

**QUESTIONNAIRE to be used for biennial reporting
on the application of the IUU Regulation**

Reporting period 2016-2017 (deadline for submission 30 April 2018)

Member State:	Czech Republic
Organisation:	General Directorate of Customs, Ministry of Agriculture
Date:	
Name, position and contact details of responsible official:	<p>Žaneta Staňková, General Directorate of Customs, senior customs officer, email: stankova@cs.mfcr.cz, tel.: 00420 261 332 230</p> <p>Hana Ženíšková, Department of the Fisheries and Beekeeping, email: Hana.Zeniskova@mze.cz, tel.: 00420 221 812 03</p>

May the Commission provide a copy of this questionnaire to other Member States?	
Yes:	x
Yes except for questions (list):	
No:	

<p>Please state your notified authorities under the IUU Regulation in accordance with:</p> <p>Article 15.2 (exportation of catches): not applicable</p> <p>Article 17.8 (verification of catch certificates): Customs offices</p> <p>Article 21.3 (re-exportation): Customs offices</p> <p>Article 39.4 (nationals): Ministry of Agriculture</p>

Section 1. Information on legal framework¹

Since the last reporting exercise covering the period 2014-2015, has your country adopted/modified national law or any administrative guides for the application of Council Regulation (EC) No 1005/2008 on illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing (IUU Regulation)?

Yes No

If yes, please detail and provide copies or provide link to the official national database

.....

Section 2. Information on administrative organisation²

2.1. Does your country have different authorities/services to deal with the implementation of the IUU Regulation?

Yes No

2.2. If different authorities/services are involved, please distinguish between:

- the control of direct landings of third country fishing vessels; not applicable
- validation of catch certificates upon exports; not applicable
- verification of catch certificates for imports under direct landing; customs offices
- verification of catch certificates for imports arriving by other means than fishing vessels (e.g. by containers, trucks); customs offices
- validation and verifications of re-exports. customs offices

a) internal co-operation (between local/regional authorities and head-quarter);

Please explain and describe this cooperation:

All 15 customs offices conduct checks and verifications of catch certificates. If doubts arise, the findings are reported to the headquarters. This information is assessed and if necessary a request for assistance is sent to a third country. The outcome of the request for assistance is reported back to the customs office and based on the information provided in the reply the importation can be denied or authorised.

b) co-operation with other authorities and allocation of tasks for various authorities in the implementation of the IUU Regulation (Fisheries, Health, Customs, Coast Guard, Navy, etc.);

Please explain and describe this cooperation:

Not applicable

c) how many officials are involved in the implementation of the catch certification scheme?

Please specify the number of officials expressed in Full Time Equivalent (FTE):

.....

3,5 employees expressed in FTE.

d) Do the authorities of your country have the possibility to audit/verify a company for the purposes laid down in the IUU Regulation?

¹ This section 1 is to be filled-in by all Member States i.e. coastal and landlocked Member State.

² This section 2 is to be filled-in by all Member States i.e. coastal and landlocked Member State.

Yes No

We can only audit companies which apply for the APEO status.

If yes, which and how many audits/verifications have they undertaken since the last reporting exercise covering the period 2014-2015? Please detail the results:
0.....

2.3. Does your country have freezones/freeports³ in which activities relevant to importation/exportation/processing of fishery products are authorised?

Yes No

No specific measures have been adopted with regard to importation/exportation/processing of fishery products in free zones. Any activities carried out in free zones shall meet the conditions laid down in Union customs legislation.

Section 3. Information on direct landings and transshipments of fishery products by third country fishing vessels⁴ (including information on port inspections and infringements)⁵

3.1. Does your country have designated ports for direct landings or transshipment operations of fishery products and port services of third country fishing vessels (Article 5 of the IUU Regulation⁶)?

Yes No

If yes, please list your country's designated ports (including ports designated under Regional Fisheries Management Organisations requirements) and answer to questions 3.2. to 3.7.:

.....
.....
.....

