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The OECD IUU indicators

**Vessel registration** by which countries collect and publicise information on vessels operating in their exclusive economic zone (EEZ) or flying their flag.

**Authorisation to operate in the EEZ** by which countries, as coastal states, regulate fishing and fishing-related operations in their EEZ.

**Authorisation to operate outside the EEZ** by which countries, as flag states, regulate the operations of vessels flying their flag in ABNJ s and in foreign EEZs.

**Port state measures** by which countries monitor and control access to and activities at port.

**Market measures** by which countries regulate how products enter the market and flow through the supply chain and economically discourage IUU fishing.

**International co-operation** by which countries engage in regional and global information sharing and joint activities against IUU fishing.

Based on a survey asking respondents whether they had regulation in place to deter, identify and punish IUU fishing and whether it was partially/fully implemented in 2018.
The indicators cover 33 countries and economies of which **13 APEC member economies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile *</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>China (People’s Republic of)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Chinese Taipei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico *</td>
<td>* (pending data update)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Uptake of best policies and practices against IUU fishing, 2018

- Vessel registration
- International co-operation
- Market measures
- Port State measures
- Authorisation to operate in the EEZ
- Authorisation to operate outside the EEZ

All respondents (average) • OECD countries (average) • APEC respondents (average)
Key findings and recommendations

- 31% of APEC respondents have no legal provisions to restrict support for operators convicted of IUU fishing
- 60% of them have no legal provisions to restrict imports from countries insufficiently fighting IUU fishing

- 46% of APEC respondents have no legal provisions to collect information on beneficial owners of vessels
- 38% of APEC respondents do not require an IMO number to register fishing vessels

IUU vessel lists fully published by only 25% of APEC respondents
50% of APEC respondents do not publish the lists of vessels authorized to conduct fishing-related activities in ABNJ

- Fishing-related activities in the high seas are not conditional on authorisation in 31% of APEC respondents
- Reporting of transshipment is not mandatory in 31% of APEC respondents
The COVID-19 has led to reduced MCS capacity among RFMOs to fight IUU fishing:

• Over two-thirds of RFMOs have reduced in-person/on-board observation of vessels – e.g. pacific tuna fisheries
• Disturbances to regular decision making reported by almost all RFMOs

→ Highlights structural needs for improved decision-making and resilient MCS capacity

RFMOs can better combat IUU fishing through:

• Uptake of remote monitoring technologies (e.g. satellite data)
• Efforts by member countries to agree procedures for the use and sharing of data (including mutual recognition of IUU vessel lists)
• Co-ordination in data collection processes and standards

→ In the short term, country-level policies against IUU fishing even more crucial
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