ON AN INTERIM PLAN FOR REBUILDING THE INDIAN OCEAN YELLOWFIN TUNA STOCK IN THE IOTC AREA OF COMPETENCE

SUBMITTED BY: Maldives, Kenya, South Africa and Comoros

Explanatory memorandum

In 2015, the Scientific Committee of the IOTC determined the Indian Ocean yellowfin tuna stock to be "Overfished and subject to overfishing". Consequently, the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission, through Resolution 16/01 adopted an "Interim plan for rebuilding the Indian Ocean yellowfin tuna stock in the IOTC area of competence" which was further revised in 2017 (Resolution 17/01), in 2018 (Resolution 18/01) and in 2019 (Resolution 19/01). The objective of the 2016 interim plan was to reduce the catches by 20% of the 2014 levels and to recover the stocks to levels above the interim target reference points with 50% probability by 2024, as per the Scientific Committee advice of 2015.However, the IOTC Commission consistently failed to achieve the catch reductions required by the interim plan and in 2020, the Scientific Committee, noted that even though some of the fisheries subject to catch reductions have reduced their catches, these reductions were offset by increase in catches from fisheries exempt and some fisheries subject to catch limits. Despite the existence of an interim rebuilding plan for the last 4 years, catches have continued to increase and in 2019 increased by around 5.22% of 2014, proving that the current measure is ineffective in achieving the required catch reductions and rebuilding the yellowfin tuna stock.

Furthermore, the Scientific Committee in 2020 noted that the Kobe II strategy matrix (K2SM) based on the 2018 stock assessment is not suitable for management advice due to critical errors in the projections and estimations for computing probabilities in the K2SM. The Scientific Committee also advised the Commission as a precautionary measure, the Commission should ensure that CPCs take all necessary action to achieve catch reductions and recommended that catches be reduced to a level at least below the C_{MSY} estimate until new information based on the 2021 stock assessment and its associated projections are carried out. The Scientific Committee also reminded the Commission that F_{2017} was 20% above the target reference point.

Thus, in order to bring F to the target reference point which equates to around 16.7% reduction in catches compared to 2017 levels. Maldives tabled a proposal at the Special Session of the Commission (SS4) convened in the aim of finding suitable solution to address the status of the yellowfin tuna stocks. The main objective of the proposal tabled was to ensure that catches of yellowfin tuna was brough down to 346,438t in order to achieve full recovery of the stocks by 2025. However, the proposal was challenged by a number of CPCs. It was argued that the proposal did not consider the impacts of the measure on coastal fishing fleets dependent on fisheries and other coastal fleets with development aspirations. Several CPCs also argued that the target reduction proposed by Maldives was unrealistic. Thus, the proposal has been further revised to reflect special circumstances of developing States, in particular Small Islands Developing States and Least Developed CPCs among them, which is enshrined in international law. The total allowable catch under this proposal is at 382,924t. This is around a 15% reduction compared to 2019 catch levels.

Thus, the measure amends 19/01 and proposes the following:

- Reduce and maintain overall yellowfin tuna catch in the Indian Ocean at ~~382,924~~ 401,011t
- Eliminate exemptions provided for in 16/01 (superseded by 17/01, then by 18/01 then by 19/01)
- Reduce the role of supply vessels in purse seine operations to reduce fishing pressure on juvenile yellowfin tuna
- Differentiate reductions based on development status of CPCs as reflected in international law

- Strengthen the penalty, compliance and monitoring mechanisms.

