



# Report of the 9<sup>th</sup> Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria

---

By videoconference, 2-4 November 2021

---

**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 2021. Report of the 9<sup>th</sup> Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria. By videoconference, 2-4 November 2021. *IOTC-2021-TCAC09-R[E]*: 25 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  
Email: [iotc-secretariat@fao.org](mailto:iotc-secretariat@fao.org)  
Website: <http://www.iotc.org>

---

**ACRONYMS**

AFAD	Anchored fish aggregating device
BMSY	Biomass which produces MSY
CMM	Conservation and Management Measure
CNCP	Cooperating Non-Contracting Party, of the IOTC
CoC	Compliance Committee of the IOTC
CPs	Contracting Parties
CPCs	Contracting Parties and Cooperating non-Contracting Parties
DCS	Developing Coastal State
DFAD	Drifting fish aggregating device
EEZ	Exclusive Economic Zone
FAD	Fish aggregating device
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FMSY	Fishing mortality at MSY
HCR	Harvest control rule
IUU	Illegal, unreported and unregulated
LRP	Limit reference point
LSTLV	Large-scale tuna longline vessel
MSE	Management Strategy Evaluation
NCP	Non-Contracting Party
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
OT	Overseas Territories
RFMO	Regional Fisheries Management Organisation
SC	Scientific Committee of the IOTC
SCAF	Standing Committee on Administration and Finance of the IOTC
SIDS	Small Island Developing States
TAC	Total Allowable Catch
TCAC	Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria of the IOTC
TCMP	Technical Committee on Management Procedures
TRP	Target referent point
UNCLOS	United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea
VMS	Vessel Monitoring System

---

## HOW TO INTERPRET TERMINOLOGY CONTAINED IN THIS REPORT

This report uses the following terms and associated definitions.

Level 1: From a subsidiary body of the Commission to the next level in the structure of the Commission:

**RECOMMENDED, RECOMMENDATION:** Any conclusion or request for an action to be undertaken, from a subsidiary body of the Commission (Committee or Working Party), which is to be formally provided to the next level in the structure of the Commission for its consideration/endorsement (e.g. from a Working Party to the Scientific Committee; from a Committee to the Commission). The intention is that the higher body will consider the recommended action for endorsement under its own mandate, if the subsidiary body does not already have the required mandate. Ideally this should be task specific and contain a timeframe for completion.

Level 2: From a subsidiary body of the Commission to a CPC, the IOTC Secretariat, or other body (not the Commission) to carry out a specified task:

**REQUESTED:** This term should only be used by a subsidiary body of the Commission if it does not wish to have the request formally adopted/endorsed by the next level in the structure of the Commission. For example, if a Committee wishes to seek additional input from a CPC on a particular topic, but does not wish to formalise the request beyond the mandate of the Committee, it may request that a set action be undertaken. Ideally this should be task specific and contain a timeframe for the completion.

Level 3: General terms to be used for consistency:

**AGREED:** Any point of discussion from a meeting which the IOTC body considers to be an agreed course of action covered by its mandate, which has not already been dealt with under Level 1 or level 2 above; a general point of agreement among delegations/participants of a meeting which does not need to be considered/adopted by the next level in the Commission's structure.

**NOTED/NOTING:** Any point of discussion from a meeting which the IOTC body considers to be important enough to record in a meeting report for future reference.

**Any other term:** Any other term may be used in addition to the Level 3 terms to highlight to the reader of an IOTC report, the importance of the relevant paragraph. However, other terms used are considered for explanatory/informational purposes only and shall have no higher rating within the reporting terminology hierarchy than Level 3, described above (e.g. **CONSIDERED; URGED; ACKNOWLEDGED**).

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

ACRONYMS .....	2
HOW TO INTERPRET TERMINOLOGY CONTAINED IN THIS REPORT .....	4
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	5
1. Opening of the Session .....	7
2. Presentation of delegations.....	7
3. Letters of Credentials.....	7
4. Admission of Observers .....	7
5. Adoption of the Agenda and arrangements for the session .....	7
6. Review of the chair’s proposed allocation regime text, annexes and appendices .....	8
7. Chairperson’s summary .....	9
8. Approach for 2022 .....	11
9. Draft Report.....	11
10. Other Business .....	11
11. Meeting Closure.....	11
Appendix 1. List of Participants .....	12
Appendix 2. Adopted agenda of the 9 <sup>th</sup> Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria .....	18
Appendix 3. List of Documents .....	19
Appendix 4. Statements.....	20

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 9<sup>th</sup> Session of the IOTC Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria was held by videoconference from 2 to 4 November 2021 and chaired by Ms Nadia Bouffard. Delegates from 20 Contracting Parties and 4 observer organisations including invited experts participated in the session.

The TCAC Members made a number of interventions on the 2<sup>nd</sup> version of the draft proposal for an allocation regime for the IOTC ranging from overarching views to specific comments on the text of the proposal. Written statements were provided by some delegations, while other delegations emphasized previous statements provided to the TCAC.

Representatives of several Coastal State Members repeatedly expressed their disappointment that, in their view, there were no improvements made in the second version of the draft proposal in respect of the most significant issues for them. Many of these Members felt their views, in particular those expressed during TCAC08, had not been heard, nor did they believe these views had been reflected in the second draft of the text. These Members also expressed concern that their feedback had been treated differently to other Members' feedback. The core of their concerns related to the full reflection in the text of their Coastal States rights under international law. Other Members expressed a readiness to work on the basis of the text, which they felt reflected a good basis for discussion. Recognizing that they too had issues with some parts of the text, they noted that the text presented a reasonable view of the divergent opinions around the table and that the TCAC had agreed on a process for taking the text forward based on reflecting the consensus views of committee members, and not based on a majority of these views.

The TCAC AGREED to a work plan leading up to TCAC10, and the Chairperson informed the TCAC that the suggested text changes and the written comments (to be received) from the meeting would form the basis of changes made to the next (third) draft text of the allocation regime proposal. Representatives of Coastal State Members informed the meeting that they will need to have a look at the next version of the draft proposal before making any decision about convening again as a committee. The Chair suggested that a discussion among TCAC heads of delegation (electronic or virtual) would be required to determine plans for moving forward following the third text proposal, including a discussion on the holding of the next meeting face to face as preferred by Members, and the date and the venue.

## 1. OPENING OF THE SESSION

1. The 9th Session of the Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria (TCAC09) was opened and chaired by the Independent TCAC Chairperson, Ms Nadia Bouffard.

## 2. PRESENTATION OF DELEGATIONS

2. The Chairperson invited the Heads of Delegations to introduce their respective delegations.

## 3. LETTERS OF CREDENTIALS

3. The TCAC **NOTED** that 20 Members and 4 Observers, including Invited Experts submitted credentials. The list of participants is provided in [Appendix 1](#).
4. Mauritius and the United Kingdom provided statements ([Appendix 4](#)).

## 4. ADMISSION OF OBSERVERS

5. Pursuant to Article VII of the IOTC Agreement and Rule XIV of the IOTC Rules of Procedure, the Commission admitted the following observers:

*Non-governmental organizations having special competence in the field of activity of the Commission.*

- Australian National Centre for Ocean Resources and Security
- International Pole and Line Foundation
- Sustainable Fisheries and Communities Trust

*Invited consultants and experts.*

- Taiwan, Province of China.

