoamérica y el Caribe en el proceso de adhesión. • Intercambio y difusión de información y contactos en temas específicos de inspección. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Falta de continuidad de los funcionarios técnicos, operativos y legales en la implementación del AMERP y en la toma de decisiones. • Necesidad de desarrollar instrumentos tecnológicos que asistan a los inspectores durante sus tareas. • Necesidad de estandarizar la capacitación y elevar el nivel de experiencia en inspección pesquera en la región. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incluir funcionarios con conocimiento técnico y capacidad de decisión en reuniones de coordinación. • Desarrollar programas de capacitación sobre el contenido del AMERP y directrices voluntarias para la actuación del Estado de pabellón. • Continuar con la ejecución talleres globales por parte de la FAO para capacitación en labores de fiscalización.
<p><i>B.8. Relación con el derecho internacional y otros instrumentos internacionales</i></p>		

Table 2a – Consolidated Outcomes of Spanish-speaking Groups (cont.)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aplicación generalizada de los acuerdos internacionales entre los Estados partes de la Región de Latinoamérica y el Caribe • Reconocimiento de las decisiones adoptadas por los Estados parte del AMERP por parte de las OROPS. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estudiar los acuerdos marítimos sobre acceso a puertos de otras instituciones como la IMO y su complementación e integración con las medidas del AMERP. • Evaluar los alcances a nivel nacional de otros instrumentos internacionales relacionados con la pesca (UNFSA, BBNJ, Acuerdo de Cumplimiento) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrar las directrices voluntarias para las actuaciones del Estado del pabellón de FAO dentro de la normativa nacional vinculante. • Exhortar a que los Estados partes y no partes de la Región de Latinoamérica y el Caribe cumplan con el Códigos de conducta para la pesca responsable de FAO. • Analizar a nivel nacional y/o regional medidas destinadas a la eficaz aplicación de otros instrumentos internacionales relacionados con la pesca. (UNFSA, BBNJ, Acuerdo de Cumplimiento)
<p>C. MECANISMOS PARA IMPLEMENTACIÓN DE LA PARTE 9 (MONITOREO, EXAMEN Y EVALUACIÓN)</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimizar los trasbordos ilegales y reducir los puertos de descarga de buques mercantes con donantes IUU. • Realización de reuniones de seguimiento sobre la implementación del Acuerdo. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definir indicadores de cumplimiento respetando la particularidad y soberanía de los países. • Obtener información oportuna y autorizaciones de trasbordo de cada buque donante y buque madre de bandera. • No existen herramientas de medición eficientes que arrojen resultados sobre la implementación del AMERP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crear de un Comité de Cumplimiento de las medidas del AMERP y de las actuaciones del estado pabellón. • Identificar empresas, propietarios y/o capitanes de buques pesqueras y/o de actividades relacionadas con la pesca IUU. • Homologación de sistemas de monitoreo MSC y empresas de transporte refrigerado para colaborar en la reducción de IUU. • Implementar un mecanismo de medición eficiente que proporcione resultados cualitativos y cuantitativos sobre la aplicación del AMERP.
<p>D. GARANTÍA DEL FUNCIONAMIENTO EFICIENTE Y SOSTENIBLE DEL ACUERDO</p>		

Table 2a – Consolidated Outcomes of Spanish-speaking Groups (cont.)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obtención de financiamiento de países donantes y participación activa de países en desarrollo en reuniones regionales. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementación y funcionamiento del Comité de Cumplimiento y obtención de recursos necesarios. • Obtener financiamiento estatal para seguimiento de planes anuales y garantizar voluntad política de las autoridades. • Mantener el funcionamiento efectivo del AMERP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identificación de posibles cooperantes para el financiamiento del Comité de Cumplimiento. • Seguir obteniendo financiamiento exterior para países en desarrollo y elaborar una hoja de ruta con análisis de las metas corto mediano y largo plazo. • Alternar reuniones presenciales y virtuales, priorizando el uso de tecnologías de comunicación.
<p><i>E. SEGUIMIENTO Y EXAMEN DE LA ESTRATEGIA.</i></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avance en la implementación de la estrategia por parte de los países miembros. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Falta de una comisión regional de seguimiento y consulta para el correcto uso del AMERP. • Definir una herramienta de medición eficiente para evaluar la implementación de la estrategia. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elaborar una herramienta metodológica para el seguimiento y monitoreo de la implementación de la estrategia. • Adoptar un Comité de cumplimiento que permita la revisión y evaluación de la implementación y aplicación de la estrategia. • Analizar los planes anuales de estrategia de cada país en relación con la estrategia general del AMERP.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cumplimiento del 70% de los objetivos planteados en las reuniones y planes de cumplimiento de cada país. 		

Table 2b – Consolidated Outcomes of English-speaking Group

ACHIEVEMENTS, CHALLENGES / GAPS AND PROPOSALS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PSMA BALI STRATEGY

ACHIEVEMENTS	CHALLENGES / GAPS	PROPOSALS
<i>A. INCREASING ADHERENCE TO AND PARTICIPATION IN THE PSMA</i>		
<p>As a region, 73% of CARICOM Member States are Parties to the PSMA which indirectly encourages participation in PSMA. However, as individual States, more can be done to encourage participation in the PSMA.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -As small development States, there is limited capacity to implement the provisions of the PSMA therefore it is difficult to encourage participation of other countries. - Internal deficiencies to spearhead due to lack of political will - Development of infrastructure in terms of human resources can be a significant challenge, including the ability to monitor any fishing activities. -Demonstration of the added value of the PSMA can be difficult. Since it requires the clear evidence of benefits as it relates to the PSMA and it's effectiveness in curbing IUU activities - It can be challenging to effectively communicate the benefits of PSMA to all relevant stakeholders (Fisheries sector and general public). -Differing interests or policies of relevant parties/countries to support PSMA objectives. -Limited or lacking human capacities, skills or resources of some countries to effectively implement the agreement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Include PSMA ratification and implementation on the CARICOM agenda for discussion and necessary action. [CARICOM] - Development of comprehensive and ongoing awareness campaigns for the relevance of PSMA and its impact on reducing IUU fishing. [FAO/RFBs] - Outreach and awareness or stakeholder consultations to understand the importance of PSMA. [FAO/RFBs]

Table 2b – Consolidated Outcomes of English-speaking Group (cont.)

