



Report of the 4th Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria

Victoria, Mahé, Seychelles, 5–7 February 2018

DISTRIBUTION:

Participants in the Session
Members of the Commission
Other interested Nations and International Organizations
FAO Fisheries Department
FAO Regional Fishery Officers

BIBLIOGRAPHIC ENTRY

IOTC 2018. Report of the 4th Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria. Victoria, Mahé, Seychelles 5–7 February 2018. *IOTC-2018-TCAC04-R[E]*: 17 pp.

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this publication and its lists do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) or the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

This work is copyright. Fair dealing for study, research, news reporting, criticism or review is permitted. Selected passages, tables or diagrams may be reproduced for such purposes provided acknowledgment of the source is included. Major extracts or the entire document may not be reproduced by any process without the written permission of the Executive Secretary, IOTC.

The Indian Ocean Tuna Commission has exercised due care and skill in the preparation and compilation of the information and data set out in this publication. Notwithstanding, the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission, employees and advisers disclaim all liability, including liability for negligence, for any loss, damage, injury, expense or cost incurred by any person as a result of accessing, using or relying upon any of the information or data set out in this publication to the maximum extent permitted by law.

Contact details:

Indian Ocean Tuna Commission
Le Chantier Mall
PO Box 1011
Victoria, Mahé, Seychelles
Ph: +248 4225 494
Fax: +248 4224 364
Email: iotc-secretariat@fao.org
Website: <http://www.iotc.org>

ACRONYMS

| | |
|-------|--|
| CMM | Conservation and Management Measure (of the IOTC; Resolutions and Recommendations) |
| CPCs | Contracting Party and Cooperating Non-Contracting Party |
| DWFN | Distant Water Fishing Nation |
| EEZ | Exclusive Economic Zone |
| FAO | Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations |
| FPAO | Fédération des Pêcheurs Artisans de L’Océan Indien |
| IOTC | Indian Ocean Tuna Commission |
| IPNLF | International Pole and Line Foundation |
| ISSF | International Seafood Sustainability Foundation |
| IGO | Inter-governmental Organisation |
| IUU | Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated |
| NGO | Non-governmental organization |
| SC | Scientific Committee of the IOTC |
| SWIOC | Southwest Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission |
| TCAC | Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria |
| WWF | World Wide Fund for Nature (a.k.a. World Wildlife Fund) |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| 1. Opening of the Session | 6 |
| 2. Letter of Credentials | 6 |
| 3. Admission of Observers | 6 |
| 4. Adoption of the Agenda and arrangements for the session | 6 |
| 5. Background of the Work of the TCAC to-date | 6 |
| 6. Proposals for a Quota Allocation System in IOTC | 7 |
| 7. Proposals for Alternative Management Measures | 9 |
| 8. Other Business | 9 |
| 9. Adoption of the report of the 4th Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria | 9 |
| Appendix 1. List of Participants | 10 |
| Appendix 2. Statements of Mauritius and the United Kingdom (OT) related to letters of credential, regarding issues of sovereignty | 14 |
| Appendix 3. Agenda of the 4 th Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria | 16 |
| Appendix 4. List of Documents | 17 |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 4th Session of the Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria (TCAC04) was held in Mahé, Victoria, Seychelles, from 5 to 7 February 2018, Chaired by an independent Chairperson, Mr Don MacKay. A total of 102 delegates attended the Session, comprising delegates from 22 Contracting Parties (Members), 9 observer organisations, and 4 invited experts.

Two proposals for allocation criteria were submitted for consideration. Both proposals were aimed at providing a fair and equitable allocation scheme for IOTC members, although there were CPCs that noted their view that each proposal fell short of that intention. Both proposals recognized such a scheme must include a fair and effective distribution of allocated catch among both coastal and flag States. Both proposals considered that they had used the appropriate and various provisions of the UN Fish Stocks Agreement and the UN Convention on Law of the Sea as their basis for the provisions within the proposals and their outlined approach to calculating a weighted allocation system, although their interpretation of the international legal provisions differed.

Although there were many similarities among the proposals they differed in some very sensitive areas. For example, while both proposals recognized that a baseline catch history should be allotted to each CPC, the G16 group of like-minded Coastal States believe that 100% of the catch taken in an EEZ by a foreign vessel should accrue solely to the Coastal State. Most of the DWFN present on the other hand believe that catches taken in the EEZ should be attributed solely to the flag States. However, some DWFN expressed their willingness to share a portion of these catches as a possible compromise. Both proposals agree some form of transferability of allocation should be included but they differ on which States would be eligible for those transfers.

Despite these basic differences, the TCAC was aligned in a number of areas. Both proponents of PropA and PropB acknowledge that all CPCs are entitled to a baseline allocation with due consideration being given to developing countries and Small Island Developing States. And proponents of both proposals generally agree a balance needs to be struck between the rights of Coastal States and DWFN, and the related duties and freedom of all States to fish on the High Seas. However, there were different views as to whether each proposal achieved this. Both sides recognize this approach to allocation must consider and address developing countries while also not placing undue burden on the resources in areas beyond national jurisdiction nor an insupportable social and economic imposition on Members, with some CPCs noting the need for a transitional period for implementation.

The TCAC discussions focused on allocation criteria and not allocation amounts. In order for any CPC to agree to a final allocation scheme the outcomes produced when the criteria is applied must first be understood. Therefore, the TCAC **AGREED** that simulations be conducted for both proposals using the same set data, and to this end catch histories for each CPC for the period 1950 to 2016 would be derived and communicated to the CPCs.