## 5. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE SESSION

6. The Chairperson provided an overview of the agenda and introduced the documents available to the meeting ([Appendix 3](#)), including:
  - the Chairperson's proposed second draft (v2) of an Allocation Regime text (IOTC-2021-TCAC09-02a and 2b)
  - the Chairperson's Memorandum (IOTC-2021-TCAC08-03)
  - the TCAC's comments on the first draft (v1) of an Allocation Regime text (IOTC-2021-TCAC09-REF01).
7. A discussion ensued on the scope of review of the 2<sup>nd</sup> version of the Allocation Regime proposal as contemplated by the draft agenda. Representatives of several coastal State Members expressed their disappointment that, in their view, there were no improvements made in the second version of the draft proposal in respect of the most significant issues for them. Many of these Members felt their views, in particular, those expressed during TCAC08 had not been heard or fully reflected in the text. One Member informed the meeting that, in its opinion, several comments and textual proposals made were only included as comments in the margins, as opposed to being presented in brackets or as agreed text within the document.
8. The core of their concerns related to the lack of full reflection in the text of their coastal State rights under international law. Some Members expressed concerns that the draft text appears to include entrenched views that coastal States fundamentally disagree with.
9. Some Members expressed a readiness to work on the basis of the text, which they felt reflected a good basis for discussion while indicating that they too had issues with some parts of the text not reflecting their views. These Members noted that the text presented a reasonable view of the divergent opinions around the table and that the TCAC had agreed on a process for taking the text forward based on reflecting the consensus views of committee Members, and not based on a majority of these views.
10. The Chairperson explained the process she undertook to adjust the first draft of the proposal. This included considering the comments noted from TCAC08, the TCAC08 meeting transcripts and the written submissions provided after the meeting. The Chairperson assured the TCAC that all these materials were considered for

inclusion in the second draft of the allocation regime text. The Chair also reminded Members of the process agreed to in TCAC08 for the review and changes to the text, as outlined in the attachment to the Chairperson’s Memorandum for the TCAC09 meeting.

11. The Chairperson informed the TCAC that her approach aims to find balance in the proposal so consensus can eventually be achieved, and she did not expect this balance to be found in the second draft. Moreover, it was important to adopt the agenda so Members can express their comments and the next version can be drafted.
12. The Chairperson informed the meeting that a higher-level review of the 2<sup>nd</sup> version of the draft proposal was possible, but she would also need Members to provide specific examples of proposed changes to the text in order to develop the 3<sup>rd</sup> version of the draft proposal.
13. After some discussion on the scope of review of the text, the provisional agenda was amended to enable a broader discussion on the proposed text rather than focus on a paragraph by paragraph review of the text, in order to facilitate the process moving forward.
14. The TCAC **ADOPTED** the agenda provided in [Appendix 2](#) which did not include a paragraph by paragraph review.

## **6. REVIEW OF THE CHAIR’S PROPOSED ALLOCATION REGIME TEXT, ANNEXES AND APPENDICES**

15. The Chair provided a detailed presentation of the 2<sup>nd</sup> version of the draft proposal for an allocation regime for the IOTC. TCAC Members then shared a broad range of views on the 2<sup>nd</sup> version of the draft proposal.
16. Some Members reiterated the comments they made on the 1<sup>st</sup> version of the draft proposal (i.e., in IOTC-2021-TCAC10-REF1) as they believed that they were not reflected in the 2<sup>nd</sup> version of the draft proposal; others stated their concerns that comments they made during TCAC08 were not reflected in the revised text.
17. Other Members indicated that they do not fully agree with the content of the 2<sup>nd</sup> version of the draft proposal but accepted that discussion and obtaining a better understanding of other Members’ perspectives were important parts of the process.
18. Some Members informed the meeting that they believed that TCAC08 had agreed to use the coastal States proposal as the basis for revising the 1<sup>st</sup> draft proposal, and they were disappointed to see that most of what was in that proposal was missing from the 2<sup>nd</sup> version of the Chair’s draft proposal. One Member further informed the meeting that the TCAC had not yet agreed on the basic principles of the regime and indicated they were willing to join discussions on the Chair’s text as long as the international rights of coastal States are met. Another Member informed the meeting that it did not believe that the current text reflected the aspirations of developing coastal States and Small Island Developing States and stronger text is needed in future revisions. The Chair invited coastal States to provide such text.
19. The bulk of the discussion centred around the two key allocation criteria in the proposal: the catch-based allocation criteria, and the coastal States allocation criteria. There were Members that strongly advocated for an explicit recognition that catches taken in the waters of coastal States by other CPCs should be attributed to those coastal States, as a matter of right enshrined in international law. Other Members opposed this and advocated for a recognition of their rights to catch fish on the high seas based on their recorded historical catch, while recognizing a need to transition a portion of this to developing coastal States in a step wise process. One Member opposed the idea of a transition or transfer of historical catches as this, in their view, implied that such catches were lawfully attributed to those that caught the fish in the first place.
20. Comments were also provided on the scope of the regime, both in terms of geographical scope and the species to be covered by the regime. While some Members requested that certain species and maritime zones be excluded from the scope of the regime, other Members opposed such exclusions.
21. The TCAC then pursued a discussion based on themes proposed by the Chair: new entrants, adjustments to allocation; transfers; allocation period; term of the regime; definitions; and implementation. However, some Members noted that these issues were secondary to resolve”
22. Written statements were provided by Indonesia and Thailand ([Appendix 4](#)).
23. Discussions were discontinued on the third day of the meeting after some coastal State Members indicated that they were not satisfied with the process. Australia delivered the following statement on their behalf:



*Thank you Chair, these are very complicated and very complex negotiations; we sincerely appreciate your efforts so far. The virtual platform makes these meetings so much more difficult. We believe we have made some very good progress over the last two and a half days.*

*We are in a position now where the draft is quite different to the draft we had at the start of the meeting, there's a number of moving parts, it's quite complicated.*

*We think now might be a good time to suspend the meeting and re-group around a new version of the document — so we are very clear about where we are and what we have agreed. In the new draft, we'd be very keen to see majority views reflected and equally very happy for minority views to be reflected as comment boxes in the draft.*

*In making the call, we note that there's ten Coastal States not present at this meeting; there has been some, I guess, tensions so far which, I think, probably doesn't not lend itself well to continue negotiations in the current form.*

*We propose that in developing a version 3, there'd be a period for some additional written comments, and we propose maybe another 30 days from this meeting. Further, in terms of scheduling the next meeting in this process, we'd be keen to have some time to have a look at another version of the draft before we make those decisions about convening again — and again a consideration may be made around whether we can meet face to face.*

*I think at that point I'll leave it, other than again to thank you sincerely for your effort so far. Thank you Chair.*

24. Other Members expressed their regret that the meeting had got to this situation, particularly because of the amount of time that had been spent in preparation. One Member expressed their regret about the decision of a few representatives of Coastal States to abandon the negotiation table. This Member reiterated the point that the TCAC had agreed to a process for taking the text forward based on reflecting the consensus views of committee Members and not the majority views, that nothing is agreed until everything is agreed, and that different or opposing views on proposed text should be reflected in the text in brackets with comments.

## **7. CHAIRPERSON'S SUMMARY**

25. In summarising the deliberations of the TCAC09, the Chairperson noted that the issues on the table were not easy ones to resolve, but she remained confident that solutions could be found that all delegations could endorse. She thanked delegations for agreeing to continue the dialogue, encouraged them to continue to discuss, exchange views, share ideas, stay engaged, cooperate and be patient. The chairperson summarized her takeaways from the meeting as follows:

### Allocation criteria

26. In terms of allocation criteria, the Chairperson acknowledged the different and opposing views and that much still needs to be resolved. In terms of the Catch Based Allocation Criteria, she noted that the TCAC will need to come to ground on the formula for determining historical catch. Several formula proposals remain on the table.

### Attributed Catch

27. The Chairperson noted that while there is no consensus on the matter of attribution of catches inside coastal States' exclusive economic zones, she noted that she heard additional support for a recognition, in the text of the Resolution, that such catches should be attributed to the coastal States, as a matter of right. The Chair indicated that she would reflect this view in the next draft proposal, with the associated brackets reflecting the oppositions expressed and the ongoing work still required to iron out the implementation approach.

28. The Chairperson also noted that she heard from one delegation that while some current access arrangements between CPCs may reflect this attribution to coastal States, this was not the case in the past. Coastal States Members wish to correct past records of catch, to ensure that the basis for formulating allocations in the future, respects their right. She flagged that other Members disagreed with this contention and expressed concerns with the socio-economic impacts that such a change would have on their stakeholders who rely on this catch history for determining their share of the total allowable catch moving forward. These Members have expressed a willingness to transition the implementation of this change, in a step-wise manner. The Chair noted that the Committee had not yet discussed what such a step-wise transition could look like.