RESOLUTION ~~19/01~~ 21/xx
ON AN INTERIM PLAN FOR REBUILDING THE INDIAN OCEAN YELLOWFIN TUNA STOCK IN THE IOTC AREA OF COMPETENCE

Keywords: Yellowfin tuna, Kobe Process, MSY, Precautionary Approach

The Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC),

CONSIDERING the objectives of the Commission to maintain stocks in perpetuity and with high probability, at levels not less than those capable of producing their maximum sustainable yield as qualified by relevant environmental and economic factors including the special requirements of developing States in the IOTC area of competence;

BEING MINDFUL of Article XVI of the IOTC Agreement regarding the rights of Coastal States and of Article 87 and 116 of the UN Convention of the Law of the Sea regarding the right to fish on the high seas;

RECOGNISING the special requirements of the developing States, particularly Small Island developing States in Article 24(b), of the Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention of the Law of the Sea of December 1982, relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks (UNFSA);

FURTHER RECOGNISING the need to ensure that conservation and management measures do not result in transferring, directly or indirectly, a disproportionate burden of conservation action onto developing States, Article 24(c) of UNFSA;

RECALLING that Article 5, of UNFSA entitles the conservation and management of highly migratory fish stocks are based on best scientific evidence available and with special reference to IOTC Resolution 15/10 for a stock where the assessed status places it within the red quadrant, and with an aim to end overfishing with a high probability and to rebuild the biomass of the stock in as short time as possible;

FURTHER RECALLING that Article 6, of UNFSA and IOTC Resolution 12/01 *"On the implementation of the precautionary approach",* requires the States to be cautious during the application of precautionary approach when information is uncertain, unreliable or inadequate and this should not be a reason for postponing or failing to take conservation and management measures;

CONSIDERING the recommendations adopted by the KOBE II, held in San Sebastian, Spain, June 23 – July 3 2009; implementing where appropriate a freeze on fishing capacity on a fishery by fishery basis and such a freeze should not constrain the access to, development of, and benefit from sustainable tuna fisheries by developing coastal States;

FURTHER CONSIDERING the recommendations adopted by the KOBE III, held in La Jolla, California, 12- 14 July 2011; considering the status of the stocks, each RFMO should consider a scheme for reduction of overcapacity in a way that does not constrain the access to, development of, and benefit from sustainable tuna fisheries, including on the high seas, by developing coastal States, in particular Small Island Developing States, territories, and States with small and vulnerable economies; and Transfer of capacity from developed fishing members to developing coastal fishing members within its area of competence where appropriate;

~~FURTHER CONSIDERING the report by International Council for the Exploration of Sea and FAO Working Group on Fishing Technology and Fish Behaviour (2006), Gillnets are considered to be one of the least catch controllable and least environmentally sustainable gears;~~

~~FURTHER CONSIDERING the recommendations of the 18th Scientific Committee held in Bali, Indonesia, 23 – 27 November 2015 and the 21st session of the Scientific Committee held in Seychelles, 3 – 7 December 2018, that the catches of yellowfin tuna have to be reduced by 20% of the 2017 levels to recover the stocks to levels above the interim target reference points with 50% probability by 2027 as specified in Kobe II Strategy Matrix;~~

FURTHER CONSIDERING the concern of the 20th Session of the Working Party for Tropical Tuna held in Seychelles, 29 October – 3 November 2018, the change in strategy by increase of usage of FADs by the purse seine vessels to maintain catch level targets has led to a substantial increase of juvenile yellowfin tuna and bigeye tuna;

NOTING THAT supply vessels contribute to the increase in effort and capacity of purse seiners and that the number of supply vessels has increased significantly over the years;

FURTHER CONSIDERING the call by the United Nations General Assembly Resolution 70/75 upon the States to increase the reliance on scientific advice in developing, adopting and implementing conservation and management measures and to take into account the special requirements of developing States, including Small Island Developing States (SIDS) as highlighted in the SIDS Accelerated Modalities of Action (SAMOA) Pathway;

NOTING THAT Article V.2b of the Agreement for the Establishment of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission give full recognition to the special interests and needs of Members in the region that are developing countries, in relation to the conservation and management and optimum utilization of stocks covered by this Agreement and encouraging development of fisheries based on such stocks;