The TCAC **AGREED** that in order to be considered at future TCAC meetings, all proposals will be submitted to the IOTC Secretariat sufficiently in advance in order to allow the IOTC Secretariat the ability to provide the proposals to all members a minimum of 30 days prior to the date of TCAC meeting at which the proposal will be considered.

1. OPENING OF THE SESSION

1. The 4th Session of the Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria (TCAC04) was held in Victoria, Mahé, Seychelles, from 5 to 7 February 2018. Chaired by an independent Chairperson, Mr. Don MacKay. A total of 102 delegates attended the Session, comprised of 82 delegates from 22 Contracting Parties (Members), 14 delegates from 9 observer organisations and 4 invited experts. The list of participants is provided at [Appendix 1](#).
2. The Chair Mr. Don MacKay welcomed the participants to the TCAC04.

2. LETTER OF CREDENTIALS

3. The TCAC **NOTED** that in accordance with Rule III, para. 1 of the IOTC Rules of Procedure (2014), a Letter of Credentials was received from 19 CPCs and the 9 observers present at the meeting.
4. The TCAC also **NOTED** the statements made by Mauritius and the United Kingdom (OT) on sovereignty, which are provided in [Appendix 2](#).

3. ADMISSION OF OBSERVERS

5. The TCAC further **NOTED** that at the 17th Session of the Commission, Members decided that its subsidiary bodies should be open to participation by observers from all those who have attended the current and/or previous sessions of the Commission. Applications by new Observers should continue to follow the procedure as outlined in Rule XIV of the IOTC Rules of Procedure (2014).

a. Intergovernmental Organisations (IGO)

- SWIOFish Project
- Southwest Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission (SWIOFC)

b. Non-governmental Organisations (NGO)

- World Wide Fund for Nature (a.k.a World Wildlife Fund, WWF)
- Fédération des Pêcheurs Artisans de L'Océan Indien (FPAO)
- International Seafood Sustainability Foundation (ISSF)
- International Pole and Line Foundation (IPNLF)
- Earfish
- Coalition for Fair Fisheries Arrangements

c. Invited experts

- Taiwan, Province of China

4. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE SESSION

6. The agenda is provided at [Appendix 3](#). All additional documents presented to the TCAC04, which included 4 new Information Papers (IOTC-2017-S21-PropN_Rev1E_wtc, IOTC-2018-TCAC04-INFO1, IOTC-2018-TCAC04-INFO2, IOTC-2018-TCAC04-INFO3), were considered under [Agenda item 6](#) and are listed in [Appendix 4](#).
7. The TCAC **REQUESTED** to reorder the bullet points under the Agenda item 6 so as to discuss the both proposals (IOTC-2018-TCAC04-PropA and IOTC-2018-TCAC04-PropB) under one item and to only discuss the document on compilation of allocation principles (IOTC-2018-TCAC04-INFO2) if time allowed. The TCAC **ADOPTED** the Agenda with the proposed amendment.

5. BACKGROUND OF THE WORK OF THE TCAC TO-DATE

5.1 Review of the Work of the TCAC to-date

8. The Executive Secretary, provided a brief overview of the outcomes and accomplishments from the last TCAC meeting (TCAC03). He noted, at the time of the last TCAC (TCAC03) there was general agreement that the document on guiding principles would be the basis for further discussions at future meetings. He also informed the TCAC that, as requested by TCAC03, the IOTC Scientific Committee has produced a document (IOTC-2017-SC20-INFO5) estimating EEZ catches and reporting on availability and quality of those EEZ catches.

5.2 Decisions of the Commission Related to the Work of the TCAC

9. The Executive Secretary further **NOTED** the IOTC Commission, in its review of the last TCAC report, agreed that the TCAC should meet as soon as possible to continue discussion on the TCAC allocation proposal put forward by

some participants, which at the time was entitled IOTC-2017-S21-PropN_Rev1. It was clarified to the participants that this document has received further comments and feedback from other TCAC participants and as such has been subsequently revised. The document in its current revised state will be discussed during this meeting as IOTC-2018-TCAC04-PropB_Rev under Agenda item 6.

5.3 Introduction to Allocation Criteria Systems in other RFMOs

10. The Executive Secretary reported to the TCAC that he had sent a correspondence to the other tuna RFMOs inquiring how each one addressed allocation. The only response received was from CCSBT, which explained it had recently updated and adopted an allocation resolution which constituted a simple division of allocation among members providing each Member with a set amount and a limited ability to change the allocated amounts. The process to change the set allocation requires a negotiation among its Commission.
11. The TCAC **NOTED** that the work undertaken by the CCSBT in this area was based on historical catch as well as consideration of the aspirations of developing countries, many of whom did not have historical catch history or equal temporal historical catch. However, the TCAC also **NOTED** that the allocated amount was not derived from a definitive, quantitative formula but was instead based on a qualitative discussion. The TCAC also **NOTED** that other RFMOs, such as ICCAT, had also produced only qualitative criteria, but in practice is based mainly on historical catch history. Some CPCs **NOTED** that the CCSBT has fewer members and manages only 1 species and thus may not be a beneficial example on which the IOTC could base its catch allocation scheme.
12. The TCAC **CONCLUDED** that the current discussions and proposed mechanisms for an IOTC allocation plan are more advanced than those of other RFMOs, that there is no one-size fits all approach, and that due to the IOTC's large membership. Some CPCs **NOTED** that due to the number of species managed as well as the economic and cultural impacts of allocation in the Indian Ocean, such comparisons among RFMOs have limited benefit. It was further concluded that the best use of the TCAC's time in moving forward would be to discuss the Member proposals that have been tabled at this meeting and to advance the work already established by the TCAC.