<i>B. FULFILMENT OF RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PARTIES FOR EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PSMA</i>		
<i>B1. Strengthening the policy, legal, institutional frameworks and operational mechanisms</i>		
<p>Development of supporting regulations to combat IUU fishing</p> <p>Some States [non-Parties] have highly developed legal regulatory frameworks that would provide for easy implementation of the PSMA.</p> <p>The identification of relevant agencies/departments (including through MOUs) that provides support to the PSMA implementation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need for legal aid to assist in the development or assessment of laws. For SIDs, this can be a challenge with the already limited resources. - Differing mandates, capacities and priorities between agencies may hinder the development of necessary legal framework to assist in the development of relevant policies. -Legal framework needs to be developed to support every possible scenario of incoming high seas vessels to port state that is found engaging in IUU -Delays in policy review or bill passage which leads to outdated policies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Since CARICOM States operate predominantly under common law, a regional strategy can be developed to transfer knowledge and improve regulatory frameworks. [CARICOM] -Dedicated personnel for policy reviews/updates [PARTIES] - Develop departmental legal administrative proceedings or procedures which limit the time taken to go to court. [PARTIES]
<i>B2. Integration and coordination at national and regional levels</i>		
<p>Participation in Regional Coordination Meetings facilitated by the FAO-PSMA Secretariat.</p> <p>Ongoing bilateral exchange and Information exchange through supporting agencies/parties.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The integration of PSMs under the PSMA can be a complex process which requires a comprehensive understanding of the PSMA, the development of appropriate legislation and the establishment of effective MCS and enforcement mechanisms. - Lack of inter-agency coordination and collaboration at the national level for ratification/implementation. -One-sided efforts due to over-capacity or under-capacity by some states or departments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Phased approach to integration. [PARTIES] -Include PSMA related issues as standing agenda items at regional meetings/Develop a standing technical working group to address PSMA matters at the regional level. [RFBs] -Joint response and training in MCS, possibly through MOUs. [PARTIES] -Transfer of technology or shared resources/tools between parties to aide developing states in their implementation and eliminate the

Table 2b – Consolidated Outcomes of English-speaking Group (cont.)

		<p>issue of limited resources in these instances. [PARTIES]</p>
<p><i>B3. Cooperation and exchange of information</i></p>		
<p>-Incorporating MCS in new developing Act/Bills</p> <p>-Currently have licensing and exploring VMS for small-scale fishing fleet.</p> <p>-Public access to pertinent agencies and personnel as well as general information relating to international fishing vessels.</p> <p>-Transparency through platforms where information is shared to combat IUU fishing activities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Making GIES fully operational by the end of 2023 can be challenging due to technical, financial and capacity constraints. Further, the continuous development while not impossible to achieve may also require ongoing technical and capacity development among countries and organizations. - Access to the GIES (non-member states). - Inability of non-parties to share information. - Inadequate data collection and database management systems (DMBS)/ record to provide comprehensive information to GIES. - Differing resources and access to resources, methods and systems for information sharing and data collection. 	<p>-Invite other agencies involved in PSMs to regional meetings to increase their understanding of the role they play and encourage execution of those roles. Even if funds are limited for in person attendance, create a virtual link for following along. [FAO]</p> <p>-Develop a mechanism for non-Parties to share pertinent information about IUU activities/vessels with Parties. [FAO]</p> <p>-Develop a full database management system which incorporates varied information to meet all PSMA requirements. [FAO]</p> <p>-Different platforms should have interconnectivity to automatically feed data into a single global system via APIs. [FAO/RFBs/PARTIES]</p>

Table 2b – Consolidated Outcomes of English-speaking Group (cont.)

<i>B4. Entry and use of Ports</i>		
<p>-Protocols exist for entry and access.</p> <p>-Catch certificates required for entry into port with intention of fish landing.</p> <p>-Timely communication with other port/flag states.</p>	<p>-Restrictive port facilities and inspection capabilities or a complete lack of both to facilitate entry and access in accordance with PSMA provisions.</p> <p>- While sharing of information is important, data privacy concerns between agencies would need to be addressed prior to the implementation.</p> <p>- Requires comprehensive understanding of international maritime law and the capacity to manage emergency situations.</p> <p>-Different department responsible for requests for port entry and is often not communicated to the relevant/fisheries agency.</p>	<p>-Develop a port facility ‘best practice’ document which provides guidance on the requisite infrastructure for PSMA implementation. [FAO]</p> <p>-Develop guidance document which outlines clear guidelines for States to fulfill their requirements. [FAO]</p>
<i>B5. Inspections and follow-up actions</i>		
<p>Some States have identified NCPs and Designated Ports.</p> <p>Some countries conduct limited inspections. Minimum standards already set out in the PSMA annex to follow.</p>	<p>-Countries might lack the resources to conduct a minimum annual level of inspections, especially if they have a large number of port entries.</p> <p>- Limited resources to develop and regularly revise a proper risk assessment system. Further, there may not be an established mechanism for information exchange with other relevant organizations.</p> <p>- Lack the capacity to conduct thorough inspections</p> <p>- No national database exists to inform statewide actions whether immediately or for future actions.</p> <p>-Different states and department inspectors and inspection standards which may cause loopholes.</p>	<p>-Opportunity for training to conduct more robust inspections [FAO]</p> <p>- Opportunity for the development of national database or utilize existing systems provided by FAO to inform follow-up actions [PARTIES]</p> <p>-A standardized training center/program for PSMA parties. [FAO]</p>

Table 2b – Consolidated Outcomes of English-speaking Group (cont.)

<i>B6. Role of flag States</i>		
<p>Some States have fully developed Flag Administrations with the necessary regulatory framework and institutional capacity to implement the PSMA.</p> <p>Support provided through FAO programs/projects</p>	<p>-Some Parties do not have the institutional capacity to act on information about Flagged vessels via the GIES.</p> <p>- Limited resources to contribute to the PSMA fund by developing states.</p> <p>-Limited capacity and inadequate resources to fulfill all the provisions of the PSMA</p> <p>-Lacking or no supporting legal framework.</p>	<p>-PSMA Secretariat should strategically work with Parties and non-Parties to develop GIES user profiles and training to effectively use the tool. [FAO]</p>
<i>B7. Capacity development</i>		
<p>States [Parties and non-Parties] routinely engage with the FAO-PSMA for technical cooperation and participate in Regional Coordination meetings and technical working group meetings.</p> <p>States partake in other regional trainings to enhance capacity for PSMA implementation.</p>	<p>-Small developing States require institutional strengthening and capacity building to effectively treat the provisions of the PSMA</p> <p>-PSMA related issues often aren't given priority status for budgetary allocations in an environment of managing scarce financial means.</p> <p>-Donor dependent.</p>	<p>-Capacity development fund needs to be instituted and offered to qualifying States to implement the provisions of the PSMA. [FAO]</p> <p>-Identify priority countries and areas for training/funding. [FAO]</p>
<i>B8. Relationship with international law and other international instruments</i>		
<p>Some incorporations of PSMA definitions into domestic legislation of Parties.</p> <p>Overlapping relevant international laws/instruments are complemented by provisions of the PSMA which strengthens the regulatory framework of the Parties</p>	<p>-Limited resources to assist in the integration and implementation impacting fisheries due to complexity and the need for legal and technical expertise.</p> <p>-Relationship with other laws may cause states to limit their duties as other frameworks may already call for the same or similar requirements. Hence, possibly (unknowingly) undermining the agreement.</p>	<p>-Capacity building to implement the PSMA. [FAO]</p> <p>-Legal and institutional reform to guide the implementation of the PSMA. [FAO]</p> <p>-Joint initiatives/programs by relevant agreement to achieve overall objectives. [FAO/RFBs/PARTIES]</p>

Table 2b – Consolidated Outcomes of English-speaking Group (cont.)