3.2. How many landings and transshipments in designated ports of third country vessels have been recorded by your country between 1 January 2016 until 31 December 2017? How many inspections has your country carried out and how many infringements have been detected?

Please fill-in the table below (2016):

Inspections of third country vessels in Member States ports (2016)								
Type of operation	Vessels	Figures (2016)	Flag of the third country vessel(s)*					Total
			Ex. NO	FS1	FS2	FS3	FSx	
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Non-EU	Number of landings	100					

³ https://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/business/customs-procedures/what-is-importation/free-zones_en

⁴ Fishing vessels as defined in article 2.5 of the IUU Regulation

⁵ This section 3 refers to Chapter II (Articles 4 to 11) of the IUU Regulation and is applicable to coastal Member States. Landlocked Member States should not fill in this section.

⁶ Please note that ports designated under Regional Fisheries Management Organisations must also be designated under the IUU Regulation with restrictions if necessary (species etc.)

	vessels using MS designated ports	Number of inspections	<i>10</i>					
		% of inspections / landings	<i>10%</i>					
		Number of infringements	<i>3</i>					
Transhipments	Non-EU vessels using MS designated ports	Number of transhipments in ports	<i>2</i>					
		Number of inspections	<i>0</i>					
		% of inspections / transhipments	<i>0</i>					
		Number of infringements	<i>0</i>					

*Use ISO Alpha-2 country codes

Please fill-in the table below (2017):

Inspections of third country vessels in Member States ports (2017)								
Type of operation	Vessels	Figures (2017)	Flag of the third country vessel(s)*					Total
			Ex. NO	FS1	FS2	FS3	FSx	
Landings	Non-EU vessels using MS designated ports	Number of landings	100					
		Number of inspections	10					
		% of inspections / landings	10%					
		Number of infringements	3					
Transshipments	Non-EU vessels using MS designated ports	Number of transshipments in ports	2					
		Number of inspections	2					
		% of inspections / transshipments	100%					
		Number of infringements	0					

*Use ISO Alpha-2 country codes

3.3. From the figures above, in the cases where your country detected infringements by third country vessels between 1 January 2016 and 31 December 2017, please specify the flag, the vessel's name, the type of infringement and the measures taken (Article 11 of the IUU Regulation).

Please fill-in the table below (2016):

Flag of the third country vessel*	Name of the third country fishing vessel	Type of infringements	Measures taken
FS1			
FS2			
...			
FSx			

*Use ISO Alpha-2 country codes

Please fill-in the table below (2017):

Flag of the third country vessel*	Name of the third country fishing vessel	Type of infringements	Measures taken
FS1			
FS2			

...			
FSx			

*Use ISO Alpha-2 country codes

3.4. Has your country had any problems with third country fishing vessels when implementing Articles 6 (prior notice) and 7 (authorisation) of the IUU Regulation?

Yes *No*

If yes, please detail the nature of the problems:

In 2016:

In 2017:

3.5. Since January 2016, has your country denied access to its ports to a fishing vessel for port services, activities of landing or transshipment of fishery products based on the conditions of the IUU Regulation?

Yes *No*

If yes, please detail the nature of the problem, the number of vessels concerned and their flags:

In 2016:

In 2017:

3.6. Do you have third country fishing vessel landings in transit in your country with final destination in another Member State? [Article 19.3 of the IUU Regulation]

Yes *No*

If yes, please indicate the number of landings in transit per year:

In 2016:

In 2017:

3.7. In order to determine the cases for port inspection, does your country use risk assessment criteria [cf. benchmarks for port inspections, Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No1010/2009]?

Yes *No*

Not applicable (e.g. in the absence of landings/transshipments from third countries)

If yes, please detail:

Section 4. Information on catch certification scheme for importation for the purpose of the IUU Regulation⁷

4.1. How many catch certificates from non-EU countries were presented to the authorities of your country from 1 January 2016 until 31 December 2017?