FURTHER NOTING THAT Article V.2d requires the Commission to keep under review the economic and social aspects of the fisheries based on the stocks covered by this Agreement bearing in mind, in particular, the interests of developing coastal States. This includes ensuring that conservation and management measures adopted by it do not result in transferring, directly or indirectly, a disproportionate burden of conservation action onto developing States, especially Small Island Developing States;

RECOGNIZING FURTHER the interactions that occur between the fisheries for yellowfin, skipjack and bigeye tuna;

FURTHER CONSIDERING the management advice of the 23rd session of the Scientific Committee, that given the limitations and uncertainties in the stock assessment and the inability to use K2SM derived from the 2018 yellowfin tuna stock assessment, the catches to be reduced to a level at least below the C_{MSY} estimate (403, 000MT) and the need to decrease the fishing mortality from the 2017 level in order to remove overfishing on the stock;

FURTHER CONSIDERING the issues raised in the 23rd session of the Scientific Committee regarding the estimated K2SM probabilities derived from the 2018 stock assessment, and that due to critical errors in projections and estimations in computing probabilities in the K2SM developed in 2018, the K2SM is not suitable to provide management advice;

FURTHER CONSIDERING the SC 2020 advice that Commission should ensure that CPCs take all necessary action to achieve the catch reductions in their fleets as per Resolution 19/01.

~~CONSIDERING paragraph 12 of Resolution 16/01 [superseded by Resolution 17/01, then by Resolution 18/01] that~~

~~allows the Commission to review this Interim Plan before 2019;~~

ADOPTS, in accordance with the provisions of Article IX, paragraph 1 of the IOTC Agreement, the following:

Application

1. This resolution shall apply to all CPCs fishing ~~vessels targeting tuna and tuna like species in the Indian Ocean of 24 meters overall length and over, and those under 24 meters if they fish outside the EEZ of their flag State,~~ within the IOTC area of competence.

2. The measures contained within this Resolution shall be considered as interim measure and will be reviewed by the Commission no later than at its annual Session in ~~2020~~ 2022.

3. Notwithstanding paragraph 2, this Resolution shall be reviewed when a formal Management Procedure for the management of the yellowfin tuna stock is adopted by the Commission and in effect.

4. Nothing in this resolution shall pre-empt or prejudice future allocation of fishing opportunities.

4bis. ~~The CPCs classification and development status as outlined in Appendix 1 shall be used in the application of this Resolution.~~

Catch limits

~~5. **Purse seine:** CPCs whose purse seine catches of yellowfin reported for 2014 were above 5000 MT to reduce their purse seine catches of yellowfin by 15 % from the 2014 levels.~~

~~6. **Gillnet:** CPCs whose Gillnet catches of yellowfin reported for 2014 were above 2000 MT to reduce their Gillnet catches of yellowfin by 10% from the 2014 levels.~~

~~7. **Longline:** CPCs whose Longline catches of yellowfin reported for 2014 were above 5000 MT to reduce their Longline catches of yellowfin by 10% from the 2014 levels.~~

~~8. **CPCs' other gears:** CPCs whose catches of yellowfin reported from other gears reported for 2014 were above 5000 MT to reduce their other gear catches of yellowfin by 11 % from the 2014 levels.~~

5. CPCs whose reported catches of yellowfin tuna for 2014 were above 5000t shall reduce their catches of yellowfin tuna by 21% compared to 2014 yellowfin tuna catch, except;
    a. If those CPCs are Coastal Developing States, they shall reduce their catches of yellowfin tuna by 12% compared to 2014 yellowfin tuna catch;
    b. If those CPCs are Small Island Developing States or Least Developed States, they shall reduce their catches of yellowfin tuna by 10% compared to 2014 yellowfin tuna catch.

