



# Report of the 15<sup>th</sup> Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria

---

Zanzibar, 14 – 17 July 2025

---

**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 2025. Report of the 15<sup>th</sup> Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria. Zanzibar, 14 – 17 July 2025. *IOTC-2025-TCAC15-R[E]*: 32pp.

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  
Abis Centre, Providence  
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 .....	8
2. Letters of credentials and admission of observers .....	8
3. Adoption of the Agenda and arrangements for the session.....	8
4. Election of vice-chairs .....	8
5. TCAC15 Workplan .....	8
6. Catch Attribution and Proxies .....	9
7. Jurisdiction .....	11
8. Temporary Transfers and Transition.....	12
9. Reference Years .....	12
10. Special Requirements for Developing States.....	13
11. Baseline.....	13
12. Compliance.....	14
13. Resolution .....	14
14. Chairs Summary.....	15
15. Other Business.....	15
15.1. 2026 meeting schedule and host nominations .....	15
15.2. Future of the TCAC .....	15
16. Adoption Of Report .....	15
Appendix 1. List of Participants.....	16
Appendix 2. Adopted agenda of the 13 <sup>th</sup> Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria .....	22
Appendix 3. List of Documents.....	23
Appendix 4. Opening Remarks by Ms Agnes Meena, Permanent Secretary for Livestock and Fisheries of the United Republic of Tanzania .....	24
Appendix 5. Member Statements .....	27
Appendix 6. Options for Catch Attributions.....	29
Appendix 7. Proposals to use EEZ size as a proxy for interest in a fishery .....	30
Appendix 8. Framework for Transferability .....	32

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 15th Session of the Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria (TCAC15) was held in Zanzibar, Tanzania from 14 to 17 July 2025. The meeting was opened by Ms Agnes Meena, Permanent Secretary for Livestock and Fisheries of the United Republic of Tanzania who provided a welcoming statement (Appendix 4), and chaired by the Independent TCAC Chairperson, Mr Quentin Hanich.

[Para. 10] The TCAC **NOTED** that no nominations (for vice-chair) were received during the current session and so **AGREED** to defer the election to TCAC16.

[Para. 44] The TCAC **REQUESTED** that the Chair revise the phrase “out to 12 nautical miles” to “beyond territorial seas” in the next draft of the document (IOTC-2025-TCAC15-06).

[Para. 51] The TCAC **REQUESTED** that the Chair develop an options paper to address artisanal fisheries within the allocation framework, for presentation at TCAC16.

[Para. 54] The TCAC **REQUESTED** that the Chair revise the phrase ‘unable to harvest’ to cover cases when transferability is made on the basis of other consideration, like commercial interests or species preferences (IOTC-2025-TCAC15-05).

[Para. 55] The TCAC **AGREED** that the term "trading" as used in the document, was somewhat misleading and should be replaced with "temporary transfers." (IOTC-2025-TCAC15-05).

[Para. 56] **NOTING** the discussion on the proposed quota temporary transfer mechanism within an allocation framework, the TCAC **AGREED** that transfers should only occur between Contracting Parties (CPs).

[Para. 58] The TCAC **AGREED** that transfers shall not affect long-term allocation rights and must be linked to a robust allocation system. Some members questioned the need to record catch locations once quota is transferred.

[Para. 70] The TCAC **REQUESTED** that the Secretariat develop a paper to be presented to TCAC16, guiding the members on how to use the shiny app by outlining when relevant management measures for the 5 relevant species had come into effect as well as summarise the previous discussions on this matter.

[Para. 75] The TCAC **REQUESTED** that the Chair develop an options paper including the various components that could be included under this criterion for presentation at TCAC16.

[Para. 76] The TCAC **REQUESTED** the Chair to develop a paper outlining different baseline options for inclusion in the allocation framework.

[Para. 82] The TCAC **AGREED** compliance is fundamental to the successful implementation of an allocation regime. The TCAC **NOTED** that many members agreed that compliance should only apply to the application of the regime and should not include past compliance issues.

[Para. 83] The TCAC **REQUESTED** that the Chair develop an option paper to be presented at TAC16 that would provide guidance on how this issue is addressed in other RFMOs, include discussions held at the TCAC13 and provide options for assessing and addressing compliance.

