

Comparison to other tRFMOs
(in U.S. dollars for 2015 costs)

Items	IOTC/FAO	ICCAT	WCPFC	IATTC	CCSBT
Salaries ¹	75,000	90,000	50,000	75,000	97,000
Entitlements/pension/health	57,000	(not available)	58,000	29,000	43,000
SUB-TOTAL entitlements related to IOTC staff ²	855,000	-	870,000	435,000	645,000
Difference ³	0	-622,00	+15,000	-420,000	-210,000
Average Difference ⁴	315000				
ICRU	131,000				
Service costs	141,000				
ICRU + Service Costs related to extraordinary contributions	70,000				
SUB-TOTAL	342,000				
Difference	657,000				
Fishing entities contribution	150,000				

¹ Unit of staff, in case of ICCAT includes all staff related costs

² Cost related to the 15 members of the IOTC staff

³ In the case of ICCAT we have extrapolated the total cost with staff to the costs related to entitlements, pensions and health.

⁴ We have eliminated the extreme cases of ICCAT and WCPFC and calculated the average of IATTC and CCSBT deviations when compared with IOTC

**New expenditure with staff/services for
new/independent RFMO**

807,000

We consider that only marginal cost could be added to the new IOTC, not linked with FAO. In conclusion, when comparing IOTC costs taken by FAO with other RFMO costs, the difference is about 800,000 U.S. dollars per year (based on 2015 costs/budget).

The advantages to stay with the FAO would be only to advance payments whenever there are cash flow problems. However, we have to relativize this advantage taking into account the position taken by the FAO in the last few years. All other advantages identified by FAO, in practical terms, are not in effect or could lead to disadvantages.

Disadvantages to stay with FAO:

- financial impact;
- burden of bureaucracy and time spent in financial circuits;
- lack of transparency;
- lack of independence and imposition of certain budgetary lines;
- unable to manage two thirds of the budget;
- creation of false expectations on scientific, legal services and support;
- membership not allowed to some fishing entities;