Flag State (non-EU)	2016	2017
Argentina	9	6
Ecuador	69	102
China	8	7
Faroe Islands	2	2
Philippines	50	100
Ghana	0	1
Guatemala	2	1
Chile	1	1
Indonesia	0	7
Iceland	42	58
South Korea	44	37
Canada	5	10
Maldives	158	34
Mauritius	9	2
Morocco	165	129
Namibia	2	1
Norway	7	7
Nicaragua	0	5
New Zealand	4	3
Panama	18	38
Papua New Guinea	0	5
Peru	3	3
Russia	121	156
El Salvador	1	2
Seychelles	29	17
United States	172	308
Sri Lanka	9	3
Solomon Islands	0	1
Thailand	2	2
Taiwan	15	22

⁷ Section to be filled-in by all Member States. Article 2.11 of the IUU Regulation – "*importation means the introduction of fishery products into the territory of the Union, including for transshipment purposes at ports in its territory*"

Flag State (non-EU)	2016	2017
Ukraine	2	1
Vietnam	37	28
Total	986	1099

4.2. From the number above, how many recognised RFMO catch certificates accompanied imports into your country? Please detail per RFMO certificate and year.

RFMO document	2016	2017
<i>ICCAT (electronic)-bluefin tuna catch document</i>	0	0
<i>Dissostichus spp. (CCAMLR)</i>	0	0
<i>CCSBT CDS</i>	0	0
Total	0	0

4.3. Has your country received processing statements from 1 January 2016 until 31 December 2017?

Yes No

If yes, how many processing statements under Article 14.2 accompanied imports into your country? If possible, please provide details per year and per processing country. Please only report processing statements received from non-EU countries:

Processing non-EU State	2016	2017
China	56	55
Ecuador	8	15
South Korea	6	6
Sri Lanka	6	0
Mauritius	52	31
Papua New Guinea	1	1
Philippines	0	1
Seychelles	0	3
Thailand	69	63
Ukraine	5	4
Vietnam	3	4
<i>Total</i>	200	183

4.4. Please indicate if the information in processing statements referring to the corresponding catch certificates is retained and recorded:

Yes No

Not applicable (e.g. in the absence of processing statements received from non-EU countries in 2016-2017)

4.5. Has your country received requests to authorise APEO⁸s in 2016-2017?

- Yes No

If yes, how many requests has your country received and how many APEOs have been authorised?

.....

4.6. Has your country adopted administrative rules referring to the management and control of APEO in 2016-2017?

- Yes No
- Not applicable (e.g. absence of APEO request)*

If yes, please detail:

.....

4.7. Has your country validated re-export certificates for products imported from 1 January 2016 until 31 December 2017?

- Yes No

If yes, how many re-export certificates? Please detail per year and, if possible, per destination country:

Destination country (non-EU)	2016	2017
Thailand	1	0
Serbia	1	0
Total	2	0

4.8. Does your country monitor if the catches for which your country has validated a re-export certificate actually leave the EU?

- Yes No
- Not applicable (e.g. in the absence of validation of re-export certificates in 2016-2017)*

If yes, please detail:

No specific procedures have been set up to monitor whether the products for which the re-export catch certificate was validated actually leave the EU territory. If such information is required, it can be easily obtained from the Export Control System (ECS).

4.9. Has your country established any IT tools to monitor the catch certificates and processing statements accompanying imports?

⁸ Approved Economic Operators – IUU Regulation, Article 16 and Implementing Regulation (EC) 1010/2009, Chapter II

Yes *No*

If yes, does it include a module for re-exportation of imported catches?

Yes *No*

4.10. Does your country implement the provisions regarding transit under Article 19.2 at the point of entry or the place of destination?

At the point of entry *At the place of destination* *Not implemented*

Section 5. Information on catch certification scheme for exportation⁹

5.1. Has your country established a procedure for validation of catch certificates for exportation of catches from own vessels in accordance with Article 15?

Yes No

Not applicable (e.g. in the absence of validation of catch certificates for exportation in 2016-2017)

If yes, please explain briefly the established procedure and answer questions 5.2 to 5.5.

.....