[Para. 84] The TCAC **NOTED** that IOTC currently has no systematic sanction mechanism and **AGREED** that this would be needed to ensure compliance with the allocation framework. This could include concepts such as payback mechanisms for overcatch as is carried out in other RFMOs.

[Para. 95] The TCAC **AGREED** to the need to extend the meeting (TCAC16) to four days to accommodate three days of discussion and a day for report review and adoption.

[Para. 97] The TCAC **REQUESTED** the Chair to lead bilateral meetings with CPCs, inviting the CPCs who have firm positions arguing points to the constructive discussion.

[Para. 98] The TCAC **AGREED** that a discussion on the future of the TCAC should be held at TCAC16. The TCAC **NOTED** that although progress had been made during TCAC15, members were urged to show flexibility moving forward to ensure the allocation process could continue.

## 1. OPENING OF THE SESSION

1. The 15th Session of the Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria (TCAC15) was held in Zanzibar, Tanzania from 14 to 17 July 2025. The meeting was opened by Ms Agnes Meena, Permanent Secretary for Livestock and Fisheries of the United Republic of Tanzania who provided a welcoming statement ([Appendix 4](#)), and chaired by the Independent TCAC Chairperson, Mr Quentin Hanich.
2. The meeting was held in a hybrid format that included participants attending in-person and by videoconference.

## 2. LETTERS OF CREDENTIALS AND ADMISSION OF OBSERVERS

3. Letters of Credentials were received from 25 Contracting Parties. China, France OT, India, Iran and Republic of Korea participated virtually. The list of participants is provided in [Appendix 1](#).
4. 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
- Europêche
- International Pole and Line Foundation
- International Seafood Sustainability Foundation
- Marine Affairs Program (Dalhousie University)
- South West Indian Ocean Tuna Forum
- Sustainable Fisheries and Communities Trust

*Invited consultants and experts:*

- Invited Experts

5. Statements by Mauritius France OT are included in [Appendix 5](#).

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

6. The Chair provided an overview of the agenda and schedule of discussions for the meeting and noted the documents included in [Appendix 2](#)
7. The Chair stressed the importance of making progress at the current session in order to be in a position to reach agreements on key components of the allocation regime at the next session of the TCAC (TCAC16) in 2026.
8. The TCAC **ADOPTED** the revised agenda provided in [Appendix 3](#).

## 4. ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRS

9. The TCAC **NOTED** that Ms Laura Marot (EU), who had been elected as a vice-Chair at TCAC13 was no longer able to continue in this role. As such the TCAC **CALLED** for nominations for the position of vice-Chair to replace Ms Marot.
10. The TCAC **NOTED** that no nominations were received during the current session and so **AGREED** to defer the election to TCAC16.
11. The Chair called on volunteers to join the rapporteuring group to assist in drafting the report for the TCAC15 in an interim role until a vice-Chair is elected. The UK offered to join the rapporteuring group for TCAC15.

## 5. TCAC15 WORKPLAN

12. The TCAC **NOTED** papers IOTC-2025-TCAC015-03, which provided the TCAC's agreed program of work from 2025 to 2027; and paper IOTC-2025-TCAC015-09, which provided an allocation decision tree.



13. The Chair highlighted that the documents outline a workplan and decision tree framework for allocating fisheries resources in the Indian Ocean, emphasizing sustainability, equity, and development. The document highlights key principles such as participation, cooperation, special requirements for developing states, and science-based management. The framework includes decisions on species allocation, criteria definition, jurisdiction, transferability, compliance, implementation needs, new entrants, criteria weightings, review arrangements, and drafting resolutions. Progress will be tracked through a timeline of TCAC meetings from TCAC15 to TCAC18, with specific milestones for agreement and implementation to ensure progress is made and an allocation regime can be considered for adoption by 2028.