<i>C. MECHANISMS FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF PART 9 (MONITORING, REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT)</i>		
<p>FAO supporting programs which develop a national strategy for PSMA implementation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Effectiveness of self-monitoring may be diminished with the absence of resource personnel or experts capable of providing assistance. - Small island states may find it difficult to meet increasing demands due to limited resources - Insufficient information/data and sector coverage for adequate self-assessment. 	<p>Benefits may be derived from regular monitoring by FAO of the implementation of the agreement by parties to speed up the process of implementation through gap identification. [FAO]</p> <p>Develop a PSMA country self-assessment tool to help with the sustainability of the PSMA. [FAO]</p>
<i>D. ENSURING EFFICIENT AND SUSTAINABLE FUNCTIONING OF THE AGREEMENT</i>		
<p>Donor aid to participate in PSMA working groups and regional meetings. Liaising with the PSMA Secretariat for technical guidance in the proper interpretation of provisions of the PSMA.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Differing criteria for countries to access financial and technical support. - Lack of treaty relations with key players involved in distant water fisheries and are subject to the provisions of the PSMA 	<p>-A PSMA Fund. [FAO]</p> <p>-Ongoing PSMA support programs. [FAO]</p> <p>-Continued promulgation of the treaty for ratification and subsequent implementation. [FAO/RFBs/IOs]</p>
<i>E. MONITORING AND REVIEW OF THE STRATEGY</i>		
<p>FAO indicator/quantifying tool.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keeping up with these updates and implementing them effectively could be challenging if there are changes in political, economic, or environmental conditions. - Limited or no national funding for ongoing efforts. 	<p>Resilience building through the development of strategies that may build resilience to external shocks, such as disasters and financial shocks that may ultimately affect the implementation of PSMA. [FAO]</p> <p>A 5-year national monitoring and review strategy. [FAO]</p>

RÉALISATIONS, DÉFIS / ÉCARTS ET PROPOSITIONS POUR LA MISE EN OEUVRE DE LA STRATÉGIE DE BALI SUR L'AMREP

RÉALISATIONS	DÉFIS / ÉCARTS	PROPOSITIONS
A. ACCROÎTRE L'ADHÉSION ET LA PARTICIPATION À L'AMREP		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Progression constante du nombre des pays adhérents à l'accord PSMA - Compréhension par les Etats des avantages de la mise en œuvre de l'Accord - Certaines ORP ont organisé des programmes de sensibilisations pour promouvoir l'adhésion des Etats non parties - Certaines parties ont mené une sensibilisation à propos du PSMA lors des forums régionaux 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Manque de volonté politique des décideurs de certains pays - Manque de moyens financiers et humains dans certains pays pour mettre en œuvre l'accord - Manque de sensibilisation et compréhension par les décideurs de certains pays 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inciter les ORP à renforcer l'action de sensibilisation des pays non adhérents à l'Accord (COMHAFAT, CPCO, CSRP...). - La FAO doit continuer à notifier les pays concernés pour mieux connaître les avantages de l'Accord. - Continuer le renforcement des capacités des pays - Échanges d'expertise entre les Etats. - Organisation des ateliers entre les Etats de la même région afin d'encourager l'adhésion à l'Accord.

B. EXERCICE DES RESPONSABILITÉS DES PARTIES POUR UNE MISE EN ŒUVRE EFFECTIVE DE L'AMREP		
B1. Renforcer les cadres politiques, juridiques, institutionnels et les mécanismes opérationnels		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Certains pays ont transposé les mesures PSMA dans la législation nationale - Certains pays ont instauré les mesures de l'accord PSMA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Complexité du processus de l'actualisation des textes réglementaires - Faiblesse du cadre institutionnel et juridique dans certains pays - Textes réglementaires non actualisées dans certains Etats - Manque de communication sur le PSMA auprès des acteurs politiques 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Solliciter l'appui des experts de la FAO pour la transposition des mesures PSMA - Établir les canaux de communication (plate-forme) entre les structures nationales impliquées dans la mise en œuvre de l'accord - Les Etats doivent adopter et mettre à jour le cadre politique, juridique, et institutionnel approprié pour la mise en œuvre du PSMA - Organiser des ateliers pour étudier les modalités spécifiques d'application de l'Accord, adaptées au cas des navires de pêche artisanale

B2. Intégration et coordination aux niveaux national et régional		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mise en place de structures de coordination au niveau national - Plusieurs Etats appliquent des programmes/mémoires régionaux/recommandations des ORGP intégrant les dispositions de l'Accord - La plate-forme de coopération de la CPLP (communauté des pays de langue portugaise) a été créée 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Manque de communication et de coopération entre les structures concernées sur le plan national et régional - Absence d'infrastructure de coordination entre les Etats pour la mise en œuvre de l'accord à savoir une plate-forme de coordination entre les États membres de la CPLP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mettre en place des plate-forme de concertation et d'échanges d'information régulière entre les administrations nationales concernées - Encourager les accords bilatéraux et régionaux de coopération (mémoire, protocole d'accord) y compris en ce qui concerne les moyens et les ressources nécessaires - Organiser des ateliers inter-régionaux pour coordonner les actions de mise en œuvre des dispositions du PSMA
B3. Coopération et échange d'information		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Plusieurs pays ont désigné leurs points de contact, ont formé les opérateurs à l'utilisation du GIES et ont commencé à utiliser le GIES 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Les craintes liées à la sécurisation et à la confidentialité des données - La réticence des Etats à partager les informations jugées sensibles (propriétaires des navires, les cas d'infraction...) - Certains Etats ne voient pas les avantages de l'utilisation du GIES 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Instaurer des protocoles de sécurisation des données échangées - Rassurer les Etats que les informations échangées seront utilisées uniquement

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Quelques ORGP travail avec la FAO pour incorporer les informations dans le GIES - Quelques parties veulent coopérer et partager le rapport d'inspection à travers le GIES 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Certaines parties rencontrent des difficultés d'utilisation du GIES - Les Etats n'ayant pas les ports et les points de contacts désignés n'échangent pas les informations 	<p>pour les fins appropriées (réunion, documents)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Encourager l'instauration des mécanismes régionaux de partage des informations avec les États portuaires voisins. - Intégrer, dans le système GIES, de nouvelles fonctionnalités d'échange d'information pertinentes entre les parties.
<i>B4. Entrée dans les ports et utilisation des services du port</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Certains pays ont établi des procédures/mémoire relatives aux modalités d'entrée et d'utilisation du port y compris ce qui concerne l'échange des informations. - Certains pays ont des plateformes d'échange et de partage des informations - Certains pays ont désigné les ports et les points de contact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Manque de communication et de coopération entre les structures concernées sur le plan national et régional - Plusieurs pays n'ont pas de procédures formalisées concernant les modalités d'entrée et d'utilisation du port - Manque de standardisation/harmonisation des procédures sur le plan régional - Insuffisance des ressources et moyens nécessaires dans certains pays - certaines structures du port ne sont pas associées dans le mécanisme de lutte contre la pêche INN/ou ne connaissent pas les mécanismes de lutte contre la pêche INN 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Encourager les Etats pour établir des procédures opérationnelles relatives aux modalités d'autorisation/refus d'entrée au port - Promouvoir la mise en place du cadre de coopération et de communication entre les autorités impliquées au niveau national et aussi entre les Etats