29. The Chairperson reminded the meeting that the IOTC is breaking ice with this TCAC process, as being the first RFMO to develop a detailed allocation regime. She emphasized that these negotiations are not about re-writing international law, but instead they are aimed at finding an implementation approach for these rights in the context of an allocation regime, and to find the right words to express this implementation approach. The Chair

conceded that this had not yet been achieved and that the voices around the table had been heard clearly in this regard. But to achieve this, she encouraged everyone to continue to stay engaged in the dialogue and the process, continue to contribute to solutions, and that compromises on the implementation approach will be needed to achieve consensus on the overall regime.

#### Coastal State Allocation Criteria

30. In terms of the coastal State allocation criteria, the Chair acknowledged the desire on the part of a number of coastal States to develop alternative indicators for the developing status of coastal States to those currently provided in Annex 3, and encouraged coastal States to share a draft of these as soon as possible for all delegations to consider during the next session of the TCAC.
31. She also highlighted the opposition by one delegation to the third component of the coastal State allocation based on the coastal States' rights and status which would be established and shared based on indicators related to the size of their Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) within the IOTC Area of Competence. In this regard, the Chairperson encouraged coastal States to consider whether changes could be brought to this provision to focus instead on biomass distribution of the allocated stock with a view to addressing the concerns expressed by India in respect of fish stocks found mainly in the EEZ of coastal States. She suggested that the implementation of this biomass distribution component of the coastal States allocation criteria should probably be contingent on IOTC scientific advice related to the biomass distribution of the allocated stock. Furthermore, she highlighted the fact that other RFMOs have provided favourable allocations to coastal States in whose waters stocks mostly occur.

#### Scope

32. The Chairperson encouraged India to work with other coastal State Members with a view to addressing their issue with stocks mainly found inside their EEZ through the coastal State allocation criteria instead of excluding them from the scope of the regime, which has been opposed by other delegations. She reiterated the general opposition heard during the meeting to excluding waters and species from the scope of the regime, which have been defined by and agreed to in the IOTC Agreement. She indicated that brackets would remain around the text of the draft allocation regime proposing such exclusions until these issues are fully resolved. However, she did flag that the solution may be found in ways to reassure these coastal State Members seeking these exclusions that they can, and indeed are expected to, continue to exercise their sovereign rights in their EEZ, and to exercise their commitments to manage these fish stocks inside their zones. In the end, the allocation regime is not intended to take away those rights.

#### Compatibility of Measures

33. The Chairperson noted the view of one delegation related to a requirement, in international law, that coastal States need to ensure that measures applicable to IOTC stocks are compatible throughout the range of the stock inside their respective EEZ's and on the high seas. The Chair mentioned that some adjustments had been made to reflect this in the 2<sup>nd</sup> draft of the proposal but encouraged delegations to share their views on whether this addresses their comments.

#### Data

34. Considerable time was spent discussing data and data reporting, as they relate to the implementation of the allocation regime. Provision of accurate and verified data is fundamental for managing fisheries by allocations. Additional data reporting requirements were included in the 2<sup>nd</sup> draft of the proposal on the basis of a proposal from the United Kingdom. These are meant to apply in the context of over-catches of allocations. One delegation expressed a challenge with the implementation of these new enhanced reporting requirements for small-scale fisheries, and others raised issues with the timelines which may need to be considered further. The Chair welcomed any proposals for addressing the small-scale fishery challenges.
35. Some delegations expressed the wish to see persistent lack of data reporting penalized through temporary allocation reductions. The Chair again welcomed proposed wording on this idea.
36. Some delegations shared their past TCAC experience and the agreed upon methodology to identify catches by zones which would greatly assist delegations in considering ways forward for attributed catches inside EEZs. It was specified that these data were based on estimates determined through scientific processes; and the files containing these data are publicly available on the IOTC website. However, some delegations questioned the format in which these data are found and whether the files can easily be used for decision-making. While the Chair expressed the wish that more progress on the concepts in the allocation regime text be made before the

Committee considers data and numbers, she did encourage the Secretariat to engage with those delegations who raised questions in respect of the format for the data for these future discussions, to get a better sense of whether what is there is adequate or whether a different format is needed for these future discussions. The Chair asked the Secretariat to report back to the Committee on this during its next meeting.

37. The Chairperson noted that there were outstanding issues regarding new entrants that will require further discussion to resolve the different views.

38. Finally, the Chairperson noted that many other suggestions had been made in respect of other concepts in the text, which she will go through and reflect in the next version of the text.

## 8. APPROACH FOR 2022

39. The TCAC **AGREED** to the following work plan going forward:

- Written proposals on the 2nd version of the draft proposal to be provided by TCAC Members to the Secretariat and the Chairperson by 17 December 2021.
- The Secretariat will compile the comments into one document and post it on the TCAC10 meeting webpage by 7 January 2022.
- The Chairperson will circulate a 3rd version of the draft proposal by 11 February 2022. This draft will be considered at TCAC10.

40. The Chair emphasized that the TCAC had agreed on a process for taking the text forward based on reflecting the consensus views of Committee Members, and not based on a majority of these views. She indicated that this approach is typically used by other international bodies, including other RFMOs, and it has been described in the detailed negotiation and drafting process provided in the appendix to the Chairperson's Memorandum for TCAC09, which she indicated will continue to apply to this TCAC process.

41. The TCAC **AGREED** that TCAC10 should be a face-to-face meeting. The Chair suggested that she would work with the Secretariat to consider a way to engage heads of delegations after 11 February 2022 either electronically or virtually, to discuss the holding of the next TCAC meeting, including dates and venue.

## 9. DRAFT REPORT

42. The Chairperson informed the TCAC that, like recent TCAC reports, the TCAC09 Report would be succinct and not contain details of the interventions made on the floor, except when they influenced the proceedings of the meeting. However, Members were invited to provide the statements underpinning their interventions on matters they wanted to be recorded, and these would be appended to the report.

43. The TCAC **AGREED** to adopt the meeting report by correspondence. *The report was adopted on 21 December 2021.*

## 10. OTHER BUSINESS

44. No matters were raised.

## 11. MEETING CLOSURE

45. The TCAC09 meeting was closed at 1616 hr on Thursday 4 November 2021.

**APPENDIX 1.****LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

(According to the videoconference participant list)

**Chairperson**

Ms Nadia Bouffard  
[Nadia.Bouffard@fao.org](mailto:Nadia.Bouffard@fao.org)

**Australia****Head of Delegation**

Mr. Neil Hughes  
 Department of Agriculture, Water  
 and the Environment  
[Neil.hughes@awe.gov.au](mailto:Neil.hughes@awe.gov.au)

**Alternate**

Mr. Patrick Sachs  
 Department of Agriculture, Water  
 and the Environment  
[patrick.sachs@awe.gov.au](mailto:patrick.sachs@awe.gov.au)

**Advisor(s)**

Ms. Alex Edgar  
 Department of Agriculture, Water  
 and the Environment  
[Alex.Edgar@awe.gov.au](mailto:Alex.Edgar@awe.gov.au)

Ms. Merryn Cavenagh  
 Attorney General's Department  
[Merryn.Cavenagh@agriculture.gov.au](mailto:Merryn.Cavenagh@agriculture.gov.au)

Mr. Trent Timmiss  
 Department of Agriculture, Water  
 and the Environment  
[trent.timmiss@awe.gov.au](mailto:trent.timmiss@awe.gov.au)

Mr. Terry Romaro  
 Ship Agencies Australia  
[terry@saa.com.au](mailto:terry@saa.com.au)

Mr. Kim Newbold  
 Western Tuna and Billfish Fishery  
[knewbold@wn.com.au](mailto:knewbold@wn.com.au)

Mr. Saiful Karim  
 Queensland University of  
 Technology  
[mdsaiful.karim@qut.edu.au](mailto:mdsaiful.karim@qut.edu.au)

Mr. SM Nazmul Alam  
 Department of Agriculture, Water  
 and the Environment  
[smnazmul.alam@agriculture.gov.au](mailto:smnazmul.alam@agriculture.gov.au)

Mr. Don Bromhead  
 Department of Agriculture, Water  
 and the Environment  
[don.bromhead@agriculture.gov.au](mailto:don.bromhead@agriculture.gov.au)