6. PROPOSALS FOR A QUOTA ALLOCATION SYSTEM IN IOTC

6.1 Presentation and discussion of Proposals from Members (IOTC-2018-TCAC04-PropA-Rev1 and IOTC-2018-TCAC04-PropB-Rev1)

13. Two proposals were introduced to the TCAC entitled IOTC-2018-TCAC04-PropA and IOTC-2018-TCAC04-PropB. These were revised to IOTC-2018-TCAC04-PropA-Rev1 and IOTC-2018-TCAC04-PropB-Rev1. IOTC-2018-TCAC04-PropB was formerly entitled IOTC-S21-PropN and was first introduced in Indonesia at the S21 of IOTC. Since that time the sponsors of the proposal received comments and suggested edits from many CPCs and the proposal was subsequently revised and titled IOTC-2018-TCAC04-PropB.
14. The TCAC **NOTED** the statements by Mauritius, UK (OT), and France (OT) on sovereignty which are provided in [Appendix 2](#).
15. The TCAC shared the desire to reach agreement swiftly for the benefit of the IOTC stocks. Both proposals are aimed at providing a fair and equitable allocation scheme for IOTC CPCs, although there were CPCs that **NOTED** their view that each proposal fell short of that intention. Both recognize such a scheme must include a fair and effective distribution of allocated catch among both coastal and flag States. Both proposals considered to have used the appropriate and various provisions of the UN Fish Stocks Agreement and the UN Convention on Law of the Sea as their basis for the provisions within the proposals and their outlined approach to calculating a weighted allocation system.
16. While both proposals base their text on the pertinent and appropriate bodies of international law, each has interpreted the provisions differently. Although there are many similarities among the proposals they do differ in some very sensitive areas. For example, while both proposals recognize that a baseline catch history should be allotted to each CPC, the G16 group of like-minded Coastal States believe that 100% of the catch taken in an EEZ by a foreign vessel should accrue solely to the Coastal State. Most of the DWFN present on the other hand believe that catches taken in the EEZ should be attributed solely to the flag States. However, some DWFN expressed their willingness to share a portion of these catches as a possible compromise. Both proposals agree some form of transferability of allocation should be included but they differ on which States would be eligible for those transfers.
17. Despite these basic differences, the TCAC were aligned in a number of areas. Both proponents of IOTC-2018-TCAC04-PropA and IOTC-2018-TCAC04-PropB acknowledge that all CPCs are entitled to a baseline allocation with due consideration being given to developing countries and Small Island Developing States. Proponents of both proposals generally agree a balance needs to be struck between the rights of Coastal States and DWFN, and the related duties and freedom of all States to fish on the High Seas, but again, there were many different views as to

whether each proposal achieved this. Both sides recognize this approach to allocation must consider and address developing countries while also not placing undue burden on the resources in areas beyond national jurisdiction nor an insupportable social and economic imposition on Members. Major changes and/or reductions in allocated catch will affect not only the specific fishing fleet but also the economic components within the industry as well as other industries dependent on the fishing industry and different views were presented as to the degree that this might occur. Some CPCs therefore **NOTED** the need for a transitional period over which to implement any changes in allocation as a result of the new allocation principles and IOTC–2018–TCAC04–PropA proposes a transitional mechanism.

Areas of common ground reached among the participants were as follows:

- i. All CPCs should be afforded a baseline allocation and an additional allocation(s) that takes account of other criteria, including catch history, in a manner that considers the interests both of DWFN and coastal States.
 - ii. Any final and adopted allocation scheme should provide language that is inclusive of a long-term participating fishing fleet.
 - iii. Some provision on transferability should be contained in a final resolution and the process for the transfers should be fully transparent.
 - iv. Elements must be developed on a weighted approach in allocation that clearly considers the size of an EEZ of the Coastal State, developing States, Small Island Developing States, and that differentiates between States of low, middle and high income. Sponsors should seek a system that is clear and not overly complex.
 - v. There is merit to considering separate reference periods per species.
 - vi. There is merit in considering a compliance component but such a provision should not unduly remove access to fishing due to minor infractions or place undue burden on States who have demonstrated their commitment to comply with management schemes but are faced with technical or capacity challenges in enforcement and/or compliance.
 - vii. Language regarding special rights of developing States, a differentiation between States of varying income, and artisanal fisheries needs to be better defined and delineated.
 - viii. There is merit to considering the highly migratory nature of the tuna resources.
18. In addition to understanding the outcomes of the applied criteria contained in the proposals have on allocation for each CPC and to allow CPCs to arrive at an informed decision, there are two areas that require attention a.) how to account for catch history that considers fishing patterns on both a spatial and flag State basis (where the fish were caught and by which flag State) and b.) how to implement such an allocation without undue economic burden on any one CPC.
 19. It was **NOTED** that this discussion was focused on allocation criteria and not allocation amounts. In order for any CPC to agree to a final allocation scheme the outcomes produced when the criteria is applied must first be understood. Therefore, until it is known how well the criteria perform in meeting the expectations of CPCs, no final decision can be reached. In this regard the TCAC **AGREED** that simulations be conducted for both proposals using the same set data.
 20. The TCAC **REQUESTED** that the IOTC Secretariat prepare catch histories for each CPC using the baseline historical catch allocation criteria currently described in paragraphs 16(a) and 16(b) of IOTC–2018–TCAC04–PropB-Rev1 and for this information to be communicated to the CPCs as soon as possible. For this request, the catch period shall be from 1950 to 2016.
 21. The IOTC Secretariat reminded the TCAC that the current data sets to be used in the simulations contain uncertainties and gaps.
 22. Mozambique, Somalia, and the Philippines **NOTED** the uncertainty surrounding each country’s catch estimates and requested assistance from the IOTC Secretariat in order to examine ways to improve the data.
 23. The TCAC **NOTED** that existing management measures on capacity limitations and one CPC indicated that these measures may need to be continued until any allocation measures come into force.
 24. TCAC **NOTED** the need to establish allocation procedures in parallel to developing harvest control rules (including TAC) for each species.
 25. The TCAC **NOTED** that the principles and criteria proposed in the IOTC–2018–TCAC04–PropB-Rev1 submitted by 10 CPCs out of the Group of G16 like-minded coastal States received support from a number of other G16 coastal States. The proponents re-iterated the adoption of the allocation system would be a phased approach and the current