5.2. Has your country validated catch certificates for exportation in 2016-2017?

Yes No

If yes, how many catch certificates did your country validate from 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2017? If possible, please provide details per requesting third country/country of destination in the following table:

Destination State	Year	
	2016	2017
<i>Third Country 1</i>		
<i>Third Country 2</i>		
...		
<i>Third Country x</i>		
Total		

5.3. Has your country established any IT tool to monitor the catch certificates validated for exports stemming from own vessels?

Yes No

5.4. Does your country monitor that the catches for which your country has validated catch certificates actually leave the EU?

Yes No

Not applicable (e.g. in the absence of validation of catch certificates for exportation in 2016-2017)

5.5. Has your country refused the validation of a catch certificate between 1 January 2016 and 31 December 2017?

Yes No

Not applicable (e.g. in the absence of request for validation of catch certificates for exportation in 2016-2017)

⁹ Section to be filled-in by flag Member States.

If yes, please detail:

Number (per year):

Reason:

Follow-up:

Section 6. Information on verifications of catch certificates for importation according to Article 17.1 to 5 of IUU Regulation¹⁰

6.1. Has your country established a procedure for verification of catch certificates for importation in accordance with Article 17.2?

Yes No

If yes, please detail:

As the number of submitted of catch certificates is not very high, every and each catch certificate is subject to checks and verifications. As a result, we do not deem it necessary to employ the risk assessment based on the EU criteria nor the national criteria.

The internal guidelines instruct customs offices that every catch certificate must come under scrutiny. Such a scrutiny must include the following steps. Firstly, customs offices have to check whether the authority which has validated the catch certificate is the competent authority notified to the Commission. Subsequently, the information contained in the catch certificate is cross-checked with the data provided in the accompanying documents (invoice, veterinary certificate, transport documents). The compliance with various RFMO's rules is also verified (inclusion on the RFMO vessel list, rules pertaining to transshipment, closure periods). If a third country is pre-identified, each catch certificate validated by this third country has to come under even greater scrutiny, with an emphasis put on the issues identified in the decision on pre-identification.

To make the verification process more effective a simple application called Risk Areas has been designed. The risk information relevant to the catch certificate verification is entered into the application (information on pre-identification, mutual assistance letters, some RFMO's rules) which can be easily accessed by keying in the vessel's name, flag state, species, etc. in the respective search fields.

6.2. How many catch certificates have been verified by your administration from 1 January 2016 until 31 December 2017? Please specify, separately for each year:

Flag State of origin (EU or non-EU)	Number of verifications 2016		Number of verifications 2017	
	No of basic document-based verifications ¹¹	No of in-depth verifications ¹²	No of basic document-based verifications	No of in-depth verifications

¹⁰ Section to be filled-in by all Member States

¹¹ See fields CC1 to CC6 (*Preliminary overview checks "helicopter view"*) of the EFCA Common methodology for IUU catch certificates verification and cross-checks.

¹² See fields CC7 to CC32 (*Verify and cross-check information related to the form, flag state, validating authority, fishing vessel, product(s), transshipment operations*) of the EFCA Common methodology for IUU catch certificates verification and cross-checks.

Flag State of origin (EU or non-EU)	Number of verifications 2016		Number of verifications 2017	
	No of basic document-based verifications ¹¹	No of in-depth verifications ¹²	No of basic document-based verifications	No of in-depth verifications
Argentina		9		6
Ecuador		69		102
China		8		7
Faroe Islands		2		2
Philippines		50		100
Ghana		0		1
Guatemala		2		1
Chile		1		1
Indonesia		0		7
Iceland		42		58
South Korea		44		37
Canada		5		10
Maldives		158		34
Mauritius		9		2
Morocco		165		129
Namibia		2		1
Norway		7		7
Nicaragua		0		5
New Zealand		4		3
Panama		18		38
Papua New Guinea		0		5
Peru		3		3
Russia		121		156
El Salvador		1		2
Seychelles		29		17
United States		172		308
Sri Lanka		9		3
Solomon Islands		0		1
Thailand		2		2
Taiwan		15		22
Ukraine		2		1
Vietnam		37		28

Flag State of origin (EU or non-EU)	Number of verifications 2016		Number of verifications 2017	
	No of basic document-based verifications ¹¹	No of in-depth verifications ¹²	No of basic document-based verifications	No of in-depth verifications
Total		986		1099

6.3. Does your country use a risk assessment approach for verification of catch certificates in accordance with Article 17?

