



联合国
粮食及
农业组织

Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations

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

Продовольственная и
сельскохозяйственная организация
Объединенных Наций

Organización de las
Naciones Unidas para la
Alimentación y la Agricultura

منظمة
الأغذية والزراعة
للأمم المتحدة

First Meeting of the PSMA Strategy ad hoc Working Group¹

Rome, Italy,² 3-7 April 2023

STATUS AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AGREEMENT ON PORT STATE MEASURES

I. STATUS OF THE AGREEMENT

1. The 2009 FAO Agreement on Port State Measures to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing (hereinafter referred to as the Agreement (PSMA of the Agreement) was approved by the FAO Conference on 22 November 2009 and open for signature from 22 November 2009 until 21 November 2010 by all States and regional economic integration organizations. In that period, 23 States and the European Union signed the Agreement. The Agreement entered into force on 5 June 2016.

2. As of March 2023, there were 74 Parties to the Agreement, including the European Union as one Party representing its 27 member States³. Five new Parties have deposited instruments of adherence⁴ to the Agreement since the Third Meeting of the Parties held in Brussels, Belgium from 31 May to 4 June 2021. The Agreement has so far displayed the highest rate of adherence of all international fisheries and ocean instruments, with 74 Parties in 6 years since its entry into force in 2016.

3. From a global perspective, the percentage of coastal States where the Agreement is in force is 59 percent and the percentage of total States where the Agreement is in force is 51 percent (see Annex 1).

4. From a regional perspective, the percentage of coastal States where the Agreement is in force is lowest in the Near East (29 percent) and Southwest Pacific (38 percent), medium in Latin America and the Caribbean (52 percent) and Asia (58 percent), and highest in Africa (73 percent), Europe (73 percent) and North America (100 percent). The percentage of total States where the Agreement is

¹ To be held in Arabic, Chinese English, French, Russian and Spanish.

² FAO Headquarters, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy.

³ The full list of Parties to the Agreement is available at www.fao.org/port-state-measures/background/parties-psma/en/

⁴ The term instruments of adherence is used to include instruments of acceptance, ratification, approval and accession.

Documents can be consulted at www.fao.org/port-state-measures/meetings/strategy-working-group/en/

in force is lowest in the Near East (24 percent), Southwest Pacific (38 percent), and medium in Asia (46 percent), Latin America and the Caribbean (49 percent) and Africa (49 percent), and highest in Europe (69 percent) and North America (100 percent) (see Annex 1).

II. OUTCOME OF THE THIRD MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE AGREEMENT

5. The Third Meeting of the Parties to the Agreement hosted by the European Union, was held virtually from 31 May to 4 June 2021, due to the global COVID-19 pandemic. The meeting was attended by 65 Parties to the Agreement, and by observers from 44 States, 35 intergovernmental and 12 international non-governmental organizations.

Use and results of the questionnaire for the review and assessment of the effectiveness of the Agreement

6. Parties noted with satisfaction that the questionnaire for the review and assessment of the effectiveness of the PSMA was completed by 82 percent of the Parties and one third of the Parties reported already having denied entry into port to vessels believed to have engaged in IUU fishing.

7. Parties agreed the questionnaire was a useful tool for Parties' self-assessment of implementation of the Agreement and agreed that Parties should complete the questionnaire every four years to monitor the implementation of the Agreement and its trends. Noting necessary modifications were required to improve the usefulness and practicality of the questionnaire, Parties tasked FAO to review the questionnaire.

8. Parties welcomed 13 regional fishery bodies' (RFBs) submission of information related to progress made in implementation of the Agreement and tasked FAO to develop a draft of standardized questionnaire for RFBs to assess their implementation of the Agreement.

Progress and challenges in implementation of the Agreement

9. While acknowledging progress has been made in implementing the Agreement to combat IUU fishing, Parties also noted that a number of challenges remained, including terminology to be clarified, lack of interagency coordination and inadequate institutional capacity for port State measures, insufficient human resources and capacities for inspections, and lack of information exchange. Some Parties raised the issue of the need for and ways to monitor compliance with the provisions of the Agreement.

Development of the Global Information Exchange System (GIES) and PSMA applications

10. Parties recognized the importance of information sharing for the implementation of the Agreement and more widely for combatting IUU fishing. Parties recognized the importance of the availability of information related to the national contact points and designated ports for the Agreement in the PSMA application and called for all those Parties not having done so yet, to provide updated information.

11. Parties welcomed the prototype of the GIES, a live demonstration of which was given by the FAO to show its characteristics, components and functions. Parties agreed that GIES enter a pilot phase and encouraged its use by Parties to allow for complete familiarization with the data upload and information sharing functions, and other features.

12. Parties also noted additional functionalities of the GIES could be developed at a later stage, such as advance request for port entry (ARPE).

13. Parties stressed the importance of data protection and confidentiality, and ensuring the system is practical and user friendly, including making it as interoperable as possible with existing systems to minimize unnecessary burdens on Parties. Parties requested technical and operational matters related to the GIES to be discussed at TWG-IE meeting in 2022 and to inform the fourth Meeting of the Parties of the outcome of discussions?

14. Parties also encouraged the Secretariat to strengthen the exchange of information with other relevant regional and international organizations and vice versa.

Requirements of developing States

15. Parties reiterated the importance of capacity development for developing states for their effective implementation of the Agreement. The meeting stressed the importance of developing states in receiving ongoing support on effective monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) systems and procedures, enforcement and the implementation of the GIES.

16. Parties welcomed the launch of the Global Capacity Development Portal, a tool to facilitate the coordination of the delivery of capacity development initiatives related to supporting countries in combatting IUU fishing, and identifying priority actions for technical assistance around the world and encouraged relevant entities to submit information to the Portal.

Strategy to improve the effectiveness of the PSMA

17. Parties established the PSMA Strategy Ad Hoc Working Group (WGS) with a mandate to develop a strategy to improve the effectiveness of the Agreement, and approved the terms of reference for the WGS. The Parties noted the need of regional and/or subregional discussions in support of the WGS.

III. ASPECTS FOR THE EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PSMA

Port State performance

18. It is advisable that different approaches to monitor the level of port State performance in conformity with the Agreement are considered. These may include the following, independently or in combination:

i. Questionnaires. They are a useful tool for self-reporting, but with limited value. A new questionnaire for RFBs has already been proposed and would be an important complement. However, in addition to conventional questions related to the implementation of every single article of the PSMA, additional questions or a table to be completed, could be introduced to collect quantitative information related to the activity in ports to enhance self-reporting. This quantitative information can be also used for statistical analysis on the global implementation of the PSMA.

ii. GIES. Once GIES is fully operational, the information provided through this tool could be used to analyse the fleet compliance levels and provide a common approach for a global risk assessment to be undertaken, which will be beneficial for harmonization of implementation by

the Parties. Furthermore, the GIES will give an insight on the levels of port inspections, actions taken and information shared by the Parties.

iii. Other ways to monitor performance. Other methods as used by various RFMOs and other organisations in the maritime sector may be considered.

Operational arrangements

19. The operational arrangements for the effective implementation of the PSMA must be periodically reviewed to ensure they meet the objectives of the Agreement. The main aspects to be reviewed are:

i. Risk Assessment (RA). The level of risk of common fishing vessels should be compared among the relevant Parties to check if RA is properly designed at national level. If there is no justification for different risk levels assigned to the same fishing vessels, the risk assessment procedures should be revised. This exchange of information could be made at least between the port State and the previous port State, or even among a wider set of Parties that usually receive the same vessel in their ports. It would be an interesting exercise to reinforce the interagency cooperation to share and compare with relevant agencies the risk they assigned to the vessels in their respective areas of competence.

ii. Inspection. Ensure that inspection procedures include all the inspection stages as described in Annex B of the PSMA, concluding with the physical verification of the fish landed or transhipped, comparing the verified quantities and composition of the fish with those declared by the operator in the transshipment or landing declaration. Specifically, inspections should include:

- Verification of external markings of the fishing vessel ensuring it is consistent with information contained in the documentation related to the identity of the vessel.
- Inspection and verification of documents related to the vessel identification, vessel owner and fishing authorizations, and in accordance with annex A. In this regard, ensure the review all documents and records on board in electronic or paper format.
- Examination of fishing gear on board and related devices, checking if they are in conformity with the conditions of the authorization, applicable regulations and markings.
- Determination, to the extent possible, of whether the fish on board was harvested in accordance with the applicable authorizations.
- Examination and verification of the quantity and composition of the fish onboard, transhipped or landed.

iii. Information exchange. Once GIES is fully operational, ensure the use of this tool to exchange information, ensuring that all relevant actors are duly designated as recipient in the system.

iv. Percentage of inspections. The minimum level of inspections set by the port State must be periodically analysed, checking the effectiveness of the inspections that have been carried out. A high rate of infringements should be an indication that the percentage set is probably too low and it should be increased, while a low rate would be an indication that a revision of the RA procedure should be carried out to ensure that inspections are targeting the highest risk vessels. In any case, a revision of the inspection procedures should be carried out to ensure that the procedures in place are able to detect possible non compliances.

v. **Containers.** A revision to the inspection and control approach made to containers should be done in view of the new Voluntary Guidelines for Transshipment, and how the existence of a landing declaration affects the exceptions foreseen in the article 3.1.b of the Agreement.