proposal is limited to principles and criteria. The proponents also indicated their intention to submit a further revised version of the proposal for consideration at the next session of Commission, set to be held in May 2018.

26. The TCAC **NOTED** that IOTC-2018-TCAC04-PropA-Rev1 was seen by some CPCs, notably most DWFNs present, as a good basis for further work and recognized the effort at convergence.

6.2 Discussion on the basis of Appendix VII the to the Report of the 3rd Session of the TCAC (IOTC-2016-TCAC03-R) Possible Principles for Allocation, as per Recommendation TCAC03.03

27. This item was not discussed at TCAC04.

7. PROPOSALS FOR ALTERNATIVE MANAGEMENT MEASURES

28. No proposals for alternative management measures were submitted at this meeting.

8. OTHER BUSINESS

29. The TCAC **AGREED** that in order to be considered at future TCAC meetings, all proposals will be submitted to the IOTC Secretariat sufficiently in advance in order to allow the IOTC Secretariat the ability to provide the proposals to all members a minimum of 30 days prior to the date of TCAC meeting at which the proposal will be considered.

9. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE 4TH TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ON ALLOCATION CRITERIA

30. The TCAC **ADOPTED** the report of the 4th Session of the Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria (IOTC-2018-TCAC04-R) on 7 February 2018.

APPENDIX 1. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

CHAIRPERSON

Mr Don **MacKay**
Independent Consultant: New Zealand
don_maria_mackay@msn.com

IOTC MEMBERS

AUSTRALIA

Head of Delegation

Ms Jenny **Baldwin**
Department of Agriculture and Water Resources
jenny.baldwin@agriculture.gov.au

Alternate

Mr Ashley **Williams**
Department of Agriculture and Water Resources
ashley.williams@agriculture.gov.au

Advisor(s)

Mr Trent **Timmiss**
Australian Fisheries Management Authority
trent.timmiss@afma.gov.au

Mr Wez **Norris**

Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency
wez.norris@ffa.int

CHINA

Mr Jianfeng **Zhu**
Shanghai Ocean University
jfzhu@shou.edu.cn

Alternate

Mr Xuejian **Chen**
China Overseas Fisheries Association
1528957706@ff.com

Advisor(s)

Mr Zijun **Zhou**
China Overseas Fisheries Association
admin1@tuna.org.cn

Ming **Lv**

Shanghai Ocean University
m-lv@shou.edu.cn

COMOROS

Head of Delegation

Mr Boina **Said**
Direction Générale des Ressources Halieutiques de Comores
dalaili@live.fr

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Head of Delegation

Mr Anders **Jessen**
European Commission
Anders.JESSEN@ec.europa.eu

Alternate

Mr Orlando **Fachada**
European Commission
Orlando.fachada@ec.europa.eu

Advisor(s)

Mr Herve **Delsol**
European Union
herve.delsol@eeas.europa.eu

Mr Antonio **Lizcano Palomares**
SGP
alizcano@mapama.es

Mr Alan **Gray**

European Commission
alan.gray@eu.europa.eu

Mr Julio **Moron Ayala**

European Commission
julio.moron@opagac.org

Mr Juan Pablo **Rodriguez**

European Commission
juanpablo@anabac.org

Mr Pierre Allain **Carre**

Compagnie Française du Thon Océanique
pierrealain.carre@cfto.fr

Mr Fabien **Le Galloudec**

Direction des pêches maritimes et de l'aquaculture
fabien.le-galloudec@agriculture.gouv.fr

Mr Michel **Goujon**

ORTHONGEL
mgoujon@orthongel.fr

Mr Auke Van de kerk

Compagnie Française du Thon Océanique
auke.vandekerke@cfto.fr

FRANCE (OT)

Head of Delegation

Son Excellence Lionel **Majesté-Larrouy**
Ambassadeur de France aux Seychelles
cad.victoria-amba@diplomatie.gouv.fr

Alternate

Mrs Anne-France **Mattlet**
Direction des pêches maritimes et de l'aquaculture
anne-france.mattlet@agriculture.gouv.fr

INDIA

Absent

INDONESIA

Head of Delegation

Mr Trian **Yunanda**
Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries
tryand_fish@yahoo.com