~~CPCs whose reported catches of yellowfin tuna for 2014 were above 5000t to reduce their catches of yellowfin tuna as follows;~~

~~c. Distant Water Fishing CPCs by 35% compared 2014 yellowfin tuna catch~~
~~d. Developed Coastal State CPCs by 30% compared to 2014 yellowfin tuna catch~~
~~e. Developing Coastal State CPCs by 11% compared to 2014 yellowfin tuna catch~~
~~f. For Small Island Developing State CPCs and Least Developed State CPCs by 9% compared to 2014 yellowfin tuna catch~~

6. CPCs whose reported catches of yellowfin tuna for 2014 were below 5000t and their average catches of yellowfin tuna for the period from 2017 to 2019 inclusive, were above 5000t, shall reduce their catches of yellowfin tuna by 21% compared to 2014 yellowfin tuna catch, except;
    a. If those CPCs are Coastal Developing States, they shall reduce their catches of yellowfin tuna by 12% compared to average of 2017 – 2019 yellowfin tuna catch;
    b. If those CPCs are Small Island Developing States or Least Developed States, they shall reduce their catches of yellowfin tuna by 10% compared to average of 2017 – 2019 or 2018 yellowfin tuna catch, whichever is higher.

~~CPCs whose reported catches of yellowfin tuna for 2014 were below 5000t and their average catches of yellowfin tuna for the period from 2017 to 2019 inclusive, were above 5000t, to reduce their catches of yellowfin tuna as follows;~~

~~c. Distant Water Fishing CPCs and Developed Coastal State CPCs by 25% 35% compared to average of 2017 – 2019 yellowfin tuna catch~~
~~d. Developed Coastal State CPCs by 30% compared to average of 2017 – 2019 yellowfin tuna catch~~
~~e. Developing Coastal State CPCs by 11% compared to average of 2017 – 2019 yellowfin tuna catch~~
~~f. For Small Island Developing State CPCs and Least Developed State CPCs by 9% compared to average of 2017 – 2019 yellowfin tuna catch~~

7. CPCs whose reported catches of yellowfin tuna for 2014 were below 5000t and their average catches of yellowfin tuna for the period from 2017 to 2019 inclusive were between 2000t to 5000t, shall not exceed ~~their yellowfin tuna catches either~~ from 2019 levels ~~or the average of 2017 to 2019 or~~ their maximum reported yellowfin tuna catches between 2017 to 2019.

~~8.~~ CPCs whose reported catches of yellowfin tuna for 2014 were below 5000t and their average catches of yellowfin tuna for the period from 2017 to 2019 inclusive were below 2000t, shall not exceed their catches above 2000t ~~of yellowfin tuna as follows;~~

~~a. Distant Water Fishing CPCs shall not exceed their yellowfin tuna catches either at 2019 levels or the average of 2017 to 2019.~~
~~b. All Coastal State CPCs to maintain their catch of yellowfin tuna at or below 2000t.~~

[8bis. In respect of para 8, for conservation purposes, France, Philippines and UK exceptionally for 2022 (or 1 year), commit not to exceed yellowfin tuna catches of 1000t, 700t and 500t respectively.]

9. In applying the catch reductions ~~by gears in provisions~~ in paragraph 5~~, 6, 7 and 8~~, Small Island Developing State CPCs and Least Developed ~~Countries~~ State CPCs can either choose between catches of yellowfin tuna reported for either 2014, or 2015 or their average catches for the period from 2017 to 2019. ~~For such CPCs Paragraph 12(a) is applicable over the accumulated catch in 2018 and 2019~~.

9bis. In applying the catch reductions in paragraph 5 for Distant Water Fishing Nation, if the average yellowfin tuna catches between 2017 – 2019 were below 10,000t, CPCs shall reduce their yellowfin catch by 13% compared to 2014 levels.

9bis. The Appendix 1 of this Resolution lists the respective paragraph(s) on catch limits that would apply to each CPC.