14. The TCAC **NOTED** that at TCAC13 (IOTC-2024-TCAC13-R):

*(Para 53) The TCAC **AGREED** to focus solely on the five principal species, aiming to submit an allocation resolution for these species to the Commission for adoption in 2027 noting that possible variations in weightings for each species may be necessary. The TCAC **AGREED** that it would include a recommendation in its submission that a second resolution then be adopted for other species, based on the same allocation criteria, subject to variations in weightings with a timeline to be discussed and agreed.*

15. The Chair acknowledged this agreement and noted that he would adjust the decision tree provided in document IOTC-2025-TCAC15-09 accordingly.

## 6. CATCH ATTRIBUTION AND PROXIES

16. The TCAC **NOTED** the Chair's presentation IOTC-2025-TCAC15-08 on catch attribution.

17. The TCAC **NOTED** the utility of the information provided in the document for informing the discussions on catch attribution and **NOTED** the Chair's clarification that catch attribution is a backward-looking process that seeks to assign historic catch, while allocation is how the catch distribution will be applied moving forward.

18. The TCAC **DISCUSSED** the scope of the catch that would be included in the allocation regime. The Chair stressed that if catch from a certain area is included in the attribution estimations, then that area should be included in the allocation regime moving forward.

19. The TCAC **NOTED** that agreement is still required on the scope of the allocation regime, as some members felt the regime should apply to the entire IOTC Area of Competence, while others expressed their view that the regime should not infringe on their sovereignty in their territorial or archipelagic waters and the sovereign rights in the EEZ.

20. The TCAC **NOTED** concerns expressed by some delegations about conservation burdens on coastal states and emphasised respect for sovereign rights.

21. The TCAC **NOTED** the ongoing discussions regarding the attribution of historical catch within an EEZ and whether this should be allocated to the coastal state with jurisdiction of the area where the catches were taken or to the flag state which has reported those catches. Coastal states have the sovereign rights of their resources in their EEZs under UNCLOS clauses 56 and 61.

22. The TCAC **NOTED** the importance of the quality of data to the allocation scheme. High-quality data, including spatial information would enhance the spatial separation and reduce uncertainty in the determination of the catches inside and outside the EEZ and subsequent attribution of catches to individual CPCs.

23. The TCAC **NOTED** the example of the WCPFC as provided in the document and were informed that the quality of data in the WCPFC facilitates this process as much of it is available at an operational level, while the data in the IOTC is not always sufficiently detailed and several assumptions are required when attributing catches to the EEZs or high seas. Some delegations expressed doubt that the example of the WCPFC could be applied to the IOTC given the substantial differences between the two areas and organisations.

24. The TCAC **DISCUSSED** the possibility of a compromise catch attribution option of some form may be required to implement the future allocation mechanism. Two options proposed are included in [Appendix 6](#).

25. The TCAC **NOTED** that a member expressed their opinion that the introductory text included in option 1 could be removed and serve as a preamble to both options. The TCAC further **NOTED** that the following text could be included in the options provided:

*"Catch attribution under this resolution shall be used solely for determining catch history criteria. Coastal State CPCs may, under mutually agreed terms, grant surplus quota resulting from the allocation process*

*to Flag State CPCs. This provision shall not prejudice the sovereign rights of Coastal States under international law to grant access, nor their authority to set access fees and conditions for Flag States regarding surplus quota.”*

26. The TCAC **NOTED** that one member expressed its view that it could not accept any option that does not result in the full catch within an EEZ being fully attributed to the coastal state.