**Bangladesh**

Absent

**China****Head of Delegation**

Mr. Xiaobing Liu  
 Shanghai Ocean University  
[xiaobing.liu@hotmail.com](mailto:xiaobing.liu@hotmail.com)

**Alternate**

Mr. Jiangfeng Zhu  
 Bureau of Fisheries  
[bofdwf@126.com](mailto:bofdwf@126.com)

**Advisor(s)**

Ms. Mengjie Xiao  
 High Seas Fisheries Department  
[xiaomengjie1128@126.com](mailto:xiaomengjie1128@126.com)

Mr. Yan Li  
 High Seas Fisheries Department  
[admin1@tuna.org.cn](mailto:admin1@tuna.org.cn)

Ms. Qiuning Li  
 High Seas Fisheries Department  
[admin1@tuna.org.cn](mailto:admin1@tuna.org.cn)

**Comoros**

Absent

**Eritrea**

Absent

**European Union****Head of Delegation**

Mr. Marco Valletta  
 Directorate-General for Maritime  
 Affairs and Fisheries (DG MARE) of  
 the European Commission  
[marco.valletta@ec.europa.eu](mailto:marco.valletta@ec.europa.eu)

**Alternate**

Ms. Laura Marot  
 Directorate-General for Maritime  
 Affairs and Fisheries (DG MARE) of  
 the European Commission  
[laura.marot@ec.europa.eu](mailto:laura.marot@ec.europa.eu)

**Advisor(s)**

Mr. Franco Biagi  
 Directorate-General for Maritime  
 Affairs and Fisheries (DG MARE) of  
 the European Commission  
[Franco.Biagi@ec.europa.eu](mailto:Franco.Biagi@ec.europa.eu)

Mr. Benoit Marcoux  
 Directorate-General for Maritime  
 Affairs and Fisheries (DG MARE) of  
 the European Commission

[benoit.marcoux@ext.ec.europa.eu](mailto:benoit.marcoux@ext.ec.europa.eu)

Ms. Teresa Molina  
[tmolina@mapa.es](mailto:tmolina@mapa.es)

Ms. Lucia Sarricolea  
[lsarricolea@mapa.es](mailto:lsarricolea@mapa.es)

Mr. Miguel Herrera Armas  
[miguel.herrera@opagac.org](mailto:miguel.herrera@opagac.org)

Mr. Borja Alonso  
[Borja.Alonso@albacora.es](mailto:Borja.Alonso@albacora.es)

Ms. Ángela Cortina  
[angela@arvi.org](mailto:angela@arvi.org)

Mr. Borja Soroa  
[borjasoroa@pevasa.es](mailto:borjasoroa@pevasa.es)

Ms. Anais Melard  
[anais.melard@agriculture.gouv.fr](mailto:anais.melard@agriculture.gouv.fr)

Mr. Michel Goujon  
[mgoujon@orthongel.fr](mailto:mgoujon@orthongel.fr)

Mr. Armelle Denoize  
[adenoize@sapmer.com](mailto:adenoize@sapmer.com)

Ms. Vanessa Barros  
[vbarros@dgrm.mm.gov.pt](mailto:vbarros@dgrm.mm.gov.pt)

Mr. Guillermo Gomez  
[gomezhall@gmail.com](mailto:gomezhall@gmail.com)

**France (OT)****Head of Delegation**

Ms. Alice Boiffin  
 Bureau des affaires europeennes  
 et internationales  
[alice.boiffin@agriculture.gouv.fr](mailto:alice.boiffin@agriculture.gouv.fr)

**Advisor(s)**

Ms. Nastassia Reyes  
 Institut de recherche pour le  
 developpement  
[nastassia.reyes@ird.fr](mailto:nastassia.reyes@ird.fr)

**India****Alternate**

Mr. R. Jeyibaskaran  
 Department of Fisheries  
[dg-fsi-mah@nic.in](mailto:dg-fsi-mah@nic.in)

**Advisor(s)**

Mr. Sanjay Pandey  
 Department of Fisheries  
[sanjay.rpandey@gov.in](mailto:sanjay.rpandey@gov.in)

Mr. Sijo P Varghese Department of Fisheries <a href="mailto:varghesejsi@hotmail.com">varghesejsi@hotmail.com</a>	Mr. Bram Setyadji Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries <a href="mailto:bramsetyadji@kkp.go.id">bramsetyadji@kkp.go.id</a>	Mr. Satya Mardi Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries <a href="mailto:satyamardi18@gmail.com">satyamardi18@gmail.com</a>
Mr. Sethuraman Ramachandran Department of Fisheries <a href="mailto:fsikochi@yahoo.co.in">fsikochi@yahoo.co.in</a>	Mr. Prawira Atmaja Rintar Tampubolon Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries <a href="mailto:tampubolon@kkp.go.id">tampubolon@kkp.go.id</a>	Ms. Saraswati Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries <a href="mailto:cacasaras@gmail.com">cacasaras@gmail.com</a>
Mr. Ashok S. Kadam Department of Fisheries <a href="mailto:fsimumbaibase@gmail.com">fsimumbaibase@gmail.com</a>	Mr. Hary Christijanto Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries <a href="mailto:hchristijanto@yahoo.com">hchristijanto@yahoo.com</a>	Mr. Hendri Kurniawan Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries <a href="mailto:hendrikur16@gmail.com">hendrikur16@gmail.com</a>
Mr. Ansuman Das Department of Fisheries <a href="mailto:ansuman@fsi.gov.in">ansuman@fsi.gov.in</a>	Mr. Yayan Hernuryadin Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries <a href="mailto:yhernuryadin@gmail.com">yhernuryadin@gmail.com</a>	Mr. Alza Rendian Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries <a href="mailto:alzarendian@gmail.com">alzarendian@gmail.com</a>
Mr. Siva Anandhan Department of Fisheries <a href="mailto:siva.anandhan@fsi.gov.in">siva.anandhan@fsi.gov.in</a>	Mr. Zaki Mubarak Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries <a href="mailto:zaki.mubarak@kkp.go.id">zaki.mubarak@kkp.go.id</a>	Mr. Ridho Rahmadi Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries <a href="mailto:ridhorahmadi94@gmail.com">ridhorahmadi94@gmail.com</a>
Ms. Prathibha Rohit Department of Fisheries <a href="mailto:prathibharohit@gmail.com">prathibharohit@gmail.com</a>	Mr. Jatu F. Nugrohorukmi Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries <a href="mailto:jatu.fn@kkp.go.id">jatu.fn@kkp.go.id</a>	Ms. Sitti Hamdiyah Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries <a href="mailto:sh_diyah@yahoo.com">sh_diyah@yahoo.com</a>
Mr. Shubhadeep Ghosh Department of Fisheries <a href="mailto:subhadeep_1977@yahoo.com">subhadeep_1977@yahoo.com</a>	Mr. Syahril Abd. Raup Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries <a href="mailto:chaliarrauf@yahoo.com">chaliarrauf@yahoo.com</a>	Mr. Ahmad Amri Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries <a href="mailto:ahmad.almaududy@kemlu.go.id">ahmad.almaududy@kemlu.go.id</a>
Mr. Mohammed Koya Department of Fisheries <a href="mailto:koya313@gmail.com">koya313@gmail.com</a>	Ms. Ririk Kartika Sulistyaningsih Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries <a href="mailto:ririk.sulistyaningsing@kkp.go.id">ririk.sulistyaningsing@kkp.go.id</a>	<b>Iran</b> Absent
<b>Indonesia</b> <b>Head of Delegation</b>	Ms. Rennisca Damantl Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries <a href="mailto:rennisca@kkp.go.id">rennisca@kkp.go.id</a>	<b>Japan</b> <b>Head of Delegation</b>
Ms. Putuh Suadela Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries <a href="mailto:putuhsuadela@gmail.com">putuhsuadela@gmail.com</a>	Mr. Muhammad Anas Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries <a href="mailto:mykalambe@yahoo.com">mykalambe@yahoo.com</a>	Mr. Hideki Moronuki Resources Management Department <a href="mailto:hideki_moronuki600@maff.go.jp">hideki_moronuki600@maff.go.jp</a>
<b>Alternate</b>	Ms. Rikrik Rahardian Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries <a href="mailto:rikrik.rahadian@kkp.go.id">rikrik.rahadian@kkp.go.id</a>	<b>Alternate</b>
Mr. Nilanto Perbowo Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries <a href="mailto:perbowon@me.com">perbowon@me.com</a>		Mr. Hiroyuki Morita International Affairs Division <a href="mailto:hiroyuki_morita970@maff.go.jp">hiroyuki_morita970@maff.go.jp</a>
<b>Advisor(s)</b>		<b>Advisor(s)</b>
Ms. Riana Handayani Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries <a href="mailto:daya139@yahoo.co.id">daya139@yahoo.co.id</a>		Ms. Maiko Nakasu International Affairs Division <a href="mailto:maiko_nakasu100@maff.go.jp">maiko_nakasu100@maff.go.jp</a>
Mr. Indra Jaya Faculty of Fisheries and Marine Sciences <a href="mailto:indrajaya123@gmail.com">indrajaya123@gmail.com</a>		