B5. Inspections and actions post-inspection		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Les navires étrangers sont inspectés aux ports des Etats parties à l'Accord - Début de mise en œuvre des procédures d'inspection, dans certains Etat, établies conformément aux mesures PSMA - Les pays se conforment aux exigences des ORGP en ce qui concerne le pourcentage d'inspections requises - Plusieurs pays ont des programmes de formation des inspecteurs - Plusieurs pays ont un système national de téléchargement des Rapport d'inspection - Certains pays ont un programme de formation des inspecteurs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Insuffisance en moyens logistiques et en personnels formés pour conduire les inspections des navires étrangers - Insuffisance de données nécessaires concernant les navires étrangers pour mener l'analyse de risque 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Renforcer les capacités logistiques et techniques des autorités des Etats du port (élaboration des guides, formation, moyens logistiques...) - Encourager et sensibiliser les Etats à utiliser le GIES notamment pour renseigner et échanger les rapports d'inspection
B6. Rôle de l'Etat du Pavillon		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Les Etats de pavillon exercent leurs autorités de contrôle sur leurs navires en dehors de leurs eaux nationales - Plusieurs Etats de pavillon ont des systèmes de suivi de leurs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Faible utilisation du GIES par l'Etat de pavillon (volonté politique, connaissance.) - Faible capacité de certains Etat pour suivre leurs navires en dehors de leurs eaux nationales - La réticence des Etats à partager les informations jugées sensibles dans le GIES (propriétaires des navires, les cas d'infraction...) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Formation et vulgarisation concernant l'utilisation du GIES - Appuyer le renforcement des capacités en matière de suivi et surveillance des

navires exerçant en dehors de leurs eaux nationales	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Absence de canaux de communication des informations liées à la surveillance des navires 	<p>navires y compris pour participer aux réunions et ateliers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Améliorer la réglementation relative au suivi des navires nationaux - Encourager les Etats du pavillon à enregistrer leurs navires dans le Fichier mondial des navires de pêche - Instaurer des protocoles de sécurisation des données échangées - Rassurer les Etats que les informations échangées dans le GIES seront utilisées uniquement pour les fins appropriées
<i>B7. Développement des capacités</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - La plupart des pays ont bénéficié de programme de renforcement des capacités pour la mise en œuvre de l'AMREP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Insuffisance des programmes de formation dédiés aux Etats de port (partie et non partie) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Solliciter des fonds auprès des partenaires pour mettre en œuvre des programmes de formation - Encourager le partenariat avec des

		<p>instituts de formation sous régional ou régional (REFMAR : réseau des instituts et établissements de formation maritime)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Encourager l'échange de personnels d'inspection entre les Etats
<i>B8. Relations avec le droit de la mer et les autres instruments internationaux</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Certains Etats ont transposé les dispositions du droit international dans leurs législations nationales 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Insuffisance des connaissances des certains dispositions des instruments internationaux en la matière - Faible ratification et appropriation des autres instruments internationaux en matière de pêche - Les pays ont une capacité limitée à mettre en œuvre les mesures internationales émises par les ORGP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Renforcement des capacités en matière de vulgarisation des dispositions des instruments internationaux - Encourager la coordination entre les organisations internationales pour une mise en œuvre cohérente des instruments internationaux - Soutenir les pays pour transposer les mesures réglementaires internationales dans la législation nationale

C. MÉCANISMES POUR LA MISE EN ŒUVRE DE LA PARTIE 9 (SUIVI, REVUE ET EVALUATION)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existence du questionnaire FAO comme outil d'évaluation de la mise en œuvre du PSMA - Certains pays ont évalué la mise en œuvre du PSMA moyennant le questionnaire de la FAO 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - La majorité des pays n'ont pas entamé en interne le processus d'évaluation de la mise en œuvre du PSMA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mettre en place des mécanismes d'évaluation du degré de conformité au niveau des ORP (disponibilité de questionnaire sur une plate-forme) et permettre aux Etats un accès facile aux différents questionnaires sur le PSMA - Promouvoir le renforcement des capacités en ce sens - Prévoir l'évaluation de l'évolution de la pêche INN en tenant compte de la mise en place des mesures et outils du PSMA
D. ASSURER UN FONCTIONNEMENT EFFICACE ET DURABLE DE L'ACCORD		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Les textes réglementaires en matière de lutte contre la pêche INN sont améliorés 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Défaut de priorisation de la lutte contre la pêche INN dans certains Etats 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Promouvoir l'engagement continu des Etats pour la mise en œuvre efficace des mesures de l'Accord - Encourager l'organisation, au niveau

		<p>régional, des ateliers et des réunions d'évaluation notamment pour proposer des solutions aux contraintes de la mise en œuvre du PSMA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Renforcer les capacités des Etats pour les rendre plus autonomes en matière d'implémentation du PSMA.
<i>E. SUIVI ET REVUE DE LA STRATÉGIE</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existence d'un groupe de travail dédié à la stratégie de mise en œuvre du PSMA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Complexité d'élaboration d'une stratégie en raison des disparités dans la mise en œuvre des dispositions de l'accord PSMA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traduire la stratégie en plan d'action de mise en œuvre selon un calendrier bien défini - Mettre en place un mécanisme d'évaluation et de suivi de la réalisation des actions découlant de de la stratégie

ACHIEVEMENTS, CHALLENGES / GAPS AND PROPOSALS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PSMA BALI STRATEGY

ACHIEVEMENTS	CHALLENGES / GAPS	PROPOSALS
A. INCREASING ADHERENCE TO AND PARTICIPATION IN THE PSMA		
<p><i>1. Number of parties has increased to 79 members globally, and 12 members in Asian region. Having this meeting, including non-members. Even non-members have made some progress, take domestic actions to be a member or to conduct inspections</i></p> <p><i>2. At bilateral level, MOU was signed; at regional and international levels, there is cooperation with FAO and RFMOs</i></p>	<p><i>1. Lack of political willingness</i></p> <p><i>2. Lack of funding</i></p> <p><i>3. Lack of info sharing about knowledge and national legislation.</i></p> <p><i>4. Lack of understanding PSMA status in Asian region</i></p> <p><i>5. Conducting inspection including language area for all countries including translating</i></p> <p><i>6. Long domestic process for the ratification of PSMA and revising domestic legislation</i></p> <p><i>7. Cooperation and coordination with relevant stake-holders and other agencies</i></p> <p><i>8. Potential rigorous reporting requirements for members. Duplication of reporting requirements via national, RFMO platforms and GIES</i></p> <p><i>9. Lack of incentives for major fishing nations to be members to the agreement</i></p>	<p><i>1. Request FAO/Organizations to enhance regional cooperation and review status and challenges of Asian region</i></p> <p><i>2. Request FAO/Organizations to identify needs of capacity building on the PSM implementation, including language training</i></p> <p><i>3. Bring PSMA agenda into larger forum and have more international (COFI and UN, etc.) and regional (ASEAN, SEAFDEC, BIMSTEC, BOBP, RPOA-IUU etc.) forum to increase political willingness</i></p> <p><i>4. Request FAO to conduct an analysis to understand the reasons behind the reluctance to ratify the agreement, and show the benefit to be the member of the PSMA</i></p> <p><i>5. Integrate RFMO's reporting platform with GIES</i></p>
B. FULFILMENT OF RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PARTIES FOR EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PSMA		