#### *Biomass Indicators*

27. The TCAC **NOTED** a presentation by the Secretariat IOTC-2025-TCAC15-07 on biomass indicators of potential use for allocation of the Total Allowable Catch in the Indian Ocean.
28. The TCAC **NOTED** the outcomes from the paper and the difficulty to provide accurate estimations of biomass based on the current quality of data available, particularly the spatial resolution of the data.
29. The TCAC **NOTED** the indication that there is no clear relationship between environmental data and catch, making it difficult to use environmental data to infer potential catch or distribution of biomass within the region.
30. The TCAC **ENQUIRED** as to whether fishery independent data such as biomass surveys could be used to assess the biomass within member EEZs but were informed by the Secretariat that fishery independent methods of biomass estimation, such as aerial surveys and acoustic surveys, have not proven to be effective for tuna species. As such, the cost to conduct this sampling cannot be easily estimated but is likely to be prohibitively expensive when taking into account the scale of sampling needed both spatially and temporally.
31. The TCAC **NOTED** the advice provided in the paper that to incorporate biomass into the allocation model, it could be possible to weight each EEZ based on the distribution of biomass of IOTC species (YFT, BET, SKJ, ALB and SWO) across different larger regions. It was, however, pointed out that productivity is not equal within each region, and therefore, this may still not provide an accurate indication of biomass by EEZ.
32. The TCAC **NOTED** that some members expressed the opinion that as this biomass indicator is difficult to determine, incorporating it into the allocation regime may not be useful at this stage and that effort should rather be focused on agreeing on the criteria under discussion. A member expressed concern that a potential disproportionate benefit arises from the application of biomass. Some members supported the ongoing development of a biomass allocation criteria, in relation to sovereign rights in the EEZ, consistent with international law.
33. The TCAC **DISCUSSED** the challenges of using biomass and fishing effort data to inform catch allocation. The TCAC **NOTED** that the variability of effort over time, low-resolution data, and the influence of historical anomalies such as piracy and climate fluctuations complicate analysis.
34. The TCAC **NOTED** that several members expressed their support for further exploring biomass proxies, utilising EEZ size and productivity and/or including bioregions, but others were concerned that the current information and data is insufficient to be able to develop meaningful proxies at this time.
35. The TCAC **NOTED** suggested options for including biomass in the allocation regime provided by a small working group convened by Australia as well as a proposals by India and Somalia. These options are included in [Appendix 7](#). One CPC expressed concern that the proposals included in Appendix 7 would complicate the negotiations.
36. The TCAC **NOTED** that several CPCs expressed their opposition to including EEZ size as a proxy for biomass. The convenors of the small working group clarified that the proposed options do not intend for EEZ size to be used as a proxy for catch history but rather indicate a countries inclusion or interest in the fishery due to the presence of an EEZ in the IOTC area. Including EEZ size could be considered an alternative to utilising catch history. Another option to achieve progress on this matter, should it not be acceptable to include this aspect as a proxy for historical catch, EEZ size could be included as a separate criterion in the allocation regime. The TCAC **NOTED** that there was no agreement on this matter at this time.

#### *Simulation Tool*

37. The Secretariat presented the updated simulation tool for allocation criteria including explanations of the data, assumptions and outputs (IOTC-2025-TCAC15-INF02 with login details provided in IOTC-2025-TCAC15-INF02a).

38. The TCAC **NOTED** the utility of the app for helping members to visualise the outputs of the different assumptions used in the allocation estimations.
39. The TCAC **NOTED** that the data used in the app is publicly available on the IOTC website and does not violate any confidentiality clauses related to the dissemination of IOTC catch data. The app is dynamic and will be revised based on the discussions and agreements/decisions made during the TCAC meetings.
40. The TCAC provided several suggestions for revising the current app including:
- Together with the glider, providing the option to add a value directly for the various options.
  - Changing the label “CPC” to “Fleet”.
  - Updating the Socio-economic indicators in response to the deliberations and recommendations made by the WPSE.
  - Providing clarifying text that the spatial separation of catch is attributed proportionally within squares that overlap the high seas and EEZs, and that it does not necessarily mean a CPC fished in the EEZ of another CPC. The Secretariat noted that this will be addressed based on future verifications of fishing distribution by CPCs on the high seas.
41. Update the app to include the most recent years of data available.