Alternate

Prof. **Wudianto**
Fisheries Research Center
wudianto59@gmail.com

Mr Rendra **Purdiansa**

Purse Seine Fishermen Association
hnpn66@yahoo.com

Advisor(s)

Prof. Dr Indra **Jaya**
Bogor Agricultural University
indrajaya@ipb.ac.id

IRAN

Absent

JAPAN

Head of Delegation

Mr Shingo **Ota**
Fisheries Agency of JAPAN
shingo_ota810@maff.go.jp

Alternate

Mr Ryo **Omori**
Fisheries Agency of JAPAN
ryo_omori330@maff.go.jp

Advisor(s)

Mr Kiyoshi **Katsuyama**
Japan Tuna Fisheries Cooperative Association
katsuyama@japantuna.or.jp

KENYA

Absent

KOREA, Rep. of

Head of Delegation

Mr Seunglyong **Kim**
Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries
kpoksl15686@korea.kr

Alternate

Ms Riley Kim **Jung-re**
Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries
riley1126@korea.kr

Advisor(s)

Mr Kim Zang **Geun**
National Institute of Fisheries Science
zgkim5676@gmail.com

Mr Junghee **Yoo**

Dongwon Industries
gagame2@dongwon.com

Mr Alex Guhyun **Kang**

Dongwon Industries
kkh@dongwon.com

Mr Ilkang **Na**

Korea Overseas Fisheries Association
ikna@kosfa.org

MADAGASCAR**Head of Delegation**

Mr Chrysostophe **Razafimandimby**
Ministère des Ressources Halieutiques et de la Pêche
chrysostophe@yahoo.fr

Alternate

Njaka **Ratsimanarisoa**
Ministère des Ressources Halieutiques et de la Pêche
njakka@gmail.com

Advisor(s)

Mr Yacinthe **Razafimandimby**
Unité Statistique Thonière d'Antsiranana
ray_razya@yahoo.fr

Mr Rijasoa **Fanazava**
WWF
rfanazava@wwf.mg

MALAYSIA**Head of Delegation**

Mr Ram Singh **Hari Singh**
Ministry of Agriculture and Agro-Based Industry
ramsingh@moa.gov.my

Mr Samsudin **Basir**
Department of Fisheries
s_basir@yahoo.com

MALDIVES**Head of Delegation**

Dr M. Shiham **Adam**
Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture
msadam@mrc.gov.mv

Alternate

Mr Adam **Ziyad**
Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture
adam.ziyad@fishagri.gov.mv

Advisor(s)

Mr Hussain **Sinan**
Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture
Hussain.sinan@fishagri.gov.mv

Mr John **Burton**
Advisor to the Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture
John.Burton@ipnlf.org

Mr Asif **Abdulla**
Atoll Tuna Pvt Ltd
asif@atolltuna.mv

MAURITIUS**Head of Delegation**

Mr Devanand **Norungee**
Ministry of Ocean Economy, Marine Resources, Fisheries and Shipping
dnorungee@gmail.com

Mrs Veronique **Garrioch**

IBL Seafood
vgarrioch@iblgroupp.com

Mr Laurent **Pinault**
IOSMS
lpinault@sapmer.com

MOZAMBIQUE**Head of Delegation**

Mr Avelino **Munwane**
Ministry of Sea, Inland Waters and Fisheries
avelinoalfiado@hotmail.co.uk

OMAN

Absent

PAKISTAN

Mr Asad **Chandna**
Ministry of Maritime Affairs
asadchandna@gmail.com

PHILIPPINES**Head of Delegation**

Mr Sammy **Malvas**
Bureau of Fisheries & Aquatic Resource
smalvas.bfar@gmail.com

Alternate

Ms Jennifer **Viron**
Bureau of Fisheries & Aquatic Resource
jennyviron@gmail.com

Advisor(s)

Ms Rosanna Bernadette **Contreras**
Sockargen Federation of Fishing and Allied Industries
fishing.federation@gmail.com

SEYCHELLES**Head of Delegation**

Mr Nirmal **Shah**
Seychelles Fishing Authority
nirmal@natureseychelles.org

Alternate

Mr Roy **Clarisse**
Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture
rclarisse@gov.sc

Advisor(s)

Mr Jude Talma
Principal Secretary for Fisheries
italma@gov.sc

Mr Ronny **Renaud**
Seychelles Fishing Authority
ceo@sfa.sc

Ms Emily **Gonthier**
Department of Legal Affairs
emily.g@gov.sc

Mr Vincent **Lucas**
Seychelles Fishing Authority
vlucas@sfa.sc

Mr Yannick **Roucou**

Seychelles Fishing Authority
yroucou@sfa.sc

Ms Sheriffa **Morel**
Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture, Seychelles
sheriffamorel@gov.sc

Mrs Trudy **Lucas**
Central Bank of Seychelles
trudy.lucas@cbs.sc

Mr Beatty **Hoarau**
Seychelles Fishing Authority
beatty.hoarau@gmail.com

Mr Miguel **Herrera**
OPAGAC
miguel.herrera@opagac.org

Mr Howard **Tan**
Deep sea Fisheries
howard.tan2@gmail.com

SOMALIA**Head of Delegation**

Mr Abdirahim **SheikHeile**
Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources
sgunrahim@yahoo.com

SOUTH AFRICA, REP. OF**Head of Delegation**

Ms Siphokazi **Ndudane**
Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
siphokazin@daff.gov.za

Alternate

Mr Saasa **Pheeha**
Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
SaasaP@daff.gov.za