FAO Voluntary Guidelines for Transshipment (VGT) – a new soft law instrument to combat IUU fishing that complements the implementation of the PSMA

20. Considering that the fight against IUU fishing requires an integrated approach and ensuring synergy among binding and non-binding instruments, the VGTS sets out new guidelines that can help strengthen the implementation of PSMA. Even though the guidelines of the VGT target primarily flag States and the discharge of their responsibilities, the implementation of the guidelines can improve port State performance, by classifying movement of fish as either a landing or a transshipment and setting out corresponding requirements, eliminating loopholes that if left in place would result in uncontrolled and undeclared movement of fish. The global implementation by the Parties of the VGT to ensure that all movement of fish in port are properly controlled and documented will contribute to achieving the PSMA objectives.

Force majeure and distress

21. Article 10 of the PSMA provides that “[n]othing in this Agreement affects the entry of vessels to port in accordance with international law for reasons of force majeure or distress, or prevents a port State from permitting entry into port to a vessel exclusively for the purpose of rendering assistance to persons, ships, or air crafts in danger or distress”.

22. While the Agreement affirms the right of port States, under international law, to grant or deny access of foreign fishing vessels to port, the Agreement recognizes that certain exemptions may have to be accorded to foreign fishing vessels in the case of force majeure or distress. Past instances of distress, including the “Erika”, the “Prestige” and the “Castor” incidents, and recent denials to port access during the Covid-19 pandemic, highlight the need for port States to consider options on how to deal with such instances in terms of the implementation of article 10 of the PSMA. Indeed, the matter of force majeure and distress were discussed at the recent FAO Informal Expert Meeting on the FAO Global Study on Coordinated Port Inspection of Fishing Vessels. In this context, Parties may wish to consider, for example, putting in place procedures and related conditions for admissions of foreign fishing vessels into internal waters in the case of force majeure, distress, or consider designating areas for safe refuge, quarantine, or for preliminary inspections and related requirements. It may be premature to take decisions on concrete recommended measures at this time. However, Parties are encouraged to anticipate and prepare for these potential occurrences. Preliminary discussions on the implementation of article 10 of the PSMA may lay the foundations for fuller consideration of this matter in the future.

IV. GLOBAL INFORMATION EXCHANGE SYSTEM

23. The Global Information Exchange System is seen as a critical tool in support of the implementation of the Agreement. Progress has been made in the development of the GIES and it has been discussed at length by the Parties through the Technical Working Group on Information Exchange (TWG-IE). The outcome of the third meeting of the TWG-IE is summarized below:

- The TWG-IE reiterated the importance that all Parties submit information on NCPs and DPs and keep this information updated. This information is essential for PSMA implementation including enabling contacts among NCPs and for the functioning of GIES.

- The TWG-IE highlighted the importance of ensuring that all designated ports under the PSMA, have been attributed a UN/LOCODE, when possible.
- The TWG-IE recommended that a deadline be set for all Parties to share technical comments on the GIES system, should they have them, so that the Secretariat can address these issues before the operationalization of the system.
- The TWG-IE recommended the operationalization of the GIES in 2023 following the approval of Parties at their fourth Meeting.
- The TWG-IE noted the importance of defining how long reports published within the GIES should be retained.
- The TWG-IE considered that the IMO number should be made mandatory in the GIES if the vessel has an IMO number. Furthermore, the Group recommended the use of other identifiers for vessels without an IMO number such as the international radio call sign, the external marking usually referring to national registration numbers, the RFMO identifiers and MMSI.
- The TWG-IE recognized the need for the terms of reference for the working group, noted that a draft has been prepared by the Secretariat and called for this matter to be brought up at the next Meeting of the Officers to the PSMA.
- The TWG-IE also made specific recommendations on improvements and future developments of the GIES, whilst stressing the need for the system to remain sustainable and that the development of new features does not postpone the operationalization of the system.
- The TWG-IE made further recommendations in relation to:
 - o considerations in cases of Force Majeure in relation to the GIES;
 - o the importance of security in the GIES;
 - o the importance of RFBs in supporting information exchange; and
 - o the importance of materials and trainings to guide GIES users.

24. Since the holding of the TWG-IE3 in December 2022, the GIES Team has been actively engaged in following up on the recommendations of the Working Group, especially with regard to the refinement of the current base features of the GIES. An update to the GIES covering some of the changes requested by the TWG-IE3 is expected to be released in the lead up to the next Meeting of the Parties in May 2023. Whilst every effort is being made to make the GIES, with its base features, ready to be made operational as soon as possible, it is likely that the system would not be sufficiently refined by MOP4. Furthermore, more time may be required for Parties to fully pilot the system during the current phase. The GIES is however key in the effective functioning of the PSMA, therefore a decision will need to be taken in order to meet the recommendation of the TWG-IE3 to make it operational by then end of the 2023.

25. The development of the GIES has up until this stage been almost entirely funded through projects. At the current stage, funding is available to cover GIES related activities until approximately the end of the 1st quarter of 2024. During the current development phase of the system, the approximate costs per year for GIES related activities is 600 000 USD. This figure includes costs related to the maintenance, development, cloud hosting infrastructure and user help desk for the system. Development of the system is expected to continue at the current rate for at least the next three years, depending upon the recommendations from the Parties to the Agreement. Once most of the development related to the system is completed, IT related expenses will be reduced to those needed for system maintenance, however expenses related to user support through the help desk and the provision of training is expected to increase as the system is operationalized.

26. At the last TWG-IE3, the inclusion of a feature for submitting advanced requests for port entry was discussed. This feature is expected to play a key role in structuring the workflow of the

application as it would allow for the creation of a port event, which would tie together reports exchanged on the system following that request for entry. The TWG-IE3 welcomed the proposal by the Secretariat for the inclusion of this new feature, subject to the approval by Parties and noting that this development should take into account normal use cases whereby such requests are supplied directly by non-State actors. The development of this feature within the GIES, would allow for the creation of an international standard for how vessel operators requests entry into port in following with Annex A of the Agreement. This feature should therefore be considered by the Parties as key component to be development once the refinement of current base features of the GIES is completed.

V. MONITORING OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PSMA

27. At the second meeting of the Parties to the Agreement on Port State Measures to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing (PSMA), Parties adopted the questionnaire for the review and assessment of the effectiveness of the Agreement. The questionnaire was sent to the Parties and the results of the responses were presented to the third meeting of the Parties. After the first assessment, the Parties noted that the questionnaire is an initial tool to be used in the process to monitor the implementation and review the effectiveness of the Agreement and may be amended and adapted according to the needs identified by the Parties.

28. The Secretariat has revised the questionnaire (see Annex 2), with improvements to some questions with a view to foster better comprehension and correcting some typing mistakes. For statistical purposes, the request for additional specific information has been included in a number of questions, such as the minimum percentage of inspection established and the number of entries per year.

29. The Secretariat has also prepared a questionnaire for RFMOs, RFBs and other relevant organizations (See Annex 3) based on the same methodology, which categorizes questions in accordance with Articles of the Agreement, providing an organized system for identifying achievements and gaps in implementation. This specific questionnaire has been developed using only those articles that are relevant to the competence of these organizations.

30. Parties are invited to consider additional mechanisms to monitor the implementation of the Agreement.

VI. CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

Part 6 Working Group and Part 6 Assistance Fund

31. Article 21 of the Agreement addresses requirements of developing States and urges the provision of technical assistance to developing States Parties in order to enhance their legal, institutional, technical and operational capacities for implementation of the port State measures and facilitate their participation in meetings organized by international organizations that promote effective implementation of the Agreement. In this respect, the Parties established an ad-hoc working group (hereinafter referred to as the Part 6 Working Group).

32. The terms of reference of the Part 6 Working Group were adopted at the First Meeting of the Parties, held from 29 to 31 May 2017, in Oslo, Norway⁵. The terms of reference for the funding mechanism under Part 6 of the Agreement were adopted in the Third Meeting of the Parties, held from 3-6 June 2019, in Santiago, Chile⁶. In accordance with the terms of reference for the funding mechanism, the Trust Fund has been established under the PSMA Part 6 Assistance Fund and Parties are invited to make pledges to contribute to the Trust Fund.

FAO global programme to support the implementation of the PSMA and complementary international instruments to combat IUU fishing

33. In response to FAO Members' request for assistance in the implementation of the PSMA, in 2017, FAO launched a global programme (the Programme) to support the implementation of the PSMA and complementary international instruments to combat IUU fishing (PGM/MUL/2016-2021/PSMA), the extension of which is underway. The Programme comprises 21 projects with funding amounting to USD 27.7 million from resource partners such as the European Union (EU), Germany, Iceland, Norway, the Republic of Korea (RoK), Spain, Sweden and the United States of America (USA). As of 31 December 2022, total delivery under the Programme amounts to USD 15.2 million (see Annex 4).

34. As of March 2023, the Programme has supported the following capacity development activities for developing states, both Parties and non-Parties to the Agreement: (i) assistance to 47 recipient countries in assessing needs to strengthen national legislation, institutional set up, and MCS systems and operations with respect to port, flag, coastal, and market states responsibilities, including the drafting of national strategies and roadmaps to implement necessary measures; (ii) support to 25 recipient countries in reviewing fisheries legal frameworks to implement the PSMA and complementary international instruments and regional mechanisms to combat IUU fishing; (iii) support to 18 recipient countries in drafting laws and regulations to implement the PSMA and the alignment of national laws with international law; (iv) support to 16 recipient countries to review MCS institutions, systems and operations; (v) assistance to 12 recipient countries in strengthening inter-agency cooperation for effective implementation of the PSMA; (vi) assistance to 11 recipient countries in developing/updating MCS-related standard operating procedures (SOPs); (vii) assistance to 4 recipient countries in developing/updating national control plan; (viii) assistance to 5 recipient countries in developing/updating national inspection plan.