## 7. JURISDICTION

42. The TCAC **NOTED** the Chair’s presentation IOTC-2025-TCAC15-06 on jurisdiction.
43. The Chair provided a brief summary of the key elements of the paper:
- Package deal – Allocation requires consensus so inclusion of EEZs, archipelagic waters and territorial seas will always be contingent on an acceptable allocation framework that addresses coastal State sovereignty, sovereign rights and equity concerns.
  - If EEZs are excluded from the allocation framework, then it will be necessary to exclude EEZ catch history from any quota calculations.
  - If EEZs are not included, then TCAC should cease work.
  - Inclusion of EEZs in allocation framework requires reciprocal recognition of their sovereign rights and treatment in quota calculations.
44. The TCAC **REQUESTED** that the Chair revise the phrase “out to 12 nautical miles” to “beyond territorial seas” in the next draft of the document.
45. The TCAC **NOTED** that a key issue centers on whether archipelagic and territorial waters should be considered in both attribution and allocation frameworks. While not explicitly mentioned in the IOTC Agreement, some members support including catches from these waters as a precondition to have a meaningful allocation system that ensures sustainability and cooperation, coherently with practices from other RFMOs. Several members emphasized the importance of reporting all catches of IOTC species, without compromising sovereignty.
46. The TCAC **NOTED** that some members requested language that reflects sovereignty in their archipelagic waters and territorial seas while encouraging compatibility in management.
47. The TCAC **NOTED** that some members stressed that jurisdiction over EEZs lies exclusively with coastal states, and that cooperation must not be interpreted as a loss of sovereign rights.
48. The TCAC **NOTED** that some coastal CPCs requested the exclusion of small-scale and artisanal fisheries from the allocation framework. The TCAC further **NOTED** that some members expressed concern regarding excluding small-scale and artisanal fisheries from allocation frameworks, as these account for substantial catch volumes given the current IOTC description of artisanal fisheries. They were concerned that exemptions could undermine management based on total allowable catch (TAC) limits as estimated by the Scientific Committee.
49. The TCAC **NOTED** that the characteristics of artisanal fisheries varies greatly between the different member states. The TCAC further **NOTED** the Chair’s comment on the need to define artisanal fleets in order to address the impacts of these fleets within an allocation regime and how their needs can be incorporated without undermining stock sustainability. The TCAC **NOTED** that not all members agreed to this process, noting it could

be extremely time consuming and had not been successfully achieved in FAO. Some members stressed that scientific advice will be needed to inform the TCAC on the consequences of excluding artisanal fisheries on resource management.

50. The TCAC **NOTED** the importance of reaching a decision on this critical component of the allocation regime. The Chair noted that should no progress on this issue be made at TCAC16, the Commission would be informed accordingly, and a decision would need to be made on the ongoing viability of the TCAC.
51. The TCAC **REQUESTED** that the Chair develop an options paper to address artisanal fisheries within the allocation framework, for presentation at TCAC16.

## 8. TEMPORARY TRANSFERS AND TRANSITION

52. The TCAC **NOTED** a presentation IOTC-2025-TCAC15-05 by the Chair which outlined options on transferability.
53. The TCAC **NOTED** that the incorporation of temporary quota transferability would be highly beneficial in ensuring that market access and stability are maintained.
54. The TCAC **REQUESTED** that the Chair revise the phrase 'unable to harvest' to cover cases when transferability is made on the basis of other consideration, like commercial interests or species preferences
55. The TCAC **AGREED** that the term "trading" as used in the document, was somewhat misleading and should be replaced with "temporary transfers."
56. **NOTING** the discussion on the proposed quota temporary transfer mechanism within an allocation framework, the TCAC **AGREED** that transfers should only occur between Contracting Parties (CPs).
57. The TCAC **NOTED** that many members supported allowing temporary transfers, provided transparency is ensured and all transfers are notified to the Secretariat by the end of the third quarter to allow for proper administration. The Secretariat would ensure all CPCs are notified via appropriate means. The TCAC further **NOTED** that transfers would be between Contracting Party governments only, not involving private entities. The TCAC further **NOTED** that a member expressed their opinion that there should be a limit on the quota that can be transferred to another CPC.
58. The TCAC **AGREED** that transfers shall not affect long-term allocation rights and must be linked to a robust allocation system. Some members questioned the need to record catch locations once quota is transferred.
59. The TCAC **NOTED** the clarification that temporary transfers are separate from catch attribution and primarily serves to optimize quota use. The issue of underages (under-catch or unused quotas) and whether they should relate to temporary transfers requires further discussion, not related to temporary transfers.
60. The TCAC **NOTED** a revised proposed framework for transferability developed by the Chair based on the comments made by members. This revised framework is included in [Appendix 8](#).