Mr. Toshihide Kitakado  
Tokyo University of Marine  
Science and Technology  
[kitakado@kaiyodai.ac.jp](mailto:kitakado@kaiyodai.ac.jp)

Mr. Hiroyuki Yoshida  
Japan Tuna Fisheries Co-operative  
Association  
[yoshida@japantuna.or.jp](mailto:yoshida@japantuna.or.jp)

Mr. Nozomu Miura  
Japan Tuna Fisheries Co-operative  
Association  
[miura@japantuna.or.jp](mailto:miura@japantuna.or.jp)

Mr. Daisaku Nagai  
Japan Tuna Fisheries Co-operative  
Association  
[nagai@japantuna.or.jp](mailto:nagai@japantuna.or.jp)

Mr. Michio Shimizu  
National Ocean Tuna Fishery  
Association  
[mich-shimizu@zengyoren.jf-net.ne.jp](mailto:mich-shimizu@zengyoren.jf-net.ne.jp)

Mr. Akihito Fukuyama  
Japan Far Seas Purse Seine Fishing  
Association  
[fukuyama@kaimaki.or.jp](mailto:fukuyama@kaimaki.or.jp)

Mr. Muneharu Tokimura  
Oversea Fishery Cooperation  
Foundation of Japan (OFCF Japan)  
[tokimura@ofcf.or.jp](mailto:tokimura@ofcf.or.jp)

#### **Kenya**

##### **Head of Delegation**

Ms. Elizabeth Mueni  
Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock,  
Fisheries, and Cooperatives  
[emueni@gmail.com](mailto:emueni@gmail.com)

##### **Alternate**

Mr. Stephen Ndegwa  
Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock,  
Fisheries, and Cooperatives  
[ndegwafish@yahoo.com](mailto:ndegwafish@yahoo.com)

##### **Advisor(s)**

Mr. Benedict Kiilu  
Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock,  
Fisheries, and Cooperatives  
[kiilub@yahoo.com](mailto:kiilub@yahoo.com)

#### **Korea, Republic of**

##### **Head of Delegation**

Mr. Sungtaek Oh  
Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries  
[republicofkorea@korea.kr](mailto:republicofkorea@korea.kr)

##### **Advisor(s)**

Mr. Tae-Hoon Won  
Korea Overseas Fisheries  
Cooperation Centre  
[4indamorning@kofci.org](mailto:4indamorning@kofci.org)

Mr. Jaehwa Lee  
Sajo Industries  
[jhlee33@dongwon.com](mailto:jhlee33@dongwon.com)

Mr. Bongjun Choi  
Korea Overseas Fisheries  
Association  
[bj@kosfa.org](mailto:bj@kosfa.org)

#### **Madagascar**

Absent

#### **Malaysia**

##### **Head of Delegation**

Mr. Arthur Besther Sujang  
Department of Fisheries  
[arthur@dof.gov.my](mailto:arthur@dof.gov.my)

##### **Alternate**

Mr. Sallehudin Jamon  
Department of Fisheries  
[sallehudin\\_jamon@dof.gov.my](mailto:sallehudin_jamon@dof.gov.my)

##### **Advisor(s)**

Ms. Nor Azlin Mokhtar  
Department of Fisheries  
[nor\\_azlin@dof.gov.my](mailto:nor_azlin@dof.gov.my)

Mr. Muhammad Safwan Othman  
Department of Fisheries  
[muhammadsafwan@dof.gov.my](mailto:muhammadsafwan@dof.gov.my)

#### **Maldives**

##### **Alternate**

Mr. Hussain Sinan  
Ministry of Fisheries, Marine  
Resources and Agriculture  
[hsinan@gmail.com](mailto:hsinan@gmail.com)

##### **Advisor(s)**

Mr. Ahmed Shifaz  
Ministry of Fisheries, Marine  
Resources and Agriculture  
[ahmed.shifaz@fishagri.gov.mv](mailto:ahmed.shifaz@fishagri.gov.mv)

Ms. Munshidha Ibrahim  
Ministry of Fisheries, Marine  
Resources and Agriculture  
[munshidha.ibrahim@fishagri.gov.mv](mailto:munshidha.ibrahim@fishagri.gov.mv)

Ms. Hawwa Nizar  
Ministry of Fisheries, Marine  
Resources and Agriculture  
[raufath.nizar@fishagri.gov.mv](mailto:raufath.nizar@fishagri.gov.mv)

Ms. Maleeha Haleem Ministry of  
Fisheries, Marine Resources and  
Agriculture  
[maleeha.haleem@fishagri.gov.mv](mailto:maleeha.haleem@fishagri.gov.mv)

#### **Mauritius**

##### **Head of Delegation**

Mr. Rajun Kashore Bunjun  
Ministry of Blue Economy, Marine  
Resources, Fisheries and Shipping  
[rbunjun@govmu.org](mailto:rbunjun@govmu.org)

##### **Alternate**

Ms. Clivy Lim Shung  
Ministry of Blue Economy, Marine  
Resources, Fisheries and Shipping  
[clivilim@yahoo.com](mailto:clivilim@yahoo.com)

##### **Advisor(s)**

Ms. Hanista Jhumun-Foolheea  
Ministry of Blue Economy, Marine  
Resources, Fisheries and Shipping  
[hanistajhumun@gmail.com](mailto:hanistajhumun@gmail.com)

#### **Mozambique**

##### **Head of Delegation**

Mr. Cassamo Junior  
National Fisheries Administration  
[cassamo.hassane@gmail.com](mailto:cassamo.hassane@gmail.com)

Mr. Avelino Munwane  
National Fisheries Administration  
[avelinomunwane@gmail.com](mailto:avelinomunwane@gmail.com)

#### **Oman**

##### **Alternate**

Mr. AlMuatasam Alhabsi  
Commercial Fleet Developmen  
[muatasim4@hotmail.com](mailto:muatasim4@hotmail.com)

#### **Pakistan**

Absent

**Philippines****Head of Delegation**

Mr. Benjamin Tabios  
Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic  
Resources  
[btabios@bfar.da.gov.ph](mailto:btabios@bfar.da.gov.ph)

**Advisor(s)**

Mr. Rafael Ramiscal  
Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic  
Resources  
[rv\\_ram55@yahoo.com](mailto:rv_ram55@yahoo.com)

Mr. Michael Andayog  
Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic  
Resources  
[mikeandayog@gmail.com](mailto:mikeandayog@gmail.com)

Mr. Severino Escobar  
Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic  
Resources  
[lejr@yahoo.com](mailto:lejr@yahoo.com)

Mr. Erick Cadapan  
Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic  
Resources  
[pedangs@yahoo.com](mailto:pedangs@yahoo.com)

Ms. Jennifer Viron  
Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic  
Resources  
[jennyviron@bfar.da.gov.ph](mailto:jennyviron@bfar.da.gov.ph)

Mr. Marlo Demo-os  
Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic  
Resources  
[mbdemos@bfar.da.gov.ph](mailto:mbdemos@bfar.da.gov.ph)

Ms. Beverly San Juan  
Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic  
Resources  
[beyessanjuan@gmail.com](mailto:beyessanjuan@gmail.com)