35. The Programme also supports training that enhance national legal, MCS, inspections, enforcement and prosecution capacities to strengthen relevant fisheries policies, laws and regulations and their enforcement that lead to ensuring improved compliance with the PSMA and other relevant international instruments, strengthen national MCS expertise and inspection/enforcement capacities and strengthen of interagency coordination mechanisms for the effective implementation of the PSMA. Specifically, the Programme has delivered the following trainings: (i) international fisheries law training for 23 recipient countries; (ii) international inspection training for 7 recipient countries; (iii) in-country judicial training for 2 recipient countries; (iv) in-country port inspection training for 2 recipient countries; (v) in-country MCS-related training for 14 recipient countries; (vi) in-country flag State performance related training for 6 recipient countries (see Annex 5).

⁵ Terms of reference of the Part 6 Working Group is in Annex F of the Report of the First Meeting of Parties, available at www.fao.org/3/i7909en/i7909en.pdf.

⁶ Terms of reference of the funding mechanism under Part 6 of the Agreement is in Annex 6 of the Report of the Third Meeting of Parties, available at www.fao.org/3/ca5757en/CA5757EN.pdf

36. Furthermore the programme has been financing: (i) the development of global information systems in support of the implementation of the PSMA, including the PSMA GIES, the Global Record, the Global Portal for Capacity Development to combat IUU fishing, FAO's database on port State measures (Port-Lex), and the PSMA applications for designated ports and contact points; (ii) the undertaking of studies and processes leading to the development and endorsement of the Voluntary Guidelines for Transshipment, (iii) the development of a comprehensive training programme including training modules and materials; and (iv) travel costs for developing states to participate in the meetings of the Parties and relevant technical working groups.

37. In addition, the Programme has supported development of a number of knowledge products, resource and operational materials, including (i) Technical Guidelines on Methodologies and Indicators for the Estimation of the Magnitude and Impact of IUU fishing; (ii) Checklists and technical guidelines to combat illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing Volume I and II; (iii) Understanding and implementing catch documentation schemes: a guide for national authorities.

New requests for capacity development

38. With more states joining the Agreement, FAO receives an increasing number of requests for technical assistance from developing states to strengthen their capacities to implement the PSMA and complementary international instruments and regional mechanisms to combat IUU fishing.

39. In addition to the technical assistance currently provided under the Programme, FAO has been receiving several new requests, which include, but not limited to:

- Parties' request for further technical assistance to improve their capacity to conduct risk assessment with respect to Advance Request for Port Entry (ARPE) and inspections, and how to use global tools and systems like Global Record and GIES for risk assessment.
- Provision of recurrent training to inspectors to strengthen their technical and operational capacities and establishment of regional training hubs with certificates.
- Collaboration with regional fisheries management organizations (RFMOs) with respect to facilitating information sharing between regional systems and GIES to ease reporting burden of Parties.
- Provision of technical assistance for implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines for Transshipment, including policy, legal frameworks and institutional aspects, MCS and operational requirements and procedures.
- Regional processes to strengthen regional exchange of experiences, such as FAO supporting technically the adoption of a legal instrument amongst the Community of Portuguese speaking countries (CPLP) that establishes a network of cooperation among the nine CPLP members to scale up efforts to combat IUU fishing, and a request from the members of the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) for FAO's support for a meeting among the FFA membership to prepare for their participation in the PSMA Meeting of Parties.

40. Constrained by the current capacity of projects that are operational under the Programme, FAO is not able to positively respond to new requests from 5 developing States currently not supported by the Programme. FAO invites new pledges from Parties to contribute to the Programme and the Trust Fund under the PSMA Part 6 Assistance Fund to allow FAO to address requests of currently unsupported countries, continuation of technical assistance to countries previously or currently supported by the Programme, and new requests.

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE FUNCTIONING OF THE AGREEMENT

41. Soon after its entry into force, Parties moved rapidly to operationalize the Agreement through the convening of Meetings of the Parties and the establishment of three working groups to address information exchange, requirements of developing states and a global implementation strategy to improve the effectiveness of the Agreement. Parties also adopted the Rules of Procedure (ROP) for conducting these meetings and entrusted the responsibilities of the Secretariat to FAO.

42. In response to the above, apart from executing its role as the depository of the Agreement and related processes, FAO has sought to fulfil its Secretariat role pursuant to Rule 4 of the ROP, in a manner that supports the decisions of the Parties and the global implementation of the Agreement. This has been possible through the allocation of dedicated regular programme staff resources, supplemented by extrabudgetary staff and non-staff resources. However, it should be noted that the tasks and responsibilities, which have risen exponentially in the past few years, are not commensurate with the resources available and some actions may not be sustainable as they have been highly dependent on extrabudgetary resources which cannot be guaranteed for the future. The following are the main processes and actions covered by the Secretariat:

- Convening of the meetings of the Parties (every two years) and related preparatory work including preparation of meeting documents;
- Convening of intersessional meetings of the Chairperson and Vice-Chairpersons (intersessionally) and related preparatory work including preparation of meeting documents;
- Convening of the Technical Working Group on Information Exchange (annual) and related preparatory work including preparation of meeting documents;
- Convening of the Part 6 Working Group (every two years) and related preparatory work including preparation of meeting documents;
- Convening of the Strategy Working Group (ad hoc) and related preparatory work including preparation of meeting documents;
- Convening of periodic Regional Coordination Meetings (4 delivered in 2022) and related preparatory work including preparation of meeting documents;
- Management of projects under the Part 6 Assistance fund (indefinite)
- Delivery of multidisciplinary technical assistance to developing states (currently on-going in 14 States, with more than 50 assisted since the entry into force of the Agreement)
- Development and management of the Global Information Exchange System – GIES (indefinite)
- Support for the participation of developing states Parties in the meetings of the Parties and working groups, pursuant to Rule 11.2 of the ROP and in accordance with Article 21 of the Agreement.
- Maintenance of the PSMA website and other communication channels

43. Whilst Rule 11.3 of the ROP specifies that the responsibility for covering meeting expenses related to Meetings of the Parties and Working Groups lies with the hosting Party, FAO has had to step in to cover the funding and organizational shortfall in the absence of offers to host a meeting, as has been the case for the Technical Working Group on Information Exchange and the Meeting of this Strategy Working Group and the Fourth Meeting of the Part 6 Working Group. This has been made possible through the securing of additional staff and non-staff resources from regular programme and extrabudgetary funding. Furthermore, the regional coordination meetings called for by the Parties, together with the development and management of the GIES, have been largely funded by

extrabudgetary resources secured by the Secretariat with the collaboration of donors. A considerable amount of the costs for the meetings prior to the adoption of the ROP were also covered by FAO through regular programme funding and ad-hoc extrabudgetary contributions. The support provided to participants to attend meetings has been possible largely due to the provision of funds from donors through various projects managed by the Secretariat.

44. The predicted growth of the Agreement in terms of number of Parties, the mechanisms put in place to support the functioning and effectiveness of the Agreement, as well as the operational tools to support its implementation such as the GIES, needs to be met with considerations for a long-term and sustainable budgetary and administrative plan. This is critical to support any decisions on improving the effectiveness of the Agreement and should be an essential component of the strategy to be considered for adoption by the Parties. In this regard, Parties may wish to explore options for securing staff and non-staff resources to sustain the needs of the PSMA which has created a global breakthrough in terms of combatting IUU fishing and supporting the sustainability of fisheries and the demands on the Secretariat. Apart from any mechanisms which the Parties may wish to set up, the Secretariat, in accordance with Rule 11.5 of the ROP, will support the decision of the Parties in this regard.

Annex 1. Status of Parties

| Region | No. of States (FAO Members) | No. of coastal states (FAO Members) | No. of Parties | No. of States (where Agreement in force) | Percentage of total states in force | Percentage of coastal States in force |
|-----------------------|--|--|-----------------------|---|--|--|
| Africa | 49 | 33 | 24 | 24 | 0.490 | 0.727 |
| Asia | 24 | 19 | 11 | 11 | 0.458 | 0.579 |
| Europe | 49 | 40 | 10 | 34 | 0.694 | 0.725 |
| LAC | 33 | 31 | 16 | 16 | 0.485 | 0.516 |
| Near East | 21 | 17 | 5 | 5 | 0.238 | 0.294 |
| North America | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| South West Pacific | 16 | 16 | 6 | 6 | 0.375 | 0.375 |
| Global | 194 | 158 | 74 | 98 | 0.505 | 0.589 |

Annex 2: Questionnaire for the review and assessment of the effectiveness of the Agreement on Port State Measures

The purpose of this questionnaire is to act as an informative tool for the Parties to review and assess the effectiveness of the Agreement in achieving its objective. Parties are encouraged to provide as much information as possible, and to the extent they deem appropriate, and may use the comment box to elaborate on the answers provided. The approach and format of this questionnaire is similar to that of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries questionnaire. The aggregated results will be presented to the Meeting of the Parties to the PSMA.

This questionnaire may be amended and adapted according to the needs identified by the Parties. The space provided for comments may also be used to indicate need for clarification on the phrasing of the question, and in the case that a Party chooses not to answer a question, this comment box may also be used to provide explanatory notes as to the reason. The comments will be used to assist the Parties in fine-tuning and improving the questionnaire itself so that it better serves its purpose.

Questions marked with * are complementary in nature and are intended to provide additional information to the Parties in the review and assessment.