B1. Strengthening the policy, legal, institutional frameworks and operational mechanisms

<p>1. Set minimum requirements via domestic legislation</p> <p>2. Inter-agency coordination, get involvement from different sectors</p> <p>3. Hold his kind of regional meeting and coordination meeting for sharing info and experiences</p> <p>4. Network with other countries.</p> <p>5. Communication with flag states</p> <p>6. Institutional / organization considered and obtained framework to support PSMA in the region</p>	<p>As a port state,</p> <p>1. Lack of harmonized SOP (standard operating procedure) for operation under PSMA</p> <p>2. Inter-agency coordination is still a challenge</p> <p>3. The amendment of legislation depends on political decision</p> <p>4. Law enforcement and legal framework for measures adopted by the RFMOs, in case the party is non-members of that RFMO</p> <p>5. Communication with flag states specially with non-member states</p> <p>6. National legal frameworks are often in native language and hence it would be difficult for independent assessor to understand the gaps in the framework</p> <p>7. Lack of access to history of vessels including AIS/VMS, IMO database (GISIS), and IHS Fairplay</p>	<p>1. More information and experience sharing</p> <p>2. Request FAO and some donor countries to reach out and support the countries to strengthen their legislation and MCS system to ensure implementation of PSMA will not be out of power</p> <p>3. Bring PSMA agenda into larger forum and have more international (COFI and UN, etc.) and regional (ASEAN, SEAFDEC, BIMSTEC, BOBP, RPOA-IUU etc.) forum to increase political willingness</p>
---	--	---

B2. Integration and coordination at national and regional levels

<p>1. The single window has been established (The integration between national systems and GIES)</p> <p>2. Some countries have SOP for integration and coordination at the national level</p> <p>3. Some countries actively participate and coordinate with regional/ sub-regional fisheries body/platforms</p>	<p>1. Not effective communication with members outside the Asian region</p> <p>2. Registration for RFMO RFV, Global record separately (duplication)</p> <p>3. Lack of inter-agency collaboration at the national level to implement PSMA for most countries</p>	<p>1. Establish integrated single window</p> <p>2. Conduct coordination meetings with other regions and invite other stakeholders such as FFA.</p> <p>3. Request to establish Asia regional training Center for MCS (not limited to PSMA)</p>
--	--	--

<p><i>such as AN-IUU, RPOA-IUU, IUU Roadmap to combat IUU-F, SEAFDEC, BOBP, and RFMOs, and at bilateral level, MOU was signed</i></p> <p><i>4. Sharing successful experiences among members including info sharing</i></p> <p><i>5. Some countries intend to ratify Cape Town Agreement</i></p>	<p><i>4. National data confidentiality regulations in information sharing.</i></p>	<p><i>4. Explore tapping on Capacity building project, such as the CAPFISH project under Korea government, to support Asia countries on PSMA implementation</i></p> <p><i>5. Encourage cooperation between flag state and port states including bilateral agreements to conduct joint port inspections, where appropriate.</i></p>
<p>B3. Cooperation and exchange of information</p>		
<p><i>1. Operationalisation of the GIES in 2024 to support parties to the PSMA in fulfilling their obligations to share information among them with the purpose to take actions against vessels involved in IUU fishing, before operationalization of the GIES, members communicated via email</i></p>	<p><i>1. Do not have enough staff for collecting and uploading info GIES</i></p> <p><i>2. The translation from own languages to English brings loads of work for some members</i></p> <p><i>3. Lack of national level digital platforms for information exchange</i></p> <p><i>4. Communication with non-members, particularly for those having not provided NCPs</i></p> <p><i>5. Constraints on personal data sharing in domestic law</i></p>	<p><i>1. Encourage non-members to provide NCP and to be members</i></p> <p><i>2. Encourage non-members to use GIES with limited access (e.g. only watching data report)</i></p> <p><i>3. FAO to introduce a function in GIES to share information among port and flag states, and GIES system to send notification</i></p> <p><i>4. Emails to parties to update information on inspection</i></p>
<p>B4. Entry and use of Ports</p>		
<p><i>1. All countries have law and regulations to support authorities in particular entry and use of Ports procedure which will aid in the implementation of PSMA</i></p> <p><i>2. Some countries have high level of inspection for verification of ARPE or</i></p>	<p><i>1. Ineffective law enforcement of use of port services</i></p> <p><i>2. In case there is different legal framework for the ports such as ports operated by individuals or the commercial ports outside the jurisdiction of fisheries agency, member has difficulty to implement PSM at these ports</i></p> <p><i>3. There is no criteria for designating the ports</i></p>	<p><i>1. Establish Guideline for the denial of port service, in particular for vessels from non-party states which do not voluntarily cooperate with inspections, and criteria for designating the ports</i></p>

<p><i>require relevant information to be submitted before entry and use of port</i></p>	<p><i>4. Different port entry notification process for each country, difficult to keep track for vessels (flag state perspective)</i></p> <p><i>5. Lack of a global registry of IUU and suspected IUU fishing vessels</i></p> <p><i>6. Vague definition of force majeure situations</i></p>	<p><i>2. Make use of the ARPE functionality under GIES for countries that do not have such framework currently</i></p> <p><i>3. Encourage non-party flag state vessels to cooperate with inspections from port states</i></p> <p><i>4. Develop a best practice guideline on force majeure situations</i></p>
<p>B5. Inspections and follow-up actions</p>		
<p><i>1. Conduct inspection, some members 100%</i></p> <p><i>2. Coordinated and effective inspection of vessels by relevant agencies and the results of the inspection are shared appropriately</i></p>	<p><i>1. Strong pressure from vessels not to identify violation</i></p> <p><i>2. Language area for all countries including translating</i></p> <p><i>3. Hand writing document is extremely difficult to read</i></p> <p><i>4. Inspectors are familiar with RFMO regulation, but not so much with CITES regulation</i></p> <p><i>5. Not easy to identify the illegal activities from limited information such as AIS, due to both lack of data and expertise of inspectors</i></p> <p><i>6. Difficult to communicate with the flag of FOC vessels</i></p> <p><i>7. Lack of a national database for inspection reports in some countries</i></p> <p><i>8. Non-declaration of national focal points making it difficult for follow-up actions</i></p>	<p><i>1. More effective communication with flag states</i></p> <p><i>2. Advocate for countries that need assistance on training for inspection to attend regional workshop, conference to discuss example of illegal operations</i></p> <p><i>3. Invite more inspectors to the regional/international</i></p> <p><i>4. Develop a risk assessment criterion and SOPs to prioritize the inspection of vessels calling to port</i></p> <p><i>5. Advocate for the use of GIES among port and flag states</i></p> <p><i>6. FAO to improve GIES</i></p> <p><i>- to share information</i></p>

9. Lack of awareness of the crew of the vessels on the requirement for inspections and PSMA procedures

- to develop guidelines/manual for training on the use of GIES

-to send notification emails to parties to update information on inspection.