Mr. Isidro Tanangonan  
Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic  
Resources  
[itanangonan@bfar.da.gov.ph](mailto:itanangonan@bfar.da.gov.ph)

Ms. Maria Joy Mabanglo  
Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic  
Resources  
[mj.mabanglo@gmail.com](mailto:mj.mabanglo@gmail.com)

**Seychelles****Head of Delegation**

Mr. Roy Clarisse  
Ministry of Fisheries  
[rclarisse@gov.sc](mailto:rclarisse@gov.sc)

**Alternate**

Mr. Vincent Lucas  
Seychelles Fishing Authority  
[vlucas@sfa.sc](mailto:vlucas@sfa.sc)

**Advisor(s)**

Mr. Philippe Michaud  
Ministry of Fisheries  
[Philippe.michaud@statehouse.gov.sc](mailto:Philippe.michaud@statehouse.gov.sc)

Ms. Sheriffa Morel  
Ministry of Fisheries  
[sheriffamorel@gov.sc](mailto:sheriffamorel@gov.sc)

Mr. Yannick Roucou  
Seychelles Fishing Authority  
[yroucou@sfa.sc](mailto:yroucou@sfa.sc)

Mr. Johnny Louys  
Seychelles Fishing Authority  
[jlouys@sfa.sc](mailto:jlouys@sfa.sc)

**Somalia**

Absent

**South Africa**

Absent

**Sri Lanka****Head of Delegation**

Ms. Kalyani Hewapathirana  
Department of Fisheries & Aquatic  
Resources  
[hewakal2012@gmail.com](mailto:hewakal2012@gmail.com)

**Alternate**

Mr. M.M Ariyaratne  
Department of Fisheries & Aquatic  
Resources  
[mma\\_fi@yahoo.com](mailto:mma_fi@yahoo.com)

**Advisor(s)**

Mr. Sisira Haputhantri  
Research and Development  
Agency  
[sirahaputhantri@yahoo.com](mailto:sirahaputhantri@yahoo.com)

Mr. Steve Creech  
Pelagikos pvt ltd  
[steve@pelagikos.lk](mailto:steve@pelagikos.lk)

**Sudan**

Absent

**Tanzania, Republic of**  
**Head of Delegation**

Mr. Zahor M. El Kharousy

Deep Sea Fishing Authority  
[zahor1m@hotmail.com](mailto:zahor1m@hotmail.com)

**Alternate**

Mr. Emmanuel Sweke  
Deep Sea Fishing Authority  
[emmanuel.sweke@dsfa.go.tz](mailto:emmanuel.sweke@dsfa.go.tz)

**Advisor(s)**

Mr. Salum Hamed  
Deep Sea Fishing Authority  
[salumhus@gmail.com](mailto:salumhus@gmail.com)

Mr. Zakaria Khamis  
Deep Sea Fishing Authority  
[zakaria.khamis@suza.ac.tz](mailto:zakaria.khamis@suza.ac.tz)

Mr. Christian Nzowa  
Deep Sea Fishing Authority  
[christiannzowa@gmail.com](mailto:christiannzowa@gmail.com)

**Thailand****Head of Delegation**

Mr. Taworn Thunjai  
Department of Fisheries  
[plachon2550@gmail.com](mailto:plachon2550@gmail.com)

**Alternate**

Ms. Prulai Nootmorn  
Marine Fisheries Research and  
Development Division  
[nootmorn@yahoo.com](mailto:nootmorn@yahoo.com)

**Advisor(s)**

Mr. Sarayoot Boonkumjad  
Fishing and Fleets Management  
Division  
[sboonkumjad@yahoo.com](mailto:sboonkumjad@yahoo.com)

Ms. Thiwarat Sinanun  
Marine Fisheries Research and  
Development Division  
[thiwaratsi@gmail.com](mailto:thiwaratsi@gmail.com)

Ms. Thanyalak Ratanadilok Na  
Phuket  
Fisheries Foreign Affairs Division  
[trthanya@gmail.com](mailto:trthanya@gmail.com)

Ms. Tirabhorn Yothakong  
Fishing and Fleets Management  
Division  
[tirabhorn@gmail.com](mailto:tirabhorn@gmail.com)

Mr. Prasit Luesrithawornsin  
Fishing and Fleets Management  
Division  
[prasit\\_kim@hotmail.com](mailto:prasit_kim@hotmail.com)

Mr. Weerapol Thitipongtrakul  
Marine Fisheries Research and  
Development Division  
[weerapol.t@gmail.com](mailto:weerapol.t@gmail.com)

Ms. Chonticha Kumyoo  
Fishing and Fleets Management  
Division  
[chonticha.dof@gmail.com](mailto:chonticha.dof@gmail.com)

**CNCP**  
**Sénégal**  
Absent

**Australian National Centre for  
Ocean Resources and Security  
(ANCORS)**  
Mr. Quentin Hanich  
[hanich@uow.edu.au](mailto:hanich@uow.edu.au)

Ms. Kerrie Robertson  
[kerrierobertson@hotmail.com](mailto:kerrierobertson@hotmail.com)

Mr. Bianca Haas  
[bhaas@uow.edu.au](mailto:bhaas@uow.edu.au)

**Head of Delegation**  
Ms. I-Lu Lai  
[ilu@ms1.fao.gov.tw](mailto:ilu@ms1.fao.gov.tw)

**Alternate**  
Mr. Chia-Chun Wu  
[jiachun@ms1.fao.gov.tw](mailto:jiachun@ms1.fao.gov.tw)

Mr Chris O'Brien  
Executive Secretary  
[Chris.OBrien@fao.org](mailto:Chris.OBrien@fao.org)

Mr Paul de Bruyn  
Science Manager  
[Paul.DeBruyn@fao.org](mailto:Paul.DeBruyn@fao.org)

Ms. Thitirat Rattanawiwian  
Fishing and Fleets Management  
Division  
[ilky\\_gm@hotmail.com](mailto:ilky_gm@hotmail.com)

Ms. Supaporn Samosorn  
Fisheries Resources Management  
and Measures Determination  
Division  
[regis\\_dof@hotmail.co.th](mailto:regis_dof@hotmail.co.th)

**United Kingdom**  
**Head of Delegation**  
Ms. Jess Keedy  
Department for Environment,  
Food and Rural Affairs

[Jess.Keedy@defra.gov.uk](mailto:Jess.Keedy@defra.gov.uk)

**Alternate**  
Mr. John Pearce  
MRAG Ltd  
[j.pearce@mrage.co.uk](mailto:j.pearce@mrage.co.uk)

**Advisor(s)**  
Ms. Charlotte Wicker  
Department for Environment,  
Food and Rural Affairs  
[charlotte.wicker@defra.gov.uk](mailto:charlotte.wicker@defra.gov.uk)

**Yemen**  
Absent

#### OBSERVERS

**IPNLF-International Pole and Line  
Fishing**  
Mr. Martin Purves  
[martin.purves@ipnlf.org](mailto:martin.purves@ipnlf.org)

Mr. Roy Bealey  
[roy.bealey@ipnlf.org](mailto:roy.bealey@ipnlf.org)

Mr. Shiham Adam  
[shiham.adam@ipnlf.org](mailto:shiham.adam@ipnlf.org)

**SFACT-Sustainable Fisheries  
Communities Trust**  
Mr. John Burton  
[john.burton@sfact.org](mailto:john.burton@sfact.org)

Ms. Beatrice Kinyua  
[beatrice.kinyua@sfact.org](mailto:beatrice.kinyua@sfact.org)

Ms. Maïa Perraudeau  
[Maia.Perraudeau@eui.eu](mailto:Maia.Perraudeau@eui.eu)

#### Invited Experts

**Advisor(s)**  
Mr. Shih-Ming Kao  
[kaosm@udel.edu](mailto:kaosm@udel.edu)

Mr. Kuan-Ting Lee  
[simon@tuna.org.tw](mailto:simon@tuna.org.tw)

Mr. Chien-Yi Yang  
[kenichifish@gmail.com](mailto:kenichifish@gmail.com)