[scale to be inserted, as in CCRF (1-5)]

List of terms in the context of this questionnaire:

“Agreement” – Agreement on Port State Measures (PSMA)

“FAO” – Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

“IGO” – Inter-Governmental Organization

“IUU fishing” – illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing

“MCS” – fisheries monitoring, control and surveillance

“VMS” – vessel monitoring system

“AIS” – automatic identification system

“NGO” – Non-Governmental Organizations

“PSM” – Port State measures

“RFMO/A” – Regional Fisheries Management Organization or Arrangement

| Question Number | Questions | Response Type | Comments |
|-----------------|--|---------------|----------|
| | Application (Article 3) | | |
| 1.1 | Has your country reviewed its legislation to determine whether it offers a suitable legal framework to fulfil the obligations under the Agreement? | Yes/No | |
| 1.1.1 | Were changes required to your country’s legislation to fulfil and implement the obligations under the Agreement? | Yes/no | |
| 1.1.1 | If needed, to what extent has your country undertaken and completed the necessary processes to bring changes into your legislation in order to implement the obligations under the Agreement? | Scale-1-5 | |

Deleted: allows your country

Deleted: its

Deleted: in order to

Deleted: your country’s

Deleted: T

Deleted: your country’s

Deleted: .

| | | | |
|--|--|---------------------|--|
| 1.1.2 | If no, does your government have plans to review your country's legislation to ensure compliance with the obligations under the Agreement? | -- Yes/No -- | Deleted: you |
| 1.2 | Does your country cooperate with neighbouring countries to prevent artisanal fisheries for subsistence from engaging in IUU fishing? | -- Yes/No/or-N/A -- | Deleted: your country enabled to fulfil its obligations Deleted: engage in cooperation |
| 1.2.2 | Does your country have measures to ensure that these vessels do not engage in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing? | -- Yes/No -- | Deleted: in place |
| 1.3 | Does your country have a procedure in place to identify if fish on board container vessels, has been previously landed to apply the exception foreseen in article 3(b)? | -- Yes/No -- | Deleted: that had Deleted: been |
| 1.3.1* | Have there been cases in your country where a container vessel was found to be carrying fish, not previously landed, which was sourced from IUU fishing activities? | Yes/No/NA | Deleted: , were not sourced from vessels conducting IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing |
| 1.4 | Does your country apply the Agreement to vessels chartered by your country exclusively for fishing in areas under your national jurisdiction and operating under your country's authority? | -- Yes/No/NA -- | Deleted: this |
| 1.4.1 | Does your country have measures to ensure that such vessels are subject to controls as effective as those applied in relation to vessels flying your flag? | -- Yes/No -- | Deleted: in place Deleted: measures Deleted: measures |
| Relationship with international law and other instruments (Article 4) | | | |
| 2.1 | Is your country implementing any measures relevant to the PSMA in compliance with the respective RFMO/A(s) requirements, to which your country is a Party? | -- Yes/No/NA -- | Deleted: requirements of the respective |
| Integration and cooperation at national level (Article 5) | | | |
| 3.1 | To what extent has your country taken measures for exchanging information and coordinating activities among relevant national agencies to implement the Agreement? | Scale | Deleted: for the implementation of |
| 3.2* | Which of the following agencies / ministries play a role in the implementation of the Agreement: | - | Deleted: is |
| 3.3.1 | Customs | Yes/No | Deleted: this |
| 3.3.2 | Fisheries | Yes/No | |
| 3.3.3 | Health | | |
| 3.3.4 | Immigration | Yes/No | |
| 3.3.5 | Maritime | Yes/No | |
| 3.3.6 | Navy / Coast guard | Yes/No | |
| 3.3.7 | Police | Yes/No | |
| 3.3.8 | Port authority | Yes/No | |
| 3.3.9 | Veterinary / Quarantine | Yes/No | |
| 3.3.10 | Trade | Yes/No | Deleted: 10 |
| 3.3.11 | Labour | Yes/No | Deleted: taken |
| 3.3.12 | Other (specify) | Yes/No | Deleted: to integrate PSMs Deleted: measures |
| 3.4 | To what extent has your country integrated port state measures with other actions to prevent, deter and eliminate IUU fishing, including those described in the FAO IPOA-IUU? | -- Scale -- | Deleted: and fishing related activities in support of such activities, taking into account as appropriate the FAO International Plan of Action to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate IUU Fishing? |

| Cooperation and exchange of information (Article 6) | | | |
|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| 4.1 | In order to promote the effective implementation of the Agreement, does your country cooperate and/or exchange information concerning the objective of the Agreement with: | - | |
| 4.1.1 | Other relevant States | Scale | |
| 4.1.2 | Relevant RFMO / As | Scale | |
| 4.1.3 | FAO | Yes/No | |
| 4.1.4 | Other IGOs | Scale | |
| 4.1.5 | Other (specify) | Yes/No | |
| Designation of ports (Article 7) | | | |
| 5.1 | Has your country designated ports to receive foreign vessels conducting fishing and fishing related activities, as required under the Agreement? | Yes/No | |
| 5.1.1* | Does any of your country's designated ports restrict landings to specific types of products? (i.e. frozen, refrigerated, fresh) and/or times or days for landing or transshipment? | Yes/No | |
| 5.2 | Has the list of designated ports been provided to the FAO? | Yes/No | |
| 5.3 | To what extent is there enough capacity to conduct inspections pursuant to the Agreement in each of your country's designated ports? | Scale | |
| 5.4* | How many foreign vessels do your designated ports receive on average, and how many available inspectors do you have to undertake the inspections? | Number of entries/number of inspectors | 5.4* |
| 5.5* | How many vessels does your country inspect out of the total number of vessels authorised to enter your designated ports? | Number of inspections | 5.5* |
| Advance request for port entry (Article 8) | | | |
| 6.1 | Does your country require an advance request for port entry? | Yes/No | |
| 6.1.1 | Does your country require, as a minimum standard, the information requested within Annex A of the Agreement, before granting entry to a vessel into its port? | Yes/No | |
| 6.1.1.1* | Does your country request more than the information required on Annex A of the Agreement as a condition to granting entry to a vessel into its ports? | Yes/No | Specify the kind of information |
| 6.1.2* | What is the minimum required time for the advance request for port entry? (please specify) | Hours | Need box to explain further details |
| 6.1.3* | Are there any particular situations where a different minimum required time for the advance request for port entry applies? | Yes/No | Specify situation and hours |
| Port entry, authorisation or denial (Article 9) | | | |

Deleted: in relation to

Deleted: that are

Deleted: the

Deleted: In each of the designated ports, t

Deleted: sufficient

Formatted Table

Deleted: prior to

Deleted: the advance request for port entry in your country go beyond the information required on Annex A of the Agreement

Deleted: general

| | | | |
|-------------------|--|-------------------|--|
| 7.1* | Which State agencies / ministries will implement the procedures and/or the activities related to the authorization or the denial of entry into port? | | |
| 7.1.1 | Customs | Yes/No | |
| 7.1.2 | Fisheries | Yes/No | |
| 7.1.3 | Health | Yes/No | |
| 7.1.4 | Immigration | Yes/No | |
| 7.1.5 | Maritime | Yes/No | |
| 7.1.6 | Navy / Coast guard | Yes/No | |
| 7.1.7 | Police | Yes/No | |
| 7.1.8 | Port authority | Yes/No | |
| 7.1.9 | Veterinary / Quarantine | Yes/No | |
| 7.1.10 | Trade | Yes/No | |
| 7.1.11 | Labour | Yes/No | |
| 7.1.12 | Other (specify) | | |
| 7.2 | After receiving an advanced request for port entry, does your country determine whether the vessel was engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing in order to authorize or deny access into port? | Yes/No | |
| 7.2.1* | Does your country have a standardized method to determining whether vessels requesting port entry have engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing? | Yes/No | |
| 7.2.1.1 | Does this standardized method include a risk assessment? | | |
| 7.3* | In implementing the PSMA, which State agencies / ministries participate in determining whether to authorize port entry for those vessels making requests? | | |
| 7.3.1 | Customs | Yes/No | |
| 7.3.2 | Fisheries | Yes/No | |
| 7.3.3 | Health | Yes/No | |
| 7.3.4 | Immigration | Yes/No | |
| 7.3.5 | Maritime | Yes/No | |
| 7.3.6 | Navy / Coast guard | Yes/No | |
| 7.3.7 | Police | Yes/No | |
| 7.3.8 | Port authority | Yes/No | |
| 7.3.9 | Veterinary / Quarantine | | |
| 7.3.10 | Trade | | |
| 7.3.11 | Labour | | |
| 7.3.12 | Other (specify) | Yes/No | |
| 7.4* | In implementing the PSMA, which State agencies / ministries participate in determining whether to deny port entry for those vessels making requests? | | |
| 7.4.1 | Customs | Yes/No | |
| 7.4.2 | Fisheries | Yes/No | |