7. Develop awareness materials on the requirements by the vessels on PSMA.

B6. Role of flag States

1. Some countries have excellent flag State responsibility

2. Some non-member countries share NCP to FAO for using GIES

1. In case of flag state is non-member, the port states have difficulties to communicate with them, particularly they are not using GIES and no NCPs are shared and they are developing states

2. Lack of resources to operate 24/7 port services to implement measures

1. Encourage non-members to use GIES with limited access (e.g. only watching data report)

2. Encourage non-members to provide NCP or to be members

3. Introduce mechanisms to utilize electronic monitoring means to implement measures

B7. Capacity development

1. Some countries are pleased to share their own experience and support capacity building

2. Party and non-party countries participate in capacity building relevant on PSM and MCS which organized by regional/ sub-regional fisheries body/platforms such as AN-

1. Lack of technical and financial capacity, so that capacity building is still needed for language, GIES and inspector training for government staff.

2. Raise awareness of PSMA and motivation for better compliance in public and industry.

3. Lack of expert pool on PSMA and MCS for sharing experience and lesson learnt to the region

4. High turnover among trained staff.

1. FAO to translate GIES platform and other relevant awareness materials to user party languages, if possible.

2. Request FAO and other organizations to support capacity building, including developing e-learning courses on the requirement under PSMA.

<p><i>IUU, RPOA-IUU, SEAFDEC, BOBP, and RFMOs.</i></p>		<p><i>3. Request FAO and other organizations to support experts on PSM and MCS in the region</i></p> <p><i>4. Find host to establish expert pool on PSMA and MCS</i></p>
<p>B8. Relationship with international law and other international instruments</p>		
<p><i>1. Higher participation in other international instruments regarding combating IUU fishing, such as UNFSA, CA, RFMOs</i></p> <p><i>2. Increasing number of countries developing, implementing and updating NPOA-IUU</i></p> <p><i>3. Some RFMOs have developed PS measures</i></p>	<p><i>1. Some RFMOs do not have PS measures</i></p> <p><i>2. Lack of expert pool on international instruments regarding combating IUU fishing</i></p> <p><i>3. Signed and ratified international instruments are often not transposed to national regulations</i></p>	<p><i>1. Encourage FAO to work with RFMOs regarding PS measures</i></p> <p><i>2. Encourage members to remind the importance of PS measures at RFMO meetings</i></p> <p><i>3. Find host to establish expert pool on international instruments to combat IUU fishing</i></p>
<p>C. MECHANISMS FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF PART 9 (MONITORING, REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT)</p>		
<p><i>1. Monitor, review and assessment has been conducted at the meeting, such as MOP, WS and so on</i></p> <p><i>2. PSMA Questionnaire for self-assessment</i></p>	<p><i>1. We have Questionnaire but not implemented well. Lack of awareness on the PSMA questionnaire and where to access the document</i></p> <p><i>2. Mechanisms for the use of data from questionnaire is unclear.</i></p> <p><i>3. The design of the questions is not quite reasonable and practical in some questions. Comments on the user friendliness and the frequency of the questionnaire (e.g. too many questions and the survey inputs might not be relevant as it is based on a snapshot of the status after 2 years)</i></p>	<p><i>1. Request FAO to clear the use of data from questionnaire</i></p> <p><i>2. Review the frequency of implementation of the questionnaire – [change it to annually.]</i></p> <p><i>3. Questionnaire should be revised. It should be simplified, and each question shall be more specific.</i></p>

		<i>4. Member countries to participate in completing the PSMA questionnaire.</i>
D. ENSURING EFFICIENT AND SUSTAINABLE FUNCTIONING OF THE AGREEMENT		
<p><i>1. FAO secretariat has done great job</i></p> <p><i>2. Voluntary contribution including international training for inspectors have been provided</i></p> <p><i>3. Many donor countries/RFB please to support PSMA meeting</i></p>	<p><i>1. No mandatory contribution</i></p> <p><i>2. It is not easy to establish mandatory contribution</i></p> <p><i>3. How to increase number of donor countries to support PSMA meeting</i></p> <p><i>4. Enhance number of expert on PSMA implementation in the region</i></p> <p><i>5. Identification of projects/deliverables to allocate the available funding.</i></p>	<p><i>1. Encourage more countries to join PSMA</i></p> <p><i>2. Request FAO to find the way in coordination with the parties to increase number of donor countries and expert to support PSMA meeting and implementation of PSMA, including through holding side meetings at COFI and other relevant gathering</i></p> <p><i>3. Recruit staff from party-members to assist the FAO secretariat</i></p> <p><i>4. Expand the PSMA secretariat capacity to maintain and develop the GIES</i></p>
E. MONITORING AND REVIEW OF THE STRATEGY		
	<p><i>1. Too early to discuss for review</i></p> <p><i>2. Lack of an established scheduled meeting calendar for regional coordination workshops</i></p>	<p><i>1. Conduct every four years</i></p> <p><i>2. Request FAO to conduct monitoring and review of the strategy in the timeline as mentioned in Bali Strategy, every 4 years</i></p> <p><i>3. Circulate or post the outcomes of the regional coordination meetings on the website meeting reports of different PSMA regional groups meeting/workshops to improve coordination</i></p>

Table 5

ACHIEVEMENTS, CHALLENGES / GAPS AND PROPOSALS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PSMA BALI STRATEGY

ACHIEVEMENTS	CHALLENGES / GAPS	PROPOSALS
A. INCREASING ADHERENCE TO AND PARTICIPATION IN THE PSMA		
<p>There is good coverage of Parties who have signed up to the PSMA in our region.</p> <p>105 countries have signed up to PSMA, and this represents a large number of countries with coastlines.</p> <p>The region has a high standard of training, and we can share this through other RFMOs.</p> <p>Through bilateral engagement and cooperation, we promote PSMA to parties and non-parties.</p> <p>There is reference to the PSMA in G20 text, this acts as a promotional reference to the importance of the PSMA.</p>	<p>Resourcing constraints such as financial restrictions faced by Parties in trying to increase adherence and participation.</p> <p>Challenges in trying to coordinate between parties of the EU and parties within a region for more effective engagement with non-parties.</p> <p>Bilateral engagements are not always helpful, not always fruitful.</p> <p>The differing level of readiness for countries to join and comply presents a challenge. Parties who are complying with all the measures, may redirect vessels to the ports of other parties. This may lead to conflict.</p>	<p>Parties of RFMOs support parties who are not part of PSMA to join.</p> <p>[Parties to RFMOs to consider introducing a provision that would require Parties to consider becoming a Party to the PSMA. Otherwise, Parties to the RFMOs consider aligning current recommendations in RFMOs with PSMA]</p> <p>There needs to be a minimum level of readiness before a non-party can join PSMA, and there should be monitoring of this Party's progress in implementing.</p>