Mr. Ken Chien-Nan Lin  
[chiennan@ms1.fao.gov.tw](mailto:chiennan@ms1.fao.gov.tw)

#### SECRETARIAT

Mr Gerard Domingue  
Compliance Manager  
[Gerard.Domingue@fao.org](mailto:Gerard.Domingue@fao.org)

Mr. Fabio Fiorellato  
[fabio.fiorellato@fao.org](mailto:fabio.fiorellato@fao.org)

Ms Mirose Govinden  
Bilingual Secretary  
[Mirose.Govinden@fao.org](mailto:Mirose.Govinden@fao.org)

#### INTERPRETERS



Ms Annie Trottier  
[a.trottier@aiic.net](mailto:a.trottier@aiic.net)

Ms Suzanne Kobine  
[s.kobine@aiic.net](mailto:s.kobine@aiic.net)

Mr Guillaume Fleury  
[g.fleury@aiic.net](mailto:g.fleury@aiic.net)

Mr Olivier Bonifacio  
[bonifacio@aiic.net](mailto:bonifacio@aiic.net)

**APPENDIX 2.**  
**ADOPTED AGENDA OF THE 9<sup>TH</sup> TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ON ALLOCATION CRITERIA**

**Day 1**

- 1. OPENING OF THE SESSION** (Chairperson & IOTC Secretariat)
- 2. INTRODUCTION OF DELEGATIONS** (Each Head of Delegation)
- 3. LETTER OF CREDENTIALS** (IOTC Secretariat)
- 4. ADMISSION OF OBSERVERS** (Chairperson)
- 5. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE SESSION** (Chairperson)
  - Chair’s Memorandum
  - Chair’s Draft #2 Proposed Allocation Regime Text, Annexes and Appendices
- 6. Review of Chair’s Proposed Allocation Regime Text, Annexes and Appendices**
  - Chair’s presentation (Chairperson)
  - General Overview Comments (All delegations)

**Days 2, 3, 4**

- **Continue general overview comments** (All delegations)
- 7. CHAIR’S SUMMARY** (Chairperson)
  - 8. APPROACH FOR 2022**
    - Chair’s Recommendations
    - Delegations Views
  - 9. DRAFT REPORT**
  - 10. OTHER BUSINESS**
  - 11. MEETING CLOSURE**

**APPENDIX 3.**  
**LIST OF DOCUMENTS**

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

<b>Document number</b>	<b>Title</b>
IOTC-2021-TCAC09-01a	Draft Agenda v5Oct
IOTC-2021-TCAC09-01b	Adopted Agenda v2Nov
IOTC-2021-TCAC09-02a	TCAC Chair's draft proposal for an Allocation Regime (v2) - annotated
IOTC-2021-TCAC09-02b	TCAC Chair's draft proposal for an Allocation Regime (v2) – word version
IOTC-2021-TCAC09-03	Chairperson’s explanatory memorandum
IOTC-2021-TCAC09-REF01	Draft Resolution on Allocation Regime - TCAC comments on v1 (1Sep)
IOTC-2021-TCAC09-REF02	TCAC Chair's draft proposal for an Allocation Regime (v2) - clean word document

## APPENDIX 4. STATEMENTS

### Statement by Mauritius

#### 9<sup>th</sup> Meeting of IOTC Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria 2-5 November 2021

#### Agenda Item 3: Letter of Credentials

#### Statement by the Republic of Mauritius

The Republic of Mauritius reiterates its long-standing position that the United Kingdom is not entitled to be a member of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) as a “coastal State situated wholly or partly within the Area [of competence of the Commission]” and wishes to place on record its objection to the participation of the United Kingdom in the 9<sup>th</sup> meeting of the IOTC Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria as a coastal State purporting to represent the Chagos Archipelago.

In addition to the reasons provided in the past to support its stand, the Republic of Mauritius wishes to draw the attention of the Committee to the Judgment delivered on 28 January 2021 in the case of *Mauritius v. Maldives* by a Special Chamber of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea (ITLOS). This Judgment ruled that the Republic of Mauritius has undisputed sovereignty over the Chagos Archipelago, thereby further confirming that the United Kingdom cannot be recognized as a member of the IOTC as a coastal State.

In its Judgment, the Special Chamber also held that:

- (a) the determinations made by the International Court of Justice (ICJ) in its Advisory Opinion of 25 February 2019 on the *Legal Consequences of the Separation of the Chagos Archipelago from Mauritius in 1965* have legal effect and clear implications for the legal status of the Chagos Archipelago;
- (b) the United Kingdom’s continued claim to sovereignty over the Chagos Archipelago is contrary to the determinations made by the ICJ that the detachment of the Chagos Archipelago by the United Kingdom from Mauritius was unlawful and that the United Kingdom’s continued administration of the Chagos Archipelago constitutes an unlawful act of a continuing character;

- (c) the fact that the time-limit of 22 November 2019 set by the UN General Assembly for the withdrawal of the United Kingdom’s administration from the Chagos Archipelago has passed without the United Kingdom complying with that demand further strengthens the Special Chamber’s finding that its claim to sovereignty over the Chagos Archipelago is contrary to the authoritative determinations made in the Advisory Opinion of the ICJ;
- (d) while the process of decolonization of the Republic of Mauritius has yet to be completed, the Republic of Mauritius’ sovereignty over the Chagos Archipelago can be inferred from the ICJ’s determinations;
- (e) the continued claim of the United Kingdom to sovereignty over the Chagos Archipelago cannot be considered anything more than “a mere assertion” and such assertion does not prove the existence of a dispute;
- (f) the Republic of Mauritius is to be regarded as the coastal State in respect of the Chagos Archipelago.

It is crystal clear that as a matter of international law, the Republic of Mauritius is the only State lawfully entitled to exercise sovereignty and sovereign rights over the Chagos Archipelago and its maritime zones, as the coastal State and that the United Kingdom is not in a position to claim any rights over the Chagos Archipelago. The so-called “British Indian Ocean Territory” which the United Kingdom purported to create by illegally excising the Chagos Archipelago from the territory of Mauritius prior to its accession to independence is an illegal entity. The United Kingdom cannot accordingly be a member of the IOTC as a coastal State.

The Republic of Mauritius requests that this statement be annexed to the report of this meeting.

## Statement by United Kingdom



Note Number: OTD/007/2021

The Overseas Territories Directorate of the Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office presents its compliments to the Secretariat of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) and Chair of the IOTC's Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria (TCAC) from 2 to 5 November 2021. For the benefit of the delegates the United Kingdom wishes to restate its position on the British Indian Ocean Territory (BIOT) and membership of the IOTC.

The United Kingdom has no doubt about its sovereignty over the Chagos Archipelago, which has been under continuous British sovereignty since 1814. Mauritius has never held sovereignty over the Archipelago and we do not recognise its claim. However, we have a long-standing commitment, first made in 1965, to cede sovereignty of the territory to Mauritius when it is no longer required for defence purposes. We stand by that commitment.

The United Kingdom was disappointed that this matter was referred to the International Court of Justice (ICJ), contrary to the principle that the Court should not consider bilateral disputes without the consent of both States concerned. Nevertheless, the United Kingdom respects the ICJ and participated fully in the ICJ process at every stage and in good faith. An Advisory Opinion is advice provided to the United Nations General Assembly at its request; it is not a legally binding judgment. The UK Government has considered the content of the Opinion carefully, however we do not share the Court's approach.

UN Resolution 73/295, adopted following the ICJ's Advisory Opinion, does not and cannot create any legal obligations for UN Member States. Neither the non-binding Advisory Opinion nor the non-binding General Assembly resolution alter the legal situation, namely that of a sovereignty dispute between the United Kingdom and Mauritius. The General Assembly is not the appropriate forum to resolve such a bilateral dispute.

The United Kingdom is aware of the judgment delivered on 28 January by the Special Chamber of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea (ITLOS) formed to deal with the Dispute concerning delimitation of a maritime boundary claimed by Mauritius to exist between Mauritius and Maldives in the Indian Ocean. The UK is not a party to these proceedings, which can have no effect for the UK or for maritime delimitation between the UK (in respect of BIOT) and the Republic of the Maldives.