Deleted: authorisation

Deleted: 10

Deleted: authorise

Deleted: entry

Deleted: standardised

Deleted: standardised

Deleted: W

Deleted: will

Deleted: the process of

Deleted: authorise

Deleted: 10

Deleted: W

Deleted: will

Deleted: the process of

| | | | |
|--------|--|--------|--|
| 7.4.3 | Health | Yes/No | |
| 7.4.4 | Immigration | Yes/No | |
| 7.4.5 | Maritime | Yes/No | |
| 7.4.6 | Navy / Coast guard | Yes/No | |
| 7.4.7 | Police | Yes/No | |
| 7.4.8 | Port authority | Yes/No | |
| 7.4.9 | Veterinary / Quarantine | Yes/No | |
| 7.4.10 | Trade | Yes/No | |
| 7.4.11 | Labour | Yes/No | |
| 7.4.12 | Other (specify) | Yes/No | |
| 7.5 | Is cooperation with the vessel's flag State requested before determining whether to authorize entry into port? | Yes/No | |
| 7.5.1* | Is cooperation with other coastal State requested before determining whether to authorize entry into port? | Yes/No | |
| 7.5.2* | To determine whether to authorize entry into port, is the cooperation of a vessel's flag State requested only when the risk assessment so determines? | Yes/No | |
| 7.6* | Which data / information sources are used to inform the decision to authorise or deny entry into port? | - | |
| 7.6.1 | National records (including fisheries and other relevant ministries / agencies) | Yes/No | |
| 7.6.2 | VMS | Yes/No | |
| 7.6.3 | AIS | Yes/No | |
| 7.6.4 | Electronic logbook | Yes/No | |
| 7.6.5 | Fishing license/authorizations | Yes/No | |
| 7.6.6 | Compliance history | Yes/No | |
| 7.6.7 | RFMO/A records | Yes/No | |
| 7.6.8 | Data / information from the flag State | Yes/No | |
| 7.6.9 | Data / information from other relevant States (coastal and port States) | Yes/No | |
| 7.6.10 | Global Record of Fishing Vessels, Refrigerated Transport Vessels and Supply Vessels | Yes/No | |
| 7.6.11 | Other regional or international vessel records (specify) | Yes/No | |
| 7.6.12 | Other (specify) | Yes/No | |
| 7.7 | Does your country have measures in place to deny vessels entry into port when there is sufficient proof that it has conducted IUU fishing activities or activities in support of such fishing? | Yes/No | |
| 7.7.1* | Has your country denied a vessel entry into port due to having sufficient proof that the vessel had conducted IUU fishing or activities in support of such fishing? | Yes/No | |
| 7.8 | In the case of denial of entry, is the decision communicated, to the extent possible, to: | - | |
| 7.8.1 | The flag State | Yes/No | |
| 7.8.2 | Relevant coastal States | Scale | |
| 7.8.3 | Relevant RFMO/A(s) | Scale | |
| 7.8.4 | Other relevant international organizations (specify) | Scale | |

Formatted Table

Deleted: 10

Deleted: To determine

Deleted: authorise

Deleted: , is the cooperation of a vessel's flag State requested

Deleted: 1

Deleted: authorise

Deleted: authorisations

Deleted: , in particular the inclusion into a list of vessels engaged in such fishing or fishing related activities adopted by RFMO/A(s), in conformity with international law

Deleted: fishing

Deleted: activities

Deleted: organisations

| Force Majeure (Article 10) | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--------------|--|
| 8.1 | Does your country have provisions in place to allow entry into <u>its</u> port for reasons of force majeure or distress <u>consistent with international law</u> ? | -- Yes/No -- | |
| Use of ports (Article 11) | | | |
| 9.1* | Which State agencies / ministries will enforce the procedures and/or the activities related to the authorisation or the denial of use of port? | - | |
| 9.1.1 | Customs | Yes/No | |
| 9.1.2 | Fisheries | Yes/No | |
| 9.1.3 | Health | Yes/No | |
| 9.1.4 | Immigration | Yes/No | |
| 9.1.5 | Maritime | Yes/No | |
| 9.1.6 | Navy / Coast guard | Yes/No | |
| 9.1.7 | Police | Yes/No | |
| 9.1.8 | Port authority | Yes/No | |
| 9.1.9 | Veterinary / Quarantine | Yes/No | |
| 9.1.10 | Trade | Yes/No | |
| 9.1.11 | Labour | Yes/No | |
| 9.1.12 | Other (specify) | Yes/No | |
| 9.2 | Once a vessel has entered its ports, does your country have measures in place to deny <u>the</u> use of <u>such</u> ports if it finds that: | - | |
| 9.2.1 | The vessel does not have a valid and applicable <u>authorization</u> to engage in fishing and fishing activities required by its flag State? | -- Yes/No -- | |
| 9.2.2 | The vessel does not have a valid and applicable <u>authorization</u> to engage in fishing and fishing activities required by the coastal State <u>with</u> respect to areas under the national jurisdiction of that State? | -- Yes/No -- | |
| 9.2.3 | There is clear evidence that the fish on board was taken in contravention of <u>the</u> applicable requirements of a coastal State <u>with</u> respect to areas under the national jurisdiction of that State? | Yes/No | |
| 9.2.4 | The flag State does not confirm within a reasonable time that the fish on board the vessel was taken in accordance with <u>the</u> applicable requirements of a relevant RFMO? | -- Yes/No -- | |
| 9.2.5 | There <u>are</u> reasonable grounds to believe that the vessel was otherwise engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing? | -- Yes/No -- | |
| 9.3* | Have there been any cases where your country has denied use of port due to: | - | |
| 9.3.1 | The vessel does not have a valid and applicable <u>authorization</u> to engage in fishing and fishing activities required by its flag State? | -- Yes/No -- | |
| 9.3.2 | The vessel does not have a valid and applicable <u>authorization</u> to engage in fishing and fishing activities required by the coastal State <u>with</u> respect to areas under the national jurisdiction of that State? | -- Yes/No -- | |

Deleted: in accordance with international law

Deleted: 10

Deleted: authorisation

Deleted: authorisation

Deleted: in

Deleted: in

Deleted: period of

Deleted: is

Deleted: authorisation

Deleted: authorisation

Deleted: in

| | | | |
|---------|---|----------------|---------------|
| 9.3.3 | There is clear evidence that the fish on board was taken in contravention of <u>the</u> applicable requirements of a coastal State <u>with</u> respect to areas under the national jurisdiction of that State? | Yes/No | |
| 9.3.4 | The flag State does not confirm within a reasonable <u>time</u> that the fish on board the vessel was taken in accordance with <u>the</u> applicable requirements of a relevant RFMO? | Yes/No | |
| 9.3.5 | There is reasonable grounds to believe that the vessel was otherwise engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing? | Yes/No | |
| 9.4 | In the case of denial of use of port, is the decision communicated to the extent possible to: | - | |
| 9.4.1 | The flag State | Yes/No | |
| 9.4.2 | Relevant coastal States when appropriate | Scale | |
| 9.4.3 | Relevant RFMO/A(s) when appropriate | Scale | |
| 9.4.4 | Other relevant international <u>organizations</u> (specify) | Scale | |
| 9.5 | Does your country withdraw its denial of the use of its port, if there is sufficient proof that the <u>conditions</u> on which <u>such</u> use was denied were inadequate or erroneous or that such grounds no longer apply? | Yes/No | |
| 9.5.1 | In cases where your country has withdrawn its denial of use of its port, does your country promptly <u>inform</u> those <u>States</u> to whom the notification was issued? | Yes/No | |
| | Levels and priorities for inspection (Article 12) | | |
| 10.1 | Do you have a minimum level of inspection that your country considers to be required to achieve the objectives of this Agreement? | Yes/No | Specify the % |
| 10.2* | Does your country inspect the number of vessels in its ports required to reach an annual level of inspection that is sufficient to achieve the objective of this Agreement? | Yes/No comment | |
| 10.2.1* | Has this minimum level of inspection been attained? | Yes/No | |
| 10.3 | In determining which vessels to inspect, are measures in place to <u>prioritize</u> : | | |
| 10.3.1 | Vessels <u>that have been already</u> denied entry or use of port in accordance with this Agreement? | Yes/No/NA | |
| 10.3.2 | Request from other relevant Parties, States or RFMO/A <u>that</u> a particular vessel be inspected, particularly where such requests are supported by evidence of IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing? | Yes/No/NA | |
| 10.3.3 | Other vessels with clear grounds for suspecting that they have engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing? | Yes/No/NA | |
| 10.4* | Have there been cases in your country where a vessel has been inspected due to information obtained on: | | |
| 10.4.1 | Vessels <u>that have been</u> denied entry or use of port in accordance with this Agreement? | | |
| 10.4.2 | Request from other relevant Parties, States or RFMO/A requesting that a particular vessel be inspected, particularly where such requests are supported by evidence of IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing? | | |
| 10.4.3 | Other vessels with clear grounds for suspecting that they have engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing? | | |

Deleted: in

Deleted: period of

Deleted: organisations

Deleted: ground

Deleted: notify

Deleted: prioritise

Deleted: requesting

| Conduct of inspections (Article 13) | | |
|--|---|--------|
| 11.1* | Which State agencies/ministries will conduct the inspection of the vessel? | |
| 11.1.1 | Customs | Yes/No |
| 11.1.2 | Fisheries | Yes/No |
| 11.1.3 | Health | Yes/No |
| 11.1.4 | Immigration | Yes/No |
| 11.1.5 | Maritime | Yes/No |
| 11.1.6 | Navy / Coast guard | Yes/No |
| 11.1.7 | Police | Yes/No |
| 11.1.8 | Port authority | Yes/No |
| | Veterinary / Quarantine | |
| 11.1.9 | Other (specify) | Yes/No |
| 11.2 | To what extent do your country's inspection procedures: | - |
| 11.2.1 | include the functions <u>outlined</u> in Annex B as a minimum standard? | Scale |
| 11.2.2 | ensure that properly qualified inspectors <u>carried out inspections and</u> are authorized for this purpose, taking into account the guidelines set out in Annex E of the Agreement for the training of inspectors? | Scale |
| 11.2.3 | require inspectors, <u>before</u> an inspection, to present to the master of the vessel an appropriate document identifying the inspector as such? | Scale |
| 11.2.4 | ensure that its inspectors examine all relevant areas on board, the nets and any other gear, equipment, and any other document or record on board that is relevant to verifying compliance with <u>the applicable</u> conservation and management measures? | Scale |
| 11.2.5* | <u>Examine the fish, including by sampling, to determine its quantity and composition before the landing or transshipment begins?</u> | Scale |
| 11.2.6* | <u>Inspect the landing or transshipment to determine the quantity and composition of the catch?</u> | Scale |
| 11.2.7* | <u>If yes, is the operation inspected partially or completely?</u> | Scale |
| 11.2.8 | require the master of the vessel to give inspectors all necessary assistance and information, and to present relevant material and document as may be required, or certified copied thereof? | Scale |
| 11.2.9 | in case of appropriate arrangements, invite the <u>vessel's</u> flag State to participate in the inspection? | Scale |
| 11.2.10 | make all possible efforts to avoid unduly delaying the vessel <u>and</u> to minimize interference and inconvenience, including any unnecessary presence of inspectors on board, and to avoid action that would adversely affect the quality of the fish on board? | Scale |
| 11.2.11 | make all possible efforts to facilitate communication with the master or senior crew members of the vessel, including where possible and where needed <u>an interpreter accompanies</u> the inspector? | Scale |
| 11.2.12 | ensure that inspections are conducted in a fair, transparent and non-discriminatory manner and would not constitute harassment of any vessel? | Scale |
| 11.2.13 | not interfere with the master's ability, in conformity with international law, to communicate with the authorities of the flag State? | Scale |