Table 5

B. FULFILMENT OF RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PARTIES FOR EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PSMA		
B1. Strengthening the policy, legal, institutional frameworks and operational mechanisms		
<p>Joint Inspection Scheme/Joint deployment program – These programs enable inspectors from different members states to visit each other to learn best practice.</p> <p>The Parties present have a legal framework in place to implement measures from the agreement.</p>	<p>Limited resourcing for the schemes to share education/best practice among Parties can be constraining</p> <p>Duplication of effort – as members of RFMOs if we need to use one system for uploading data and also GIES, this can be prevented if the systems are interoperable.</p> <p>The need to compare domestic legislation with RFMO text and international agreement creates complexity.</p> <p>Parties of multiple agreements need to adhere to several similar measures, leading to duplication of work e.g. the different the benchmarks for completing inspections, and the processes for reporting on inspections, the different forms that are required for the different circumstances and agreements.</p> <p>Upon discovering non-compliance, it is not clear who takes the enforcement action.</p>	<p>Joint Inspection Schemes could be encouraged more for sharing of best practices, perhaps awareness could be raised that these exist.</p> <p>Can the different texts be more closely aligned to ease this complexity</p> <p>Can processes be aligned to cover multiple legislation and texts and agreements</p> <p>Parties should share experiences of implementing PSMA, this could be through a compliance groups.</p>

Table 5

	<p>Within the European region, the layers of governance are complex, responsibilities are spread as well as being unclear.</p>	
<p><i>B2. Integration and coordination at national and regional levels</i></p>		
<p>Some parties have adopted the ISO 31000 standard for implementing risk assessments, which requires conducting risk-based controls. However, it is also important to carry out random inspections for vessels entering port.</p> <p>Some RFMO Port State Systems are quite developed and provides a good start for developing interoperability between this and GIES.</p>	<p>There are resourcing constraints, there is limited resourcing to have people, technology and time which would be needed to develop IT systems for reporting on inspections.</p> <p>The challenge of enforcing PSMA measures to smaller scale fisheries, smaller scale fisheries do not have a definition, the monitoring systems are not in place, there is not always requirement for documentation or reporting.</p>	<p>Encourage a baseline effective methodology for risk assessments to be applied. This would also discourage ships going to other ports with lower baselines for inspections. This could be informed by indicators.</p> <p>Seeking budget and support from other Parties to RFMOs to develop the systems necessary for implementation.</p> <p>Defining these fisheries and what measures should apply would help where smaller scale fisheries need monitoring and control. All commercial fisheries</p>

Table 5

<p>See text above regarding the joint deployment programs</p>	<p>Integration and coordination and regional levels -</p> <p>Challenge of getting a unified stance from parties of RFMOS to propose and push for the integration of GIES to other recording systems.</p> <p>Within the region, the layers of governance are complex, responsibilities are spread as well as being unclear.</p> <p>See text above regarding the joint deployment programs</p>	<p>should be monitored and controlled.</p> <p>See text above regarding the joint deployment programs</p>
--	--	--

Table 5

<i>B3. Cooperation and exchange of information</i>			Cooperation and exchange of information
GIES is updated and available, there are national contact points available.	<p>Resource constraints to develop RFMO systems from their Parties. Little motivation from Parties to support the development of RFMO systems, this may be due to their competing priorities.</p> <p>There is little coordination between parties of and RFMOS on the systems they are developing, this prevents interoperability and slows development.</p> <p>There is little coordination between RFMOS on administration and logistics of organizing international events, better systems and communication would</p>	<p>Invite FAO to deliver education on the use of GIES to parties of RFMOS - this coordinated capacity building effort enables everyone to use GIES.</p> <p>This prevents duplication of education to the same members and standardizes the training being delivered.</p> <p>This structures engagement and ensures needs (of Parties) are met and the standard of data uploading, and general use of the system is standardized/maintained.</p> <p>Integration between systems and reducing burdens to streamline processes.</p>	

Table 5

	<p>facilitate collaboration, the delivery of shared objectives, and avoid logistical difficulties such as clashes scheduling.</p> <p>Parties prioritize PSMA differently between their other work and this should be considered when engaging with members.</p>		
<i>B4. Entry and use of Ports</i>			Entry and use of Ports
<p>Most of the implementation of the PSMA requirements for the entry and use of ports are also required under RFMOs and therefore are implemented well.</p>	<p>(Environmental) Circumstances influence the advanced notice that fisheries can provide before entering ports. The agreed processes need to be practical and account for the changeable environment.</p> <p>Under some RFMOs certain vessels aren't required to provide advance notice, such as vessels with no catch, they may lie to enter ports.</p>	<p>A process to share information to understand the best practice from other members on how they handle advanced requests for entry.</p> <p>NEAFC Control and Enforcement Scheme to consider how Parties implement the FAO PSMA in this regard</p>	

Table 5

	<p>EU States do not perform checks equally to vessels from other EU States under the PSMA requirements, and the reports from these inspections are not uploaded through GIES. This creates gaps in the data set which affects the completeness of the data which could impact the efficacy of indicators.</p> <p>Abuse of the Force Majeure, vessels may lie to enter ports.</p>	<p>Include a definition for “force majeure”.</p>	
<i>B5. Inspections and follow-up actions</i>			Inspections and follow-up actions
<p>All the Parties present have systems to capture relevant data at a national level.</p> <p>Some RFMOs have systems that capture inspection data and denials, and flag states can see reports for their own vessels.</p>		<p>When the strategy refers to inter-agency cooperation, does this mean domestically or internationally?</p>	

Table 5

<p>EU Member states can inspect their vessels in Third Countries, if agreed through bilateral engagements.</p>	<p>CPs of RFMOs may not provide all reports of their inspections, it is not possible to monitor compliance, and this is not the role of the RFMO, CPs may not be performing inspections at the agreed rate.</p> <p>Parties should have the tools to review the detail, which is submitted on inspection reports, this is not the role in some RFMOs.</p> <p>The data from some systems is submitted via PDFs, but this is not available for digital analysis</p>	<p>RFMO CPs should provide all available reports which can be used to inform indicators.</p> <p>Develop a system that collects data on all report to inform indicators.</p> <p>The process for inspection reports would benefit from digitizing, making the systems and data electronically available.</p> <p>See text above regarding a baseline methodology for</p>
--	--	---

Table 5

	<p>Coastal States don't have access to inspection reports.</p> <p>All parties access all reports available. Even if reports are from other locations may seem irrelevant. Some imports could be risk assessed after their processing journey to determine whether inspections are performed. If all data is publicly available, this may benefit market states, but the publication of the data may be misused or sensationalized.</p>	<p>risk assessments and their implementation.</p> <p>Parties have a system for sharing their practice for how they carry out their risk assessments</p> <p>The coastal states whose waters have been fished, the port state and the flag state should have access to the inspection reports and denials.</p>
--	--	--