Yes No

If yes, please detail (e.g. EU criteria for verifications (Article 31 of Commission Regulation 1010/2009); EFCA risk assessment methodology; national criteria).

.....

6.4. Does your country also physically verify the consignments?

Yes No

The physical examination is not part of the verification procedure, nevertheless the consignment can be physically examined at the time of customs clearance.

If yes, please detail:

Number (per year):

Method of selection:

Follow-up:

Section 7. Verification requests to flag States¹³

7.1. Has your country sent requests for verifications under Article 17.6 of the IUU Regulation to other countries authorities in 2016-2017?

Yes No

If yes, how many requests for verifications? *Note: please provide separate data for 2016 and 2017:*

Flag States	No of requests for verifications 2016	Justifications (Articles 17.4 and 17.6 of the IUU Regulation)-	No of requests for verifications 2017	Justifications (Articles 17.4 and 17.6 of the IUU Regulation)
Brazil	1	The stamp which was used to validate	0	

¹³ Section to be filled-in by all Member States

Flag States	No of requests for verifications 2016	Justifications (Articles 17.4 and 17.6 of the IUU Regulation)-	No of requests for verifications 2017	Justifications (Articles 17.4 and 17.6 of the IUU Regulation
		the catch certificate did not match the specimen in the SMS database.		
South Korea	1	Weight discrepancy in the catch certificate and the health certificate.	1	Discrepancy between the weight in the catch certificate and the health certificate.
Philippines	3	1. Discrepancy between transhipped weight and weight in the captain's statement, request to provide evidence that the vessel has been granted an exemption to tranship. 2. More evidence needed as the fishery products were caught in waters of Pacific Islands states. 3. More evidence needed as the fishery products were harvested in waters of FSM, Palau and PNG and directly transported to Philippines.	3	1. Too big a time lag between the end of the fishing activities and the transhipment. 2. Transhipment declaration not signed by the authorities overseeing the transhipment. 3. Request addressed to the authorities of Panama. Need to clarify the vessel status "foreign vessel, bilateral".
Norway	1	Suspicion that the catch certificate has been tampered with after its issuance.		
Papua New Guinea	0		1	The transhipment declaration not signed by the competent authorities overseeing the transhipment.
Ecuador	0		1	Doubts over the accuracy of the data provided in Annex B.

Flag States	No of requests for verifications 2016	Justifications (Articles 17.4 and 17.6 of the IUU Regulation)-	No of requests for verifications 2017	Justifications (Articles 17.4 and 17.6 of the IUU Regulation)
Indonesia	0		1	Box 3 regarding vessels which have provided the catches was not filled out.
Panama	0		1	No transport details
Vietnam	2	<p>1. The catch certificate was signed by an official whose name has not been notified to the Commission.</p> <p>2. The authorisation to sign a catch certificate has expired.</p>		
Morocco	0		1	Discrepancies in the processing operation
Russia	1	Weight discrepancy in the catch certificate and the health certificate.		
Ukraine	1	The catch certificate did not contain all the information as set out by the specimen in Annex IV of 1010/2009		
Total	10		9	

7.2. How many requests for verification were not replied to by the other countries' authorities within the deadline provided in Article 17.6 of the IUU Regulation? Does your country in these situations

send a reminder to the authorities of the country in question? [Please provide separate data for 2016 and 2017]

2016 2 requests for assistance were not replied to within the prescribed deadline. A reminder was sent and the reply received.

2017 4 requests for assistance were not replied to within the stipulated deadline. A reminder was sent and the reply received.