~~10. Exceptionally for 2019 and 2020, Small Island Developing States CPCs that contributed less than 4% of the total yellowfin catch of the Indian Ocean in 2017, shall reduce their purse seine catch by 7.5% of 2018 levels.~~

~~11. Any CPC to whom para 5- 10 do not apply and whose catches exceeded the threshold limits in any subsequent~~

~~year (from 2017), shall reduce their catches to the levels prescribed for that particular gear as mentioned in paragraphs 5, 6, 7 and 8.~~

11. CPCs ~~Flag States~~ will determine appropriate methods for achieving these catch reductions, which could include capacity reductions, effort limits, *etc*.., and will report to the IOTC Secretariat in their Implementation Report every year.

11bis. Any CPC who submits updated catch histories of yellowfin tuna in accordance with IOTC resolution 15/01 and verified by the secretariat and the IOTC Scientific Committee, shall have a right to access yellowfin tuna in accordance with the limits prescribed in the Resolution.

Over catch of annual limit

12. If over catch of an annual limit for a given ~~fleet of a~~ CPC listed in paragraph 5 to 8~~10~~ occurs, catch limits for that ~~fleet~~ CPC shall be reduced as follows:

~~a. If the accumulated catch in 2017, 2018 and 2019 exceeds the sum of the catch limit[1] for 2017, 2018 and 2019 the excess (over-catch) shall be deducted from the 2021 catch limit.~~

~~b. for 2020 and following years, 100% of that over-catch shall be deducted from following two years limit; unless~~

a. for over-catch of limits set forth in Resolution 19/01, in 2020 and/or 2021, 100% of that over-catch shall be deducted from following two years limit, and;

b. over-catch in 2022 and following years, 100% of that over-catch shall be deducted from the following two years' limit, unless;

c. Over-catch for that ~~fleet~~ CPC has occurred in two or more consecutive years, in which case 125% of the over-catch shall be deducted from the following two years limit.

13. CPCs that are subject to catch reductions due to over-catch shall inform the Commission via the IOTC Compliance Committee, corrective actions taken by the CPC to adhere to the prescribed catch levels, ~~any reductions in the following year because of over catch in paragraph 12~~ in their implementation Report.

14. The revised limits from paragraph 12 will apply in the following year and CPCs compliance shall be assessed against the revised limits reported to the IOTC Compliance Committee.

~~15.~~ The tropical tuna data submitted by CPCs in accordance with Resolution 15/01 *"On the recording of catch and effort data by fishing vessels in the IOTC area of competence"* and Resolution 15/02 *"Mandatory statistical reporting requirements for IOTC Contracting Parties and Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties (CPCs)"* shall be reviewed by the Secretariat and discussed by the Scientific Committee for possible inconsistencies. In such cases, the Scientific Committee shall provide the rationale of the detected inconsistencies and justify the choice of the best solution available with regard the scientific analysis to be carried out. Data used for catch limit calculations shall be based on the data reviewed, including possible estimates, by the Secretariat~~, estimates derived by the Secretariat and endorsed by the Scientific Committee.~~

~~[1] Catches of Indonesia is based on the national reports submitted to the Scientific Committee~~

Supply Vessels

16. CPCs shall gradually reduce supply vessels[2] in purse seine operations targeting tropical tuna, by 31st December 2022 as specified below in (a), (b), (c) and (d). Flag States shall submit the status of reducing the use of supply vessel as part of the report of Implementation to the Compliance Committee.

    a) ~~From 1st of January 2018 to 31st December 2019: 1 supply vessel in support of not less than 2 purse seiners, all of the same flag State[3].~~

    b) ~~From 1st of January 2020 to 31st December 2020: 2 supply vessels in support of not less than 5 purse seiners, all of the same flag State[4].~~

    a. From 1 January 2022 to 31 December 2024: 3 supply vessels in support of not less than 10 purse seiners, all of the same ~~CPC~~ flag State[3].

    b. ~~After 31 December 2024: No supply vessels shall be used by Purse seine vessels in the IOTC area of competence.~~

    c. No CPC is allowed to register any new or additional supply vessel on the IOTC Record of Authorized Vessels ~~after 31st December 2017.~~

17. A single purse seine vessel shall not be supported by more than one single supply vessel of the same CPC ~~flag State~~ at any point of time.