Deleted: set forth

Deleted: inspections are carried out by

Deleted: s

Deleted: prior to

Deleted: relevant

Deleted: 5

Deleted: 6

Deleted: of the vessel

Deleted: 7

Deleted: 8

Deleted: that

Deleted: is accompanied by an interpreter

Deleted: 9

Deleted: 10

| Results of inspections (Article 14) | | |
|--|---|---|
| 12.1 | Does your country, as a minimum standard, include the information in Annex C of the Agreement in the written report of the results of each inspection? | Yes/No |
| 12.1.1* | Do the written reports go beyond the information set out in Annex C? | Yes/No |
| | | If yes, specify the additional information included |
| Transmittal of inspection results (Article 15) | | |
| 13.1 | Does your country transmit the results of each inspection to the flag State of the inspected vessel? | Scale |
| 13.2 | Does your country transmit the results of each inspection to, as appropriate: | - |
| 13.2.1 | Those States for which there is evidence through inspection that the vessel has engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing within waters under their national jurisdiction | Scale |
| 13.2.2 | The State in which the vessel's master is a national | Yes/No |
| 13.2.3 | RFMO/A(s) | Scale |
| 13.2.4 | FAO | Yes/No |
| 13.2.5 | Other relevant international organizations (specify) | Yes/No |
| Electronic exchange of information (Article 16) | | |
| 14.1 | Has your country designated an authority that shall act as a contact point for exchanging information under this Agreement? | Yes/No |
| 14.2 | Does your country have a national communication mechanism that allows for the direct electronic sharing of information relevant to this agreement? | Scale |
| 14.3* | Does your country use any electronic information exchange mechanism to communicate with a flag State or other port or coastal States? | Yes/No |
| 14.3.1 | Does your country use any bilateral electronic information exchange mechanisms | Yes/No |
| 14.3.2 | Does your country use any regional electronic information exchange mechanisms | Yes/No |
| 14.4 | To what extent can information be transmitted through information exchange mechanisms consistent with Annex D of the Agreement? | Scale |
| Training of inspectors (Article 17) | | |
| 15.1 | To what extent has your country trained its inspectors, considering the guidelines for the training of inspectors outlined in Annex E of the Agreement? | Scale |
| | | Yes/No |
| 15.2* | Have any of your country's national inspectors participated in PSM training courses conducted by other States / organizations? | Yes/No |

Deleted: set out

Deleted: of

Deleted:

Deleted: the

Deleted: e

Deleted: of

Deleted: vessel's

Deleted: ,

Deleted: is

Deleted: to

Deleted: taking into

Deleted: ation

Deleted: set forth

Deleted: organisations

| | | | |
|----------|--|-----------|--|
| 15.2.1 | If yes, please indicate which organizations: | - | |
| 15.2.1.1 | Other Parties | Yes/No | |
| | Non-Parties | | |
| 15.2.1.2 | FAO | Yes/No | |
| 15.2.1.3 | RFMO/A(s) | Yes/No | |
| 15.2.1.4 | Other (specify) | Yes/No | |
| | Port State actions following inspection (Article 18) | | |
| 16.1 | Where, following an inspection, there are clear grounds for believing that a vessel has engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing, does your country have a process in place to promptly notify its findings to: | - | |
| 16.1.1 | The flag State | Yes/No/NA | |
| | And as appropriate: | | |
| 16.1.2 | Relevant coastal States | Scale | |
| 16.1.3 | Relevant RFMO/As | Scale | |
| 16.1.4 | Other international organizations (specify) | Scale | |
| 16.2 | In such cases, does your country have a process in place to deny the vessel the use of its port for landing, transshipping, packaging and processing of fish and for other port services, including, <i>inter alia</i> , refuelling and resupplying, maintenance and drydocking, if these actions have not already been taken in respect of the vessel, in a manner consistent with this Agreement, including Article 4? | Scale | |
| 16.3* | Have cases occurred in your country where vessels have been denied use of port following an inspection, where there are clear grounds for believing that a vessel has engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing? | Yes/No | |
| | Information on recourse in a port State (Article 19) | | |
| 17.1 | Does your country have a process to maintain <u>on recourse</u> the relevant information <u>concerning</u> the Agreement <u>available to the public, including on measures taken in relation to:</u> | | |
| 17.1.1* | Article 9 - Port entry, authorization and denial | Yes/No | |
| 17.1.2* | Article 11 - Use of ports | Yes/No | |
| 17.1.3* | Article 13 - Conduct of inspections | Yes/No | |
| 17.1.4* | Article 18 - Port State action following inspection | Yes/No | |
| 17.2 | Does your country have a process in place to provide information on recourse to the owner, operator, master or representative of a vessel, in accordance with the Agreement, with regard to PSMs taken pursuant to: | | |
| 17.2.1 | Article 9 - Port entry, authorization and denial | Yes/No | |
| 17.2.2 | Article 11 - Use of ports | Yes/No | |
| 17.2.3 | Article 13 - Conduct of inspections | Yes/No | |
| 17.2.4 | Article 18 - Port State action following inspection | Yes/No | |

Deleted: organisations

Deleted: that have not been previously landed

Formatted: Font: Italic

Deleted: in place

Deleted: on recourse available to the public in accordance with

Deleted: with regard to PSMs

Deleted: pursuant

| | | | |
|--------|--|-------------------|--|
| 17.3* | Has your country provided information on recourse to the owner, operator, master or representative of a vessel with regard to PSMs taken pursuant to: | | |
| 17.3.1 | Article 9 - Port entry, authorization and denial | Yes/No | |
| 17.3.2 | Article 11 - Use of ports | Yes/No | |
| 17.3.3 | Article 13 - Conduct of inspections | Yes/No | |
| 17.3.4 | Article 18 - Port State action following inspection | Yes/No | |
| 17.4 | Does your country have measures in place to report the outcome of any such recourse to the flag State and the owner, operator, master or representative, as appropriate? | Yes/No | |
| 17.5* | Has your country reported the outcome of any such recourse to the flag State and the owner, operator, master or representative, as appropriate? | Yes/No | |
| 17.6 | In cases where other Parties, States or international organizations have been informed of the prior decision pursuant to Articles 9, 11, 13 or 18, does your country have a process to notify them of any change in this decision? | Yes/No | |
| 17.7* | In cases where other Parties, States or international organizations have been informed of the prior decision pursuant to Articles 9, 11, 13 or 18, has your country notified them of any change in this decision? | Yes/No/NA | |
| | Role of flag State (Article 20) | | |
| 18.1 | Does your country require the vessels entitled to fly its flag to cooperate with the port State in inspections carried out pursuant to this Agreement? | Yes/No | |
| 18.2 | In accordance with Article 20 paragraph 2 of the Agreement, does your country, as appropriate, request that State inspect the vessel or to take other measures consistent with this Agreement? | Yes/No/NA | |
| 18.3 | Does your country encourage vessels entitled to fly its flag to land, tranship, package and process fish, and use other port services, in ports of States that are acting in accordance with, or in a manner consistent with this Agreement? | Yes/No | |
| 18.4 | In cases where, following port State inspection, your country receives an inspection report indicating that there are clear grounds to believe that a vessel entitled to fly its flag has engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing, does it immediately and thoroughly investigate the matter and, upon sufficient evidence, take enforcement action without delay in accordance with its laws and regulations? | Yes/No | |
| 18.5 | Does your country, in its capacity as a flag State, report to other Parties, relevant port and other States, regional fisheries management organizations and FAO on actions it has taken in respect of vessels entitled to fly its flag that, as a result of port State measures taken pursuant to this Agreement, have been determined to have engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing? | Yes/No | |
| 18.6 | Does your country ensure that measures applied to vessels entitled to fly its flag are at least as effective in preventing, deterring, and eliminating IUU fishing and fishing related activities in support of such fishing as measures applied to vessels referred to in paragraph 1 of Article 3? | Yes/No | |
| | Requirements of developing States (Article 21) | | |
| 19.1 | Has your country obtained external assistance on PSMA implementation? | Yes/No/NA | |
| 19.2 | Please select from which actors you received external assistance: | - | |

Deleted: organisations

Deleted: in place

Deleted: inform

Deleted: organisations

Deleted: has your country informed

Deleted: to

Deleted: your

Deleted: your

Deleted: fully

Deleted:

Deleted: and, as appropriate, other relevant States

Deleted: your

Deleted: your

| | | | |
|--------|-----------------|--------|--|
| 19.2.1 | Other States | Yes/No | |
| 19.2.2 | FAO | Yes/No | |
| 19.2.3 | RFMO/A(s) | Yes/No | |
| 19.2.4 | Other (specify) | Yes/No | |

Supplementary questions:

Has the UN/LOCODE allocated for all your country's designated ports?