Advisor(s)

Mr Qayiso **Mketsu**
Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
QayisoMK@daff.gov.za

Mr David **Wilson**
Advisor to Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
davetroywilson@gmail.com

SRI LANKA**Head of Delegation**

Mr Nishantha Mohan **Wickramasinghe**
Ministry of Fisheries & Aquatic Resources Development
wnishantha66@gmail.com

Alternate

Mr C.R.B **Fernando**
Ministry of Fisheries & Aquatic Resources Development
clausdef@sitnet.lk

Advisors

Mrs H.P.K **Hewapathirana**
Department of Fisheries and Aquatic
Resources
hewakal2012@gmail.com

Mr Sisira **Haputhantri**
NARA
sisirahaputhantri@yahoo.com

Mr Roshan **Fernando**
Seafood Exporters' Association of Sri Lanka
roshanf@tropicsrilanka.com

Ms Sashini **Fernando**
Seafood Exporters' Association
sashini@tropicsrilanka.com

SUDAN
Absent

TANZANIA (UNITED REPUBLIC OF)

Head of Delegation
Mr Hosea Gonza **Mbilinyi**
Deep Sea Fishing Authority
hoseagonza86@gmail.com

Alternate
Mr Daniel **Kawiche**
Deep Sea Fishing Authority
bababelinda07@gmail.com

Advisor(s)
Mr Omar Ali **Amir**
Deep Sea Fishing Authority
omar.amir@dsfa.go.tz

Ms Maryam **Abdulla**
Ministry of Agriculture, Natural resources,
Livestock and Fisheries
mammabx@yahoo.com

THAILAND

Head of Delegation
Ms Sampan **Panjarat**
Department of Fisheries
spanjarat@yahoo.com

Mr Prasit **Luesrithawornsin**
Department of Fisheries
prasit_kim@hotmail.com

UNITED KINGDOM (OT)
Head of Delegation
Mr John **Pearce**
MRAG
j.pearce@mrag.co.uk

YEMEN
Absent

COOPERATING NON-CONTRACTING PARTIES

BANGLADESH
Absent

LIBERIA
Absent

SENEGAL
Absent

OBSERVERS

**Food and Agriculture Organization of
the UN (FAO)**
Mr Blaise **Kuemplangan**
Chief, Development Law Service
FAO Legal Office
Blaise.Kuemplangan@fao.org

**South West Indian Ocean Fisheries
Project (SWIOFISH1)**
Mr Daroomalingum **Mauree**
daroomalingum.mauree@coi-ioc.com

**South West Indian Ocean Fisheries
Commission (SWIOFC)**
Mr Erudito **Malate**
malateerudito@gmail.com

Mr Vasco **Schmidt**
vasco.schmidt@fao.org

Mr Ahmed **Shifaz**
ahmed.shifaz@fishagri.gov.mv

**Federation of artisanal Fishermen of
the Indian Ocean (FPAOI)**
Mr Ismail **Mahamoudou**
mzesoule@yahoo.fr

Mrs Virginie **Lagarde**
lagarde.vir2@gmail.com

Mr Keith **André**
Email: andrte.kit@gmail.com

**International Seafood Sustainability
Foundation (ISSF)**
Gerald **Scott**
gpscott_fish@hotmail.com

World Wide Fund for Nature
Mr Manuel **Castiano**
mcastiano@wwf.org.mz

**East Africa Platform of Non State
Actors in Fisheries and Aquaculture
Sector (EARFISH)**
Mr Albert **Nappier**

alnapier@hotmail.com

**Coalition for Fair Fisheries
Arrangements (CFFA)**
Mr André **Standing**
standing.andre@gmail.com

**International Pole-and-line
Foundation (IPNLF)**
Mr Daniel **Owen**
daniel.owen@fennerschambers.com

INVITED EXPERTS

Mr Ming-Fen **Wu**
mingfen@mssl.fao.gov.tw

Mr Chien-Nan **Lin**
chiennan@mssl.fao.gov.tw

Mr Kuan-Ting **Lee**
simon@tuna.org.tw

Mr Shih-Ming **Kao**
kaosm@udel.edu

INDIAN OCEAN TUNA COMMISSION SECRETARIAT

Mr Chris **O'Brien**
Chris.OBrien@fao.org

Mr Gerard **Domingue**
Gerard.Domingue@fao.org

Mr Fabio **Fiorellato**
Fabio.Fiorellato@fao.org

Mr Hilario **Murua**
Chair of IOTC Scientific Committee
hmurua@azti.es

Ms Christel **Navarret**
Consultant – documents
christelnavarret@gmail.com

Ms Nicole **Ricci**
Consultant – reports
nmricci@gmail.com

INTERPRETERS

Ms Sylvia **Amisi**
sylviaamisi@yahoo.com

Mr Dickens Omondi **Awiti**
awitidickens@gmail.com

Ms Chantal **Mariotte**
chantal.mariotte@gmail.com

Mr Mesfin **Wolde-Giorghis**
meswolde@gmail.com

APPENDIX 2.

STATEMENTS OF MAURITIUS AND THE UNITED KINGDOM (OT) RELATED TO LETTERS OF CREDENTIAL, REGARDING ISSUES OF SOVEREIGNTY

Statement by the Republic of Mauritius

The Government of the Republic of Mauritius reiterates that the Chagos Archipelago, including Diego Garcia, forms an integral part of the territory of the Republic of Mauritius under both Mauritian law and international law.