18. Complementary to Resolution 18~~15~~/08 ~~[superseded by Resolution 17/08, then by Resolution 18/08]~~ and to Resolution 15/02, CPC/flag States shall report annually before the 1st of January for the coming year of operations which Purse seiners are served by each supply vessel. This information will be published on IOTC website so as to be accessible to all CPCs and is mandatory.

~~19. CPCS shall report by 1 March 2019, the number of FADs that were deployed in 2018 and 2019 by purse seine vessels and associated supply vessels per 1°x1° grid~~

Gillnet

20. Without prejudice to Article 16 of the IOTC Agreement, CPCs shall encourage phasing out or convert gillnet fishing vessels to other gears, considering the huge ecological impact of these gears and fast track the implementation of Resolution 17/07 *"On the Prohibition to use large-scale driftnets in the IOTC"*, noting that large-scale driftnets are prohibited in the IOTC Area of Competence from 1 January 2022.

21. CPCs shall set their gillnets at 2m depth from the surface in gillnet fisheries by 2023 to mitigate ecological impacts of gillnets.

22. CPCs are encouraged to increase their observer coverage or field sampling in gillnet fishing vessels by 10% using alternative data collection methodologies (electronic or human) verified by the IOTC Scientific Committee by 2023.

[2] For the purpose of this resolution, the term "supply vessel" includes "support vessel"

[3] The subparagraphs (a) ~~and (b)~~ shall not apply to CPCs~~flag States~~ which use only one supply vessel

23. CPCs shall report the level of implementation of para ~~18 –~~ 20 - 22 to the IOTC Commission via the Compliance Committee.

Administration

24. The IOTC Secretariat under advice of the Scientific Committee shall prepare and ~~circulate~~ publish a table of allocated catch limits disaggregated as per the conditions set out in paragraphs 5 – 10 for ~~preceding~~ following year, in December of the current year.

24bis. For the purposes of the implementation of this resolution, each CPC shall, by 15 February of the following year, notify to the Executive Secretary the list of vessels, which have fished for yellowfin tuna in the IOTC area of competence for the preceding year.

24ter. The IOTC Secretariat shall report each year these lists of active vessels to the IOTC Compliance Committee and to the IOTC Scientific Committee in the form of aggregated statistics concerning fishing fleets capacity metrics.

25. CPCs shall monitor the yellowfin tuna catches from their vessels in conformity with Resolution 15/01 *"On the recording of catch and effort data by fishing vessels in the IOTC area of competence"* and Resolution 15/02 *"Mandatory statistical reporting requirements for IOTC Contracting Parties and Cooperating Non Contracting Parties (CPCs)"* and will provide a summary of most-recent yellowfin catches for the consideration of the IOTC Compliance Committee.

~~25bis. CPCs shall endeavor to report on a quarterly basis to the Secretariat the provisional amount of tropical tunas (by species) caught by flag purse seiners and large longline vessels (LOA 24m or greater).~~

~~25ter. CPCs shall endeavor report to the Secretariat, the vessels not subject to paragraph 25bis, periodically at least every 6 months the provisional amounts of tropical tuna (by species) caught by their fleet~~

~~25quater. When a CPC reaches 100% of its catch limit, the CPC shall inform the IOTC Secretariat and the Commission.~~

~~26. For the purposes of the implementation of this resolution, CPCs shall submit their catches of yellowfin disaggregated for vessel 24 m overall length and over, and those under 24 m meter if they fish outside the EEZ as per resolution 15/02.~~

26. Each year, the IOTC Compliance Committee shall evaluate the level of compliance with the reporting obligations and the catch limits deriving from this Resolution and shall make recommendations to the Commission accordingly.