Annex 3: Questions for RFMOs/RFBs/other relevant organizations (“the organization”)

01- Has the organization adopted any decision, measure, recommendation or similar instrument implementing the measures established in the PSMA?
 If the answer to 01 is yes, please continue with question 02.
 If the answer to 01 is no, just one additional question: is the organization considering adopting any decision, decision, measure, recommendation or similar instrument implementing the PSMA?

02- Is it a binding decision, measure, recommendation or instrument?
 If the answer to 02 is no, which percentage of the organization Parties/members of the Commission are applying the instrument?

All questions from now forward are referred to the specific decision, measure, recommendation or similar instrument(s) relevant to the PSMA implementation adopted by the organizations, which will be referred to as “the decision(s)”.

QUESTIONNAIRE

PART 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

Article 1. Use of terms

- 1- Does the decision(s) include definitions consistent with article 1 of the PSMA? Please specify.
- 2- Does the decision(s) make a distinction between fishing and fishing related activities?
- 3- Does the definition of vessel include both activities?

Article 3. Application

- 1.- Does the decision(s) request a Party/Member to apply it to vessels not entitled to fly its flag that are seeking entry to its ports? Please explain the scope of the decision and whether there are any exceptions.
- 2.- Is the decision(s) applicable to artisanal fishing for subsistence?
- 3.- How does the decision(s) approach containers carrying fish caught within the relevant ORGANIZATION area of competence or subject to the ORGANIZATION regulations that have not been previously landed?
- 4.- Does the decision contains any provision regarding chartered vessels?
- 5.- Does the decision(s) request Parties/Members to apply to chartered vessels measures as effective as measures applied in relation to vessels entitled to fly its flag?

4. Relationship with international law and other international instruments

- 1.- Does the decision(s) include or request to apply more stringent measures than those under the PSMA?

Article 6. Cooperation and exchange of information

- 1.- Does the decision(s) establish a mechanism of cooperation and exchange of information among the Parties/Members?
- 2.- Does the decision(s) establish a mechanism of cooperation and exchange of information among the Parties/Members with non-Parties relevant states, FAO and other international organizations and regional fisheries management organizations?

PART 2. ENTRY INTO PORT

Article 7. Designation of ports

- 1.- Does the decision(s) request Parties/Members to designate and publicize the ports to which vessels may request entry?
- 2.- Does the ORGANIZATION receive and publish the list of ports?
- 3.- Does the decision(s) request the Parties/Members to have sufficient capacity to conduct inspections for a port to be designated?

Article 8. Advance request for port entry

- 1.- Does the decision(s) request Parties/Members to require an advance request for port entry?
- 2.- Does this minimum content cover all the information stated in Annex A of PSMA?
- 3.- How long in advance does the decision(s) require the request for port access to be submitted?

Article 9. Port entry, authorization or denial

- 1.- Does the decision(s) request Parties/Members to decide whether to authorize or deny port entry after doing due diligence considering, among others, the information received in the advance request?
- 2.- Does the decision(s) request Parties/Members to communicate the decision taken to the master of the vessel or its representative?
- 3.- Does the decision(s) request Parties/Members to communicate entry denials to the vessel's flag State and, as appropriate and to the extent possible, relevant coastal states, regional fisheries management organizations and other international organizations?
- 4.- Does the decision(s) request Parties/Members to deny access to port when a Party/Member has sufficient proof that a vessel seeking entry into its port has engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing, in particular the inclusion of a vessel on a list of vessels having engaged in such fishing or fishing related activities adopted by a relevant regional fisheries management organization in accordance with the rules and procedures of such organization and in conformity with international law?
- 5.- Does the decision(s) allow Parties/Members to grant entry into its ports of a vessel with enough proof that it has been engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities exclusively for the purpose of inspecting it and taking other appropriate actions in conformity with international law which are at least as effective as denial of port entry in preventing, deterring and eliminating IUU fishing and fishing related activities in support of such fishing?
- 6.- Where a vessel with enough proof of having engaged in IUU fishing is in port, does the decision(s) request the Party/Member to deny such vessel the use of its ports for landing, transshipping, packaging, and processing of fish and for other port services including refuelling and resupplying, maintenance and drydocking?

Article 10. Force majeure or distress

- 1.- Does the decision(s) contemplate any force majeure or distress provision to permit entry into port?
- 2.- Is such access only permitted for the purpose of rendering assistance to persons, ships or aircraft in danger or distress?
- 3.- Is there any other purpose permitted? If yes, please specify.

PART 3. USE OF PORTS

Article 11. Use of ports

- 1.- Does the decision(s) request Parties/Members to deny the use of ports (for landing, transshipping, packaging and processing of fish that have not been previously landed and for other port services, including, inter alia, refuelling and resupplying, maintenance and drydocking) to a vessel that has entered, if:
- (a) the Party/Member finds that the vessel does not have a valid and applicable authorization to engage in fishing or fishing related activities required by its flag State;
 - (b) the Party/Member finds that the vessel does not have a valid and applicable authorization to engage in fishing or fishing related activities required by a coastal State in respect of areas under the national jurisdiction of that State;
 - (c) the Party/Member receives clear evidence that the fish on board was taken in contravention of applicable requirements of a coastal State in respect of areas under the national jurisdiction of that State;
 - (d) the flag State does not confirm within a reasonable period of time, on the request of the port State, that the fish on board was taken in accordance with applicable requirements of a relevant regional fisheries management organization; or
 - (e) the Party/Member has reasonable grounds to believe that the vessel was otherwise engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing, unless the vessel can establish:
 - (i) that it was acting in a manner consistent with relevant conservation and management measures; or
 - (ii) in the case of provision of personnel, fuel, gear and other supplies at sea, that the vessel that was provisioned was not, at the time of provisioning, included on a list of vessels having engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities adopted by a relevant regional fisheries management organization in accordance with the rules and procedures of such organization and in conformity with international law?
- 2.- Notwithstanding any exceptions, does the decision(s) allow Parties/Members to permit the use of port services:
- (a) essential to the safety or health of the crew or the safety of the vessel, provided these needs are duly proven, or
 - (b) where appropriate, for the scrapping of the vessel?
- 3.- Does the decision(s) request Parties/Members promptly notify the denial of the use of port to relevant coastal states, regional fisheries management organizations and other relevant international organizations?
- 4.- Does the decision(s) allow Parties/Members to withdraw the denial of the use of port only if there is sufficient proof that the grounds on which such use was denied were inadequate or erroneous or that no longer apply?
- 5.- In the case of withdrawing a denial, does the decision(s) request Parties/Members to notify those to whom a notification was issued promptly?

PART 4. INSPECTIONS AND FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS

Article 12. Levels and priorities for inspection

- 1.- Does the decision request Parties to establish an annual level of inspections to reach?
- 2.- Does the decision(s) establish a minimum level of inspections for Parties/Members to reach?
- 3.- Does the decision(s) request Parties/Members to prioritize inspections to
 - (a) vessels that have been denied entry or use of a port in accordance with the decision;
 - (b) requests from other relevant Parties, states or regional fisheries management organizations that specific vessels be inspected, particularly where such requests are supported by evidence of IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing by the vessel in question; and
 - (c) other vessels for which there are clear grounds for suspecting that they have engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing?

Article 13. Conduct of inspections

- 1.- Does the decision(s) set functions for inspectors as a minimum standard? If yes, is this minimum standard consistent with Annex B of the PSMA?
2. When carrying out inspections in its ports, does the decision(s) request Parties/Members to:

- (a) ensure that inspections are carried out by properly qualified inspectors authorized for that purpose;
- (b) ensure that, prior to an inspection, inspectors are required to present to the master of the vessel an appropriate document identifying the inspectors as such;
- (c) ensure that inspectors examine all relevant areas of the vessel, the fish on board, the nets and any other gear, equipment, and any document or record on board that is relevant to verifying compliance with relevant conservation and management measures;
- (d) require the master of the vessel to give inspectors all necessary assistance and information, and to present relevant material and documents as may be required, or certified copies thereof;
- (e) in case of appropriate arrangements with the flag State of the vessel, invite that State to participate in the inspection;
- (f) make all possible efforts to avoid unduly delaying the vessel to minimize interference and inconvenience, including any unnecessary presence of inspectors on board, and to avoid action that would adversely affect the quality of the fish on board;
- (g) make all possible efforts to facilitate communication with the master or senior crew members of the vessel, including where possible and where needed that the inspector is accompanied by an interpreter;
- (h) ensure that inspections are conducted in a fair, transparent and non-discriminatory manner and would not constitute harassment of any vessel; and
- (i) not interfere with the master's ability, in conformity with international law, to communicate with the authorities of the flag State?

Article 14. Results of inspections

1.- Does the decision(s) request Parties/Members to include the information established as the minimum standard, consistent with Annex C of the PSMA, in the written inspection report of the result of each inspection?

Article 15. Transmittal of inspection results

1.- Does the decision(s) request Parties/Members to transmit the results of each inspection to the flag State of the inspected vessel and, as appropriate, to:

- (a) relevant Parties and states, including:
 - (i) those states for which there is evidence through inspection that the vessel has engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing within waters under their national jurisdiction; and
 - (ii) the State of which the vessel's master is a national;
- (b) relevant regional fisheries management organizations; and
- (c) FAO and other relevant international organizations?

Article 16. Electronic exchange of information

1.- Does the decision(s) request Parties/Members to establish a communication mechanism that allows for direct electronic exchange of information, with due regard to appropriate confidentiality requirements?

2.- Is the ORGANIZATION cooperating with FAO to establish an information-sharing mechanism?