7.3. Was the quality of the answers provided overall sufficient to satisfy the request?

Yes

No

Section 8. Information on refusal of importations (Article 18 of the IUU Regulation)¹⁴

8.1. Has your country refused any imports from 1 January 2016 until 31 December 2017? *Note: please only consider refusals based on the IUU Regulation, not for other reasons e.g. Food Safety, Customs legislation, etc.*

Yes No

If yes, please provide details in the table below:

Reason for refusal of importation	2016		2017	
	Flag State	No.	Flag State	No.
Non-submission of a catch certificate for products to be imported.				
The products intended for importation are not the same as those mentioned in the catch certificate.				
The catch certificate is not validated by the notified public authority of the flag State				
The catch certificate does not indicate all the required information.				
The importer is not in a position to prove that the fishery products comply with the conditions of Article 14.1 or 2.				
A fishing vessel figuring on the catch certificate as vessel of origin of the catches is included in the Union IUU vessel list or in the IUU vessel lists referred to in Article 30.				
The catch certificate has been validated by the authorities of a flag State identified as a non-cooperating State in accordance with Article 31				
Further to the request for verification (Article 18.2)				

8.2. If the answer to 8.1 is yes, what measures were taken by your authorities towards the refused fishery products?

.....

¹⁴ Section to be filled-in by all Member States

8.3. In case of refusal of importation, did the operators contest the decision of the authorities of your country?

Yes No

If yes, please detail:

Section 9. Information on trade flows¹⁵

9.1. Did your country note a change¹⁶ of imports of fishery products since the last reporting exercise covering the period 2014-2015?

Yes No

If yes, please detail:

There has not been a significant change as regards a change of trade patterns since the last reporting exercise covering the period 2014-2015. The majority of fishery products come from countries such as United States, Morocco, Thailand, Ecuador and Russia. Nevertheless, there has been a decline in imports of fishery products coming from Thailand, Peru, Iceland, Indonesia, Sri Lanka and India while imports of fishery products originating in Russia and the Philippines have risen.

9.2. Please provide information, deriving from your country's statistical data, concerning change of trade patterns in imports of fishery products into your country:

There has not been a significant change of trade patterns since the last reporting exercise covering the period 2014-2015. The majority of fishery products come from countries such as United States, Morocco, Thailand, Ecuador and Russia. Nevertheless, there has been a decline in imports of fishery products coming from Thailand, Peru, Iceland, Indonesia, Sri Lanka and India while imports of fishery products originating in Russia and the Philippines have risen.

Section 10. Information on mutual assistance¹⁷

10.1. Since the last reporting exercise covering the period 2014-2015, how many mutual assistance messages of the Commission has your country replied to?

Please provide separate data for 2016 and 2017 (if any)

2016.....

2017.....

We believe that we replied to all of the mutual assistance messages.

10.2. Since the last reporting exercise covering the period 2014-2015, has your country sent any mutual assistance message to the Commission/other Member States?

¹⁵ Section to be filled-in by all Member States
¹⁶ For example: new kinds of fishery products, new trade patterns or significant and sudden increase in trade volume for a certain species and/or certain third countries.
¹⁷ Section to be filled-in by all Member States

NO

Please provide separate data for 2016 and 2017 (if any)

2016.....

2017.....

Section 11. Information on cooperation with third countries¹⁸

11.1. Apart from verifications and refusals under Articles 17 and 18, has your country had information exchange with third countries on issues related to the implementation of the IUU Regulation, such as follow-up of cases concerning nationals, consignments, trade flows, operators, private fishing licencing, as well as the investigation of criminal activities and serious infringements (Article 42)?

Yes *No*

If yes, please detail (please provide separate data for 2016 and 2017, if any).

.....

Section 12. Information on nationals¹⁹

12.1. Since the last reporting exercise covering the period 2014-2015, has your country implemented or modified existing measures to ensure that your country can take appropriate action with regards to nationals involved in IUU fishing in accordance with Article 39 of the IUU Regulation?