The United Kingdom is a full member of the IOTC. The United Kingdom deposited instruments of acceptance to the IOTC Agreement on 31st March 1995 and 22nd December 2020 and has been a party to the Agreement since it entered into force. 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 BIOT 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.

The United Kingdom requests that this statement be annexed to the report of TCAC's session and posted on the IOTC's website.

The Overseas Territories Directorate of the Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office avails itself of the opportunity to renew to the Secretariat of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission the assurances of its highest consideration.

FOREIGN, COMMONWEALTH AND DEVELOPMENT OFFICE  
LONDON

29 October 2021



Statement by Indonesia (day 1)

**General View of Chair’s Draft Proposal for an Allocation Regime (V2)  
By Indonesia**

**Madame Chair**

Ms. Nadia Bouffard,

Chair of the 9<sup>th</sup> TCAC meeting

Executive Secretary of the Commission, Distinguished Delegates, Observers,

On behalf of the Government of the Republic of Indonesia, I would like to thank to the Chair of TCAC and the Secretariat for their hard work in arranging all preparatory works and material to this meeting.

**Madame Chair and distinguished delegates,**

TCAC meeting has been conducted 3 times during 2021, and the process shows some positive progress despite there is yet any agreed text. In principle, Indonesia strongly keep its commitment to actively participate and involve in the discussion on the Draft proposal on allocation regime as prepared by Chair. Therefore, we encourage members and invited parties to support the appropriate and comprehensive formulation of the Allocation Criteria for the IOTC Cooperation on managing tuna and its tuna related species.

**Madame Chair and distinguished delegates,**

Developing an allocation scheme for distributing rights amongst fishing nations is a key issue in the development of stable cooperative arrangements to explore and manage international fish resources. In developing the criteria for allocation regime, Indonesia is of the view that it is necessary to provide a transparent and equitable means of distributing fishing opportunities for allocation regimes. Furthermore, this regime shall take into account relevant international legal instruments based on their hierarchy and binding nature as main references. Thus, Indonesia views that UNCLOS serves as the main reference to regulate the allocation regimes.

Indonesia would like to highlight Article 61 (1) UNCLOS which states that coastal State shall determine the allowable catch of the living resources in its exclusive economic zone. Articles 63(2) and 64 of UNCLOS require cooperation, directly or through RFMOs, between coastal States and States who fish in the region with a view to ensuring conservation of stocks that occur in the EEZ(s) of coastal States and the area beyond or adjacent to the EEZ(s). We also note that in accordance with Article 62 (3) UNCLOS, a coastal state in giving access to other States to its exclusive economic zone, shall take into account all relevant factors, including, inter alia, the significance of the living resources of the area to the economy of the coastal State concerned and its other national interests.

In that connection, we view that further discussion and assessment need to be conducted in order to determine the criteria for allocation as well as historical catch baseline. The following factors should be taken into consideration i.e. the time when UNCLOS come into force, when IOTC members ratified UNCLOS and when a State became members of the Commission.

**Madame Chair and distinguished delegates,**

In the case of highly migratory stocks, there is the additional requirement that cooperation to promote the optimum utilisation of such stocks throughout the region, both within and beyond the EEZ of coastal States. Moreover, Article 87 of UNCLOS provides that all States have the freedom to fish on the high seas. That freedom is not absolute, but it is conditional on other treaty obligations, including obligations under constitutive treaties of existing RFMOs, the duty of members and non-Members of RFMOs to cooperate on conservation and management.

Furthermore, the UNFSA that also become reference of this draft stated that the RFMOs serve as the primary institutional mechanism for the adoption of conservation and Management measure for international fisheries. The UNFSA strengthens the position of RFMOs as the primary institutional mechanism for the adoption of conservation and management measures for international fisheries. Article 8 of the UNFSA imposes a duty to cooperate through RFMOs by providing that only members of RFMOs or non-Members which agree to apply the conservation and management measures adopted by RFMOs can have access to the fishery concerned.

The interest and measures of coastal state in managing and conserving the waters under its jurisdiction shall also be referred as regulated under Article 7 of UNFSA on the compatibility of conservation and management measures between the coastal States and those in RFMOs and Article XVI of the IOTC Agreement. These provisions clearly state that the coastal State's sovereign rights under UNCLOS to regulate the exploitation of living resources within their EEZs must be acknowledged, providing that they are exercised in accordance with UNCLOS.

In this connection, the adjacency principle shall play a key role in determining the allocation criteria. This principle recognizes the sovereign rights of coastal states under its jurisdiction and freedom of high seas. Through this principle, coastal States have a special role and rights, in parts of high seas that are nearby, or ecologically linked, to areas within national jurisdiction. This role generates the responsibility of coastal states that shall be considered seriously by RFMOs when it comes into allocation regime.

**Madame Chair and distinguished delegates,**

To conclude my remarks, I wish that the discussion this week will provide beneficial results that can contribute significantly to our joint efforts to meet the utmost objectives of IOTC on Allocation Regime. Nothing is agreed until everything is agreed. With that, I would like to underline our willingness to work constructively and cooperatively with other delegations for the success of this meeting. Thank you.

Statement by Indonesia (day 2)

Thank you Madam Chair,

Reflecting on some interventions made by colleagues yesterday and today, I would like to re-emphasize the following:

1. Allocation regime shall take into account relevant international legal instruments based on their hierarchy and binding nature as main references.

In that regard, we view that UNCLOS serves as the main reference to regulate the allocation regimes that we are currently discussing.

We believe that interpretation of IOTC agreement and FAO references shall be in line with UNCLOS.

2. The IOTC Agreement article XVI regarding coastal states right, clearly mentioned that the IOTC agreement shall not prejudice the exercise of sovereign rights of a coastal state in accordance with the international law of the sea for the purposes of exploring and exploiting, conserving and managing the living resources, including the highly migratory species, within a zone of up to 200 nautical miles under its jurisdiction.

3. Article 61 (1) UNCLOS mentioned that coastal State shall determine the allowable catch of the living resources in its exclusive economic zone. Thus clear, the coastal state has the right and is the one to determine allowable catch in its EEZ.

4. As for territorial sea and archipelagic waters, it is more than clear that coastal states have sovereignty over these areas. UNCLOS ensures such rights to the coastal states (article 2.1).

5. Concerning the historical catch, it is necessary to take into account the discrepancies between the developed and developing states regarding our past capacity in the history, the allocation criteria should be reinvented based on forward-looking and equality principles as well as the interest of coastal states.

Thank you



## Statement by Thailand

### Thailand’s statement for TCAC09

First of all, I would like to thank Madam Chair for working closely with CPCs to ensure that the objectives of establishing Allocation Regime are achieved effectively towards the sustainability. Regarding the TCAC Chair’s draft proposal on an Allocation Regime (v2), Thailand has some comments that:

1. In Article 2: Purpose, Thailand agrees that the objectives of the allocation of fish stocks are determined on the basis of fairness, equity, and transparency.
2. In Article 3: Guiding Principles, Thailand agrees that respect for the sovereign rights and obligations of the coastal States, including the status of fish stocks, shall be included as a criteria to determine the allocation. In particular, at point 3.5 bis, criteria of compliance with IOTC conservation and management measures is used as a criteria to allocate quotas to CPCs to enable efficient and sustainable utilization of stocks.
3. Article 8: Allocation Transfers and Use, Article 9 Implementation, and Article 10 Allocation Period, Thailand agrees that CPs can transfer a portion or all of their allocations, and supports the establishment of the Allocation Committee. In addition, Thailand considers that the allocation of priority fish stocks which are yellowfin tuna, bigeye tuna, skipjack tuna, albacore tuna, and swordfish should be considered and adopted first. Thailand also agrees with the clause “each allocation for a given fish stock shall remain valid for the period determined by the Commission for that stock. In the absence of a specified period, the allocation shall remain valid for the same period as the TAC period established for the fish stock.” identified in Article 10.1.
4. For Article 11: Final Clauses MDV, term, and Amendment, Thailand proposes that the Allocation Regime should be reviewed every 5 years to ensure that it is consistent with the Total Allowable Catch (TAC) allocation or stocks assessment.