Table 5

	<p>See challenge above of systems that could be more closely aligned if they collect similar information for similar purposes.</p> <p>Differences between risk assessments, the criteria used and how they are applied.</p> <p>Parties may apply different enforcement practices when non-compliance is identified.</p>	<p>Provide guidance to support enforcement actions</p> <p>Consider possibility of vessel profiles, their record of behaviors and these could be used alongside risk assessments</p> <p>Port States should be able to exert discretion on the advance notice required to enter port states.</p>
<p><i>B6. Role of flag States</i></p>		
<p>We already cooperate and provide inspection reports to RFMOs.</p>	<p>It is not always clear who is responsible to conduct enforcement action, should it be port or flag state?</p> <p>Points of contact may be outdated.</p>	<p>All Parties should have a point of contact which is maintained, or the contact point should be a shared mailbox or general email</p>

Table 5

		<p>contact that is not linked to an individual.</p> <p>We continue to push for interoperability between systems and for digital systems within parties of RFMOs which do not have them yet.</p>	
<i>B7. Capacity development</i>			Capacity development
<p>See paragraph above regarding the joint inspection schemes</p>	<p>See paragraph above regarding the joint inspection schemes</p> <p>It is difficult to track activity across parties of RFMOs, regarding capacity development, training initiatives, etc.</p>	<p>See paragraph above regarding the joint inspection schemes</p> <p>A system to share updates would be helpful.</p> <p>Budgetary and financial updates on the project functioning (being delivered by the PSMA) and forward looks would be helpful.</p> <p>For transparency reasons it would be helpful to know</p>	

Table 5

	<p>Challenges arise from Parties which experience turnover of staff, or who are new to the agreement when they are trying to implement it.</p> <p>Many Parties are not aware that the Capacity Development Portal Application Exists.</p>	<p>what funding is going where.</p> <p>Encouragement to complete the existing PSMA E-learning.</p> <p>RFMOs can add their modules to the existing materials.</p> <p>RFMOs can connect to the educational materials from their websites</p> <p>There should be a baseline understanding that is shared by all parties and this addresses the challenges created by staff changes and resource constraints.</p> <p>Clarity on what FAO can deliver and support, what can they deliver?</p> <p>Encourage parties of RFMOs and RFMOs to share educational resources.</p>
--	---	--

Table 5

<p>Bilateral engagement, support and cooperation from this region facilitates capacity building</p>	<p>The Capacity Development Portal Application can be difficult to navigate.</p> <p>Parties having resources (Expertise (e.g. guidance on what is working elsewhere re control and enforcement), funding and capacity) to support other Parties and projects.</p> <p>Cooperation and participation of parties receiving funding, how receptive are they to capacity development.</p>	<p>Encourage use of the Capacity Development Portal Application, this could be through communication sharing to raise awareness and also increasing accessibility with a guide on how to use it and also accessibility in terms of how to find information on specific projects</p>
---	--	---

Table 5

<i>B8. Relationship with international law and other international instruments</i>		
<p>Clarity/distinction on the definition of transshipment and landing.</p>	<p>More join-up/collaboration between different organizations for example at meetings such as the FAO IMO and ILO Joint Working Group.</p> <p>Organizations lacking expertise where fisheries is not their focus or covered by their expertise.</p>	<p>Secretariats should work closely to plan, organize and redefine working group structure.</p> <p>Joint Working Group meetings should be more frequent than every four years.</p> <p>Encourage parties of RFMOS to update definitions within RFMOS to the FAOs definitions</p> <p>A definition of fishing vessel that is consistent between texts. Is a reefer considered a fishing vessel?</p> <p>A definition of IUU that is consistent between texts.</p>

Table 5

	<p>The definition of IUU fishing is not consistent (in national laws) everywhere, where can IUU fishing occur? Can it occur in domestic waters and be conducted by domestic vessels? Is this consistent internationally?</p> <p>Compatibility with WTO agreement.</p>	
<p>C. MECHANISMS FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF PART 9 (MONITORING, REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT)</p>		
	<p>Parties may not have a baseline understanding of the PSMA.</p> <p>The implementation of robust and reliable indicators is not possible without a complete [or strong] data set.</p> <p>We don't know where level of knowledge is and where Parties are, it is not transparent how well other parties are implementing it.</p>	<p>After parties have completed the recommended E-learning they could complete the PSMA questionnaire to self-assess, [or complete a self-assessment]</p> <p>Consider how indicators can be used for PSMA Parties, we could encourage a [effective] minimum level of inspection rate and to record the number of vessels entering ports.</p> <p>There should be increased transparency of the progress made by parties</p>

Table 5

	<p>The self-assessment has weaknesses – the accuracy and quality of the data collected, what happens to the data collected?</p> <p>Some parties may be unaware of the role of the self-assessment and the process that applies for the self-assessment may not be understood (frequency of self-assessment, requirement).</p> <p>Limited capacity to complete assessments, within the European region, the layers of governance are complex, responsibilities are spread, this may lead to unnecessary duplication.</p>	<p>implementing PSMA, an online survey/the existing questionnaire could be used to collect this data.</p> <p>Amend strategy ad-hoc working group to rename it to the strategy and monitoring working group.</p> <p>FAO should deliver a (virtual) workshop [produce guidance] on completing the questionnaire.</p> <p>The questionnaire could be replaced with or used alongside indicators, but this must not introduce burdens to the parties.</p> <p>Results of the questionnaire should be analyzed and presented to communicate progress.</p>
--	---	--

Table 5

D. ENSURING EFFICIENT AND SUSTAINABLE FUNCTIONING OF THE AGREEMENT		
<p>GIES is in place [has been launched] and so is the capacity building program.</p>	<p>Unsustainability/uncertainty of funding for FAO.</p> <p>Fundamental issue of stretched resources, and lack of capacity (for all Parties) but being asked to deliver more and attend a greater number of meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Funding – the FAO needs to be funded to provide its secretariat function. - Resourcing – the people need to be able to attend, may need to prioritize among competing asks. - Organization - meeting resources are not provided in advance. 	<p>Consider an annual financial contribution. This would involve creating a budgetary plan and looking into rules and procedures.</p> <p>This may be scaled against the GDP of the country.</p> <p>A calendar of international events between multiple organizations.</p>
E. MONITORING AND REVIEW OF THE STRATEGY		
<p>Reviewing the strategy as part of the RCM meetings.</p>	<p>Who are the outputs from the Regional Coordination Meeting going to be shared with?</p> <p>The strategy is very high level and not very tangible.</p>	<p>Consider updating the strategy every two years instead of four years, to coincide with the meeting of the Parties.</p>

Table 5

	<p>Not clear if our efforts are achieving our long-term goal of reducing/ending IUU fishing.</p>	<p>The strategy should contain indicators and benchmarks to review progress over time.</p> <p>The strategy needs to be simplified and more tangible/specific so progress can be measured.</p>
--	--	---