Yes *No*

If yes, please detail:

12.2. What measures has your country taken to encourage nationals to notify any information on interests in third country vessels (Article 40.1)?

.....

12.3. Has your country endeavoured to obtain information on arrangements between nationals and third countries allowing reflagging of their vessels in accordance with Article 40.4?

Yes *No*

If yes, please detail:

12.4. If yes to any of the above, how many cases have your country dealt with and which administrative or penal follow-up was given?

Please provide details:

12.5. Has your country put in place procedures to ensure that nationals do not sell or export any fishing vessels to operators involved in the operation, management or ownership of fishing vessels included in the Union IUU vessel list (Article 40.2)?

Yes *No*

If yes, please provide details:

12.6. Has your country made use of Article 40.3 and removed public aid under national aid regimes or under Union funds to operators involved in the operation, management or ownership of fishing vessels included in the Union IUU vessel list?

Yes *No*

¹⁸ Section to be filled-in by all Member States

¹⁹ Section to be filled-in by all Member States

If yes, please detail:

All the questions 12.1, 12.2., 12.3., 12.4., 12.5., 12.6., 12.7., 12.8., 12.9., 12.10., 12.11., are not relevant for the Czech Republic. The Czech Republic is a landlocked country and is not engaged in the marine fishing, the Czech Republic does not own the fishing fleet.

Section 13. Infringements (Chapter IX of the IUU Regulation) and Sightings (Chapter X of the IUU Regulation)²⁰

13.1. Has your country detected serious infringements as defined in Article 42 of the IUU Regulation from 1 January 2016 until 31 December 2017?

Yes *No*

If yes, please detail separately for each year the number of serious infringements, nature and sanctions applied:

Flag State of the vessel or nationality of the operator (EU and non-EU)	Serious infringements detected in 2016:			Serious infringements detected in 2017:		
	Number	Nature	Sanctions applied	Number	Nature	Sanctions applied
<i>Country 1</i>						
<i>Country 2</i>						
...						
<i>Country x</i>						
<i>Total</i>						

13.2. Has your country applied or adapted its levels of administrative sanctions in accordance with Article 44?

Yes *No*

If yes, please detail:

Currently, the fishing right in the Czech Republic is regulated by Act No. 99/2004 Coll., of 10 February 2004, on fish farming, exercise of fishing right, fishing inspection, protection of marine fishing resources and on amending certain Acts as amended (in 2012, 2015, 2016 and in 2017) .

The Fisheries Act is implemented under Decree No. 197/2004 Coll., of 13 April 2004, as amended by Decree No. 239/2006 Coll., by Decree No.20/2010 Coll., by Decree No. 122/2010 Coll., and Decree No. 123/2016 Coll.

²⁰ Section to be filled-in by all Member States

13.3. Has your country issued sighting reports from 1 January 2016 until 31 December 2017?

- Yes* *No* **This question is not relevant for the Czech Republic.**

If yes, how many sighting reports were issued by your country from 1 January 2016 until 31 December 2017?

Flag State of the sighted vessel (EU and non-EU)	No of sighting reports issued in 2016	No of sighting reports issued in 2017
<i>Country 1</i>		
<i>Country 2</i>		
<i>...</i>		
<i>Country x</i>		
<i>Total</i>		

13.4. Since the last reporting exercise covering the period 2014-2015, has your country received any sighting reports for its own vessels from other competent authorities?

- Yes* *No* **This question is not relevant for the Czech Republic.**

If yes, please detail follow-up (in accordance with Article 50 of the IUU Regulation).

.....

Section 14. General

14.1. In the reporting period 2016/2017, what have been the main difficulties that your country has encountered in implementing the IUU Regulation, including the catch certification scheme?

The interpretation of RFMO’s rules has been a major issue in the implementation of the IUU Regulation. The non-existence of EU-wide IUU IT system is a problem as well.

.....

14.2. Which improvements would your country suggest to the Regulation that would make implementation smoother?

.....

Section 15. Any other comments

.....

.....

.....

...