3.- Does the decision(s) request Parties/Members to cooperate with FAO to establish an information-sharing mechanism?

4.- Does the decision(s) request Parties/Members to designate an authority that shall act as a contact point for the exchange of information under this decision?

5.- Does the ORGANIZATION provide information to FAO concerning the measures or decisions adopted and implemented which relate to PSMA for their integration, to the extent possible and taking due account of the appropriate confidentiality requirements, into the information-sharing mechanism?

Article 17. Training of inspectors

1.- Does the decision(s) request Parties/Members to ensure that their inspectors are properly trained?

2.- Does the decision(s) include provisions for training of inspectors?

If yes, do they include or consider the guidelines of Annex E of PSMA?

Article 18. Port State actions following inspection

1. Where, following an inspection, there are clear grounds for believing that a vessel has engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing, does the decision(s) request Parties/Members to:
- (a) promptly notify the flag State and, as appropriate, relevant coastal states, regional fisheries management organizations and other international organizations, and the State of which the vessel's master is a national of its findings; and
 - (b) deny the vessel the use of its port for landing, transshipping, packaging and processing of fish that have not been previously landed and for other port services, including, inter alia, refuelling and resupplying, maintenance and drydocking, if these actions have not already been taken in respect of the vessel?
- 2.- Notwithstanding question 1811, does the decision(s) allow Parties/Members to permit such a vessel the use of port services essential for the safety or health of the crew or the safety of the vessel?

Article 19. Information on recourse in the port State

- 1.- Does the decision(s) request Parties/Members to maintain the relevant information available to the public and provide such information, upon written request, to the owner, operator, master or representative of a vessel with regard to any recourse established in accordance with its national laws and regulations concerning port State measures taken by that Party in application of the decision(s), including
- (a) information pertaining to the public services or judicial institutions available for this purpose,
 - (b) information on whether there is any right to seek compensation in accordance with its national laws and regulations in the event of any loss or damage suffered as a consequence of any alleged unlawful action by the Party?
- 2.- Does the decision(s) request Parties/Members to inform the flag State, the owner, operator, master or representative, as appropriate, of the outcome of any such recourse?
- 3.- Where other Parties, states or international organizations have been informed of the prior decision related to questions 9, 11, 13 and 18, does the decision(s) request the Parties/Members to inform them of any change in its decision?

PART 5. ROLE OF FLAG STATES

Article 20. Role of flag states

- 1.- Does the decision(s) require a Party/Member to request vessels entitled to fly its flag to cooperate with the port State in inspections carried out pursuant to the decision(s)?
- 2.- When a Party/Member has clear grounds to believe that a vessel entitled to fly its flag has engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing and is seeking entry to or is in the port of another State, does the decision require Parties/Members to request that State to inspect the vessel or to take other measures consistent with the decision(s)?
- 3.- Does the decision(s) request Parties/Members to encourage vessels entitled to fly its flag to land, transship, package and process fish, and use other port services, in ports of states that are acting in accordance with, or in a manner consistent with the decision(s)?
- 4.- Does the decision(s) develop or request Parties/Members to develop fair, transparent and non-discriminatory procedures for identifying any State that may not be acting in accordance with, or in a manner consistent with the decision(s)?
- 5.- Where, following port State inspection, a flag State Party or Member receives an inspection report indicating that there are clear grounds to believe that a vessel entitled to fly its flag has engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing, does the decision request the flag state Party or Member to immediately and fully investigate the matter and to, upon sufficient evidence, take enforcement action without delay in accordance with its laws and regulations?
- 6.- Does the decision(s) request Parties/Members, in their capacity as flag states, to report to other Parties/Members, relevant port states and, as appropriate, other relevant states, regional fisheries management organizations and FAO on actions they have taken in respect of vessels entitled to fly their flag that, as a result of port state measures taken pursuant to this decision, have been determined to have engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing?
- 7.- Does the decision(s) request Parties/Members to ensure that measures applied to vessels entitled to fly their flag are at least as effective in preventing, deterring, and eliminating IUU fishing and fishing related activities in support of such fishing as measures applied to vessels in the scope of the decision?

PART 6. REQUIREMENTS OF DEVELOPING STATES

Requirements of developing states

Request Parties/members to give full recognition to the special requirements of developing states Parties/members in relation to the port State measures consistent with the decision(s)?

Request Parties/members to provide assistance to developing states, either directly or through FAO, other specialized agencies of the United Nations, appropriate international organizations and bodies, including regional fisheries management organizations, in order to, *inter alia*:
- ensure the legal capability, in particular the least-developed among them and small island developing states, to develop a legal basis and capacity for the adoption of effective port State measures;

- ensure participation in any international organizations that promote the effective development and implementation of port State measures; and
- ensure technical assistance to strengthen the development and implementation of port State measures by them, in coordination with relevant mechanisms?

Request Parties/members to give due regard to the special requirements of developing port states Parties, in particular the least-developed and small island developing states, to ensure that a disproportionate burden resulting from the implementation of the decision is not transferred to them?

If a disproportionate burden has been demonstrated, does the decision request Parties/Members to cooperate to facilitate the fulfilment of the relevant obligations of specific obligations under the decision(s)?

Request Parties/Members to assess the special requirements of developing states Parties concerning the implementation of the decision?

PART 8. NON-PARTIES

Requirements of non-Parties to this Agreement

Request Parties/Members to take fair, non-discriminatory and transparent measures consistent with the decision and other applicable measures to prevent the activities of non-Parties which undermine the effective implementation of this decision?

Annex 4: PGM/MUL/2016-2021/PSMA: FAO Global Capacity Development Programme to support the implementation of the PSMA. Commitments, Contributions and Delivery as at 31 December 2022 (USD)^{7,8}

| Resource Partner | Commitments ⁹ 2017-2022 | Contributions ¹⁰ | | | | | | Delivery 2017-2022 | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| | | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | | Total |
| EU | 7 110 749 | | 1 803 617 | 816 149 | 910 709 | 790 020 | 1 381 857 | 5 702 353 | 4 476 637 |
| Germany | 4 743 698 | | | | | 31 545 | 1 030 990 | 1 062 534 | 839 180 |
| Iceland | 800 000 | | | 400 000 | | | 400 000 | 800 000 | 652 942 |
| RoK | 3 755 227 | | 737 927 | 43 500 | 1 100 243 | 1 191 631 | | 3 073 301 | 1 776 282 |
| Norway | 4 376 293 | 1 219 875 | | 1 137 482 | 649 928 | 715 852 | 640 319 | 4 363 456 | 2 793 084 |
| Spain | 233 414 | | | 57 078 | 115 361 | 60 976 | | 233 414 | 233 414 |
| Sweden | 5 800 600 | | 5 807 688 ¹¹ | | | | | 5 807 688 | 3 505 098 |
| USA | 903 369 | | 973 741 | | | | -70 373 | 903 369 | 903 369 |
| Total¹² | 27 723 350 | 1 219 875 | 9 322 973 | 2 454 209 | 2 776 241 | 2 790 023 | 3 382 793 | 21 946 114 | 15 180 005 |

⁷ All data and information is provided for informational purposes only and should not be relied upon for any other use. In particular, it is not intended for financial reporting which is governed by the relevant agreements between FAO and the concerned Resource Partners.

⁸ Net of interests accrued.

⁹ As stipulated in formal agreements between FAO and relevant Resource Partners.

¹⁰ Contributions received by FAO. The difference between Commitments and Contributions relate to commitments paid or to be paid in instalments.

¹¹ Higher contribution than commitment is due to exchange rate gain.

¹² Totals may not add up due to rounding.

Annex 5: National level PSMA capacity development support (As of 02/03/2023)

| | | | Technical assistance (legal and policy) | | | | Technical assistance (MCS and operational aspects) | | | | | | | | | | International training | |
|--------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|---|----------------|-------------|-------------------|--|-----------------------|------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----|--------------------------------------|--------------|----------------------|--------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| Country | Gap assessment workshop | National strategy and roadmap | Legal review | Legal drafting | Regulations | Judicial training | MCS review | Interagency mechanism | SOPs | National control plan | National inspection plan | CDS | Port inspection/enforcement training | MCS training | FSP support/training | VMS training | International fisheries law | Port inspection |
| Bahamas | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Brazil | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| Cambodia | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | |
| Cameroon | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Chile | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | | | |
| Colombia | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Costa Rica | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Côte D'Ivoire | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cuba | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | |
| Djibouti | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dominica | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dominican Republic | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 | | | |
| Ecuador | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Equatorial Guinea | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fiji | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gabon | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gambia | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ghana | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 1 | |
| Guinea | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | 1 |

| | | | Technical assistance (legal and policy) | | | | Technical assistance (MCS and operational aspects) | | | | | | | | | | International training | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|---|----------------|-------------|-------------------|--|-----------------------|-----------|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------------------|--------------|----------------------|--------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| Country | Gap assessment workshop | National strategy and roadmap | Legal review | Legal drafting | Regulations | Judicial training | MCS review | Interagency mechanism | SOPs | National control plan | National inspection plan | CDS | Port inspection/enforcement training | MCS training | FSP support/training | VMS training | International fisheries law | Port inspection |
| Saint Vincent and the Grenadines | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 | |
| São Tome and Principe* | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Senegal | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sierra Leone | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Solomon Islands | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | |
| Somalia | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| South Africa | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sri Lanka | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | |
| Sudan | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 | |
| Suriname | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| Thailand | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | |
| Tonga | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Uruguay | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | |
| Vanuatu | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | |
| TOTAL | 47 | 47 | 25 | 11 | 7 | 2 | 16 | 12 | 11 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 23 | 7 |

 Non-Parties
 Parties