27. The IOTC Scientific Committee via its Working Party on Tropical Tunas shall implement the "Workplan to improve current assessment of yellowfin tuna" and shall advice the Commission the financial and administrational requirements to further strengthen the work undertaken to minimize the issues and complexities regarding yellowfin tuna stock assessment.

27bis. The IOTC Scientific Committee and its Working Parties shall prioritise the work on the yellowfin tuna management procedure and to provide advice to the Technical Committee on Management Procedures and to enable the Commission to adopt the yellowfin tuna management procedure at the earliest opportunity.

28. The Scientific Committee via its Working Party on Tropical Tunas shall ~~in 2019~~ undertake ~~an~~ evaluation of the effectiveness of the measures detailed in this Resolution, taking into account all sources of fishing mortality possible aiming at returning and maintaining biomass levels at the Commission's target level.

29. This Resolution supersedes IOTC Resolution 19/01 *On an interim plan for rebuilding the Indian Ocean yellowfin tuna stock.*

~~APPENDIX 1~~

~~Development classification of IOTC member countries~~[4]

~~Country~~	~~CPC type~~	~~Development Status~~
~~Australia~~	~~Coastal~~	~~Developed~~
~~Bangladesh~~	~~Coastal~~	~~Least Developed~~
~~China~~	~~DWFN~~	~~Developing~~
~~Comoros~~	~~SIDS~~	~~Least Developed~~
~~Eritrea~~	~~Coastal~~	~~Least Developed~~
~~European Union~~	~~DWFN~~	~~Developed~~
~~France (OT)~~	~~Coastal~~	~~Developed~~
~~India~~	~~Coastal~~	~~Developing~~
~~Indonesia~~	~~Coastal~~	~~Developing~~
~~Islamic Republic of Iran~~	~~Coastal~~	~~Developing~~
~~Japan~~	~~DWFN~~	~~Developed~~
~~Kenya~~	~~Coastal~~	~~Developing~~
~~Republic of Korea~~	~~DWFN~~	~~Developing~~
~~Madagascar~~	~~Coastal~~	~~Least Developed~~
~~Malaysia~~	~~Coastal~~	~~Developing~~
~~Maldives~~	~~SIDS~~	~~Developing~~
~~Mauritius~~	~~SIDS~~	~~Developing~~
~~Mozambique~~	~~Coastal~~	~~Least Developed~~
~~Sultanate of Oman~~	~~Coastal~~	~~Developing~~
~~Pakistan~~	~~Coastal~~	~~Developing~~
~~Philippines~~	~~DWFN~~	~~Developing~~
~~Seychelles~~	~~SIDS~~	~~Developing~~
~~Somalia~~	~~Coastal~~	~~Least Developed~~

[4] ~~*Source: United Nations World Economic Situation and Prospects 2020 (https://www.un.org/development/desa/dpad/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/WESP2020_Annex.pdf)*~~

~~Sri Lanka~~	~~Coastal~~	~~Developing~~
~~South Africa~~	~~Coastal~~	~~Developing~~
~~Sudan~~	~~Coastal~~	~~Least Developed~~
~~Tanzania~~	~~Coastal~~	~~Least Developed~~
~~Thailand~~	~~Coastal~~	~~Developing~~
~~United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Island~~	~~DWFN~~	~~Developed~~
~~Yemen~~	~~Coastal~~	~~Least Developed~~

Country	**Applicable Para**
Australia	8
Bangladesh	8
China	5
Comoros	7
Eritrea	8
European Union	5
France (OT)	8bis
India	5a
Indonesia	5a
Islamic Republic of Iran	5a
Japan	7
Kenya	7
Republic of Korea	9bis
Madagascar	8
Malaysia	8
Maldives	5b+9
Mauritius	6b
Mozambique	8
Sultanate of Oman	5a
Pakistan	5a
Philippines	8bis
Seychelles	5b+9
Somalia	8
Sri Lanka	5a
South Africa	8
Sudan	8
Tanzania	7
Thailand	8
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	8bis
Yemen	5b+9