The Government of the Republic of Mauritius reaffirms that it does not recognize the so-called “British Indian Ocean Territory” (“BIOT”) which the United Kingdom purported to create by illegally excising the Chagos Archipelago from the territory of Mauritius prior to its accession to independence. This excision was carried out in violation of international law and of United Nations General Assembly Resolutions 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960, 2066 (XX) of 16 December 1965, 2232 (XXI) of 20 December 1966 and 2357 (XXII) of 19 December 1967.

The Government of the Republic of Mauritius further reiterates that the United Kingdom is not entitled to be a member of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) as it is not a “coastal State situated wholly or partly within the Area [of competence of the Commission]”. Nor can the so-called “BIOT” claim to be a member of the IOTC on the basis of Article IV of the IOTC Agreement.

In the light of the foregoing, the delegation of the Republic of Mauritius strongly objects to the ‘Letter of Credentials’ of the UK delegation or the so-called “United Kingdom (OT)” delegation received by the Executive Secretary. It also requests that the ‘Letter of Credentials’ of the UK delegation or the so-called “United Kingdom (OT)” delegation should not be uploaded on the meeting pages of the IOTC website.

UK Position on Sovereignty of the British Indian Ocean Territory

The Government of the United Kingdom is clear about its sovereignty of the Chagos Archipelago, which has been British since 1814, and which it administers as the British Indian Ocean Territory. No international tribunal, including the Arbitral Tribunal constituted under Annex VII to the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), has ever called the UK’s sovereignty of the Territory into doubt

Whilst the United Kingdom does not recognise the Republic of Mauritius’ claim to sovereignty of the Chagos Archipelago, it has repeatedly undertaken to cede it to Mauritius, when no longer required for defence purposes. We maintain that commitment, though it is for the UK alone to determine when this condition is met. In the meantime, BIOT is still needed for defence purposes. It is used to combat some of the most difficult problems of the 21st Century including terrorism, international criminality, instability and piracy.

Marine Protected Area

The British Indian Ocean Territory Marine Protected Area (MPA), which the UK declared in 2010, is highly valued by scientists from many countries. They consider it a global reference site for marine conservation in an ocean that is heavily overfished.

The UNCLOS Tribunal was clear that it took no view on the substantive quality or nature of the MPA. Its concern was confined to the manner in which it was established. The Tribunal found that the UK needed to have further consultation with Mauritius about the establishment of the MPA in order to have due regard to its rights and interests. We began implementation of the Tribunal’s Award with a series of bilateral talks but Mauritius have refused to engage on this following their insistence on being given a date for sovereignty transfer.

Mauritius suggests that the Marine Protected Area (‘MPA’) established within the Territory in 2010 by the UK has been ruled to be “illegal” by that same Arbitral Tribunal. That is not the case. The Tribunal’s Final Observation is:

“In concluding that the declaration of the MPA was not in accordance with the provisions of the Convention, the Tribunal has taken no view on the substantive quality or nature of the MPA or the importance of environmental protection. The Tribunal’s concern has been with the manner in which the MPA was established, rather than its

substance. It is now open to the Parties to enter into the negotiations that the Tribunal would have expected prior to the proclamation of the MPA, with a view to achieving a mutually satisfactory arrangement for protecting the marine environment, to the extent necessary under a “sovereignty umbrella”.”

The Award does not have the effect of rendering the MPA illegal. It explicitly states that the Tribunal takes no view on the substance of the MPA, a measure that preserves the Indian Ocean’s fish stocks, and safeguards their importance for the economy and food security of the region.

The Tribunal’s finding was far more narrow: that the United Kingdom should have consulted the Republic of Mauritius more fully about the establishment of the MPA, so as to give due regard to its rights. As the Tribunal notes in its Final Observation, it is open to both Parties to enter into such negotiations now, and to do so without reference to matters of sovereignty, as the term “sovereignty umbrella” denotes. The Government of the United Kingdom has made extensive efforts to engage the Republic of Mauritius about conservation matters and, following the Award, has begun bilateral consultations with the Republic of Mauritius. We remain committed to working with the Republic of Mauritius to explore all aspects of its interests in relation to the MPA.

UK Position on the right to participate at IOTC

The Agreement for the Establishment of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission provides that IOTC membership shall be open, inter alia, to FAO members that are situated wholly or partly within the IOTC’s Area of Competence. As the British Indian Ocean Territory is situated wholly within the IOTC’s Area of Competence, there can therefore be no doubt that the United Kingdom, as the State with sovereignty over BIOT as aforementioned, is entitled to be a member of IOTC. As such, we are full members of the IOTC and have every right to be here.

IOTC incorrect forum to raise bilateral issues

The United Kingdom regrets the continued use of this important multilateral forum by the Republic of Mauritius to address a bilateral matter. This only serves to distract from the important work of IOTC members to combat the regional IUU threat and other matters considered by this Committee.

The UK notes the statement from the FAO at the IOTC meeting in May 2016 recognising that this is a bilateral matter between Mauritius and the United Kingdom and that the FAO Secretariat would not express any views on the question. The FAO Secretariat went on to state that “The United Kingdom and Mauritius are both Parties to the IOTC Agreement and Members of the IOTC and that the instruments of acceptance of the IOTC Agreement of 1994 and 1995 and none of the instruments contains any declaration, restriction or reservation on the matter. The IOTC is not a forum to discuss issues of sovereignty.” The FAO Secretariat requested both Members not to raise the matter in this forum. As such, the UK thanks the FAO for recognising this matter as a bilateral issue and rather than respond to Mauritius each time it inappropriately raises it, has submitted this written statement for the record, to avoid any further disruption to the work of this meeting.

Reply by the Republic of Mauritius to UK’s Statement

The Government of the Republic of Mauritius reiterates that it does not recognize the so-called “British Indian Ocean Territory” (“BIOT”) and that the Chagos Archipelago, including Diego Garcia, forms an integral part of the territory of the Republic of Mauritius, a position on which no international judge or arbitrator has expressed a contrary view. In the arbitral proceedings initiated in December 2010 by the Republic of Mauritius against the United Kingdom under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, two of the arbitrators concluded that the United Kingdom does not have sovereignty over the Chagos Archipelago.

The Government of the Republic of Mauritius reaffirms that the United Kingdom is not entitled to be a member of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC). Nor can the so-called “BIOT” claim to be a member of the IOTC.

The delegation of the Republic of Mauritius therefore reiterates its strong objection to the ‘Letter of Credentials’ of the UK delegation or the so-called “United Kingdom (OT)” delegation received by the Executive Secretary. It also maintains that the ‘Letter of Credentials’ of the UK delegation or the so-called “United Kingdom (OT)” delegation should not be uploaded on the meeting pages of the IOTC website.

APPENDIX 3.
AGENDA OF THE 4TH TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ON ALLOCATION CRITERIA

Date: 5-7 February 2018

Location: Seychelles

Venue: Savoy Hotel, Beau Vallon

Time: 09:00–17:00 daily

Chairperson: Mr Don MacKay

- 1. OPENING OF THE SESSION** (Chairperson & IOTC Secretariat)
- 2. LETTER OF CREDENTIALS** (IOTC Secretariat)
- 3. ADMISSION OF OBSERVERS** (Chairperson)
- 4. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE SESSION** (Chairperson)
 - IOTC-2016-TCAC04-01: Agenda for the 4th Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria (TCAC03)
 - IOTC-2016-TCAC04-02: List of documents for the 4th Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria (TCAC04)
- 5. BACKGROUND OF THE WORK OF THE TCAC TO-DATE** (IOTC Secretariat)
 - Review of the work of the TAC to-date
 - IOTC-2018-TCAC04-03: Decisions of the Commission related to the work of the TCAC
 - Introduction to allocation criteria system in other tuna RFMOs
- 6. PROPOSALS FOR A QUOTA ALLOCATION SYSTEM IN IOTC**
 - 6.1 Presentation and Discussion of Proposals from Members
 - IOTC-2016-TCAC03-04: Progress on the recommendations of TCAC02 (IOTC Secretariat)
 - IOTC-2016-TCAC03-05: Report on the availability, completeness and quality of catch data for all fleets in the IOTC database (IOTC Secretariat)
 - 6.2 Continuation of Deliberations from 21st Session of the Commission on IOTC-2010-S21-PropN *On the Allocation of Fishing Opportunities for IOTC species*
 - 6.3 Discussion on the Basis of Appendix VII to the Report of the 3rd Session of the TCAC (IOTC-2016-TCAC03-R) Possible Principles for Allocation, as per Recommendation TCAC03.03
- 7. PROPOSALS FOR ALTERNATIVE MANAGEMENT MEASURES** (Chairperson) **PROPOSALS FOR ALTERNATIVE MANAGEMENT MEASURES AS STATED IN RESOLUTION 14/02** (Chairperson)
 - IOTC-2016-TCAC03-PropE: Limiting fishing capacity in the IOTC area of competence. Based on reference capacities (2006 for vessels targeting trop. tunas and 2007 for vessels targeting SWO and ALB) and achieved fleet development plans (European Union)
- 8. OTHER BUSINESS**
- 9. REVIEW OF THE DRAFT, AND ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE 4TH TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ON ALLOCATION CRITERIA (TCAC04)** (Chairperson)

APPENDIX 4.
LIST OF DOCUMENTS

All documents are available on the IOTC website [[click here](#)]

| Document number | Title |
|----------------------------------|--|
| IOTC–2018–TCAC04–01 | Draft agenda for the 4 th Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria |
| IOTC–2018–TCAC04–02 | Comments on IOTC-2017-S22-PropN_Rev1 |
| IOTC–2018–TCAC04–PropA | 2018 Establishing a quota allocation system for the main targeted species in the IOTC Area of Competence (from the European Union) |
| IOTC–2018–TCAC04–PropA-Rev1 | Proposal by the European Union |
| IOTC–2018–TCAC04–PropB | On allocation of fishing opportunities for IOTC species (from 9 coastal States) |
| IOTC–2018–TCAC04–PropB-Rev1 | Allocation of fishing opportunities v5Feb2018 |
| <i>Information papers</i> | |
| IOTC–2018–TCAC04–INF01 | Letter for the TCAC Chairperson |
| IOTC–2-17–TCAC04–INF02 | Possible Principles for Allocation |
| IOTC–2018–TCAC04–INFO3 | TCAC Chair’s comparison of PropA and PropB |
| IOTC–2018–TCAC04–INFO4 | CAOPA/CFFA paper The challenge for setting up access allocation system in IOTC: eliminating overcapacity whilst ensuring the rights of developing states |
| IOTC-2017-SC20-INFO5 | Estimation of EEZ catches |
| IOTC-2017-S21-PropN Rev1 [E] | Proposal N-rev1 as considered by the Commission at S21 |