## 9. REFERENCE YEARS

61. The TCAC **NOTED** a presentation by the Secretariat on catch histories (IOTC-2025-TCAC15-INF01).
62. The TCAC **NOTED** the Secretariat's observation that the data reported to the Secretariat had improved in recent years. The TCAC was informed that these improvements were on a case-by-case basis and not across all CPCs or fleets equally, and that large improvements in reporting from some key fisheries were taken into consideration when making this observation.
63. The TCAC **NOTED** that the Secretariat had acknowledged several challenges that affect the quality of the data. Several CPCs requested that these challenges be taken into consideration when developing the allocation framework.
64. The TCAC **ACKNOWLEDGED** that in order for the allocation framework to be effective, there would need to be capacity to monitor the catches to ensure that the quotas are not exceeded.
65. The TCAC **NOTED** that the current lag in the reporting of data, would be an impediment for some members in determining when quotas may be at risk of being exceeded. Increasing the use of technology, electronic monitoring, and data collection systems may help address this issue in the future. Some members stressed the futility of implementing an allocation framework in the absence of an effective quota consumption monitoring process.

*Methodology for catch estimation*

66. The TCAC **NOTED** the concern from some members on the current methodology used to apportion catches between the high seas and EEZs, applied by the Secretariat.
67. The TCAC **NOTED** that some members considered that unless coastal states could provide evidence (access agreements, licensing etc.) that catches had occurred in their EEZ, that all catches taken by flag states in a square that overlaps the high seas and EEZ should be attributed to the high seas. Other members considered that in some cases coastal states did not have access to the relevant VMS and catch data information to be able to make this case and therefore the current method of assigning the catch proportional to the relative size of the EEZ or high seas in a given square, should be continued.
68. The TCAC **NOTED** the Chair's proposal that the Secretariat attempt to identify these squares where the overlap is most prevalent and work with the affected flag and coastal states to try and apportion the catch equitably and in line with the information and evidence available.

*Reference year selection*

69. The TCAC **NOTED** that discussions on reference years had taken place during the TCAC13 and no agreement had yet been reached on this issue.
70. The TCAC **REQUESTED** that the Secretariat develop a paper to be presented to TCAC16, guiding the members on how to use the shiny app by outlining when relevant management measures for the 5 relevant species had come into effect as well as summarise the previous discussions on this matter.

**10. SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS FOR DEVELOPING STATES**

71. The TCAC **DISCUSSED** quota distribution methods and indicators.
72. The TCAC **NOTED** that one member expressed their view that this issue should be a priority as basing allocation on catch history disadvantaged coastal states that had not been able to develop their fishing capacity. The TCAC further **NOTED** that several coastal states did not agree with this view as they had catch histories within their EEZ and felt that they should not be disadvantaged based on their fishing history.
73. The TCAC **NOTED** that Article 24, paragraph 2 of the United Nations Fish Stocks Agreement provides guidance on this matter:

*“(a) the vulnerability of developing States which are dependent on the exploitation of living marine resources, including for meeting the nutritional requirements of their populations or parts thereof;*

*(b) the need to avoid adverse impacts on, and ensure access to fisheries by, subsistence, small-scale and artisanal fishers and women fishworkers, as well as indigenous people in developing States, particularly small island developing States; and*

*(c) the need to ensure that such measures do not result in transferring, directly or indirectly, a disproportionate burden of conservation action onto developing States.”*

74. The TCAC **NOTED** several options proposed by members such as:
- Taking into account the evolution of a member's developmental status over time based on international indices and definitions. Should a developing state member become a developed state, this component would no longer apply to them. It was noted that an agreement should be made on how a member's development status should be defined.
  - Weighting the allocation under this criterion by per capita fish consumption and population size.
75. The TCAC **REQUESTED** that the Chair develop an options paper including the various components that could be included under this criterion for presentation at TCAC16.

**11. BASELINE**

76. The TCAC **REQUESTED** the Chair to develop a paper outlining different baseline options for inclusion in the allocation framework.
77. The TCAC **NOTED** that several CPCs expressed their view that a baseline allocation should be an equal portion for all members, reflecting the right to fish on the high seas, while others suggested that an additional separate baseline component could be set aside for coastal states to reflect their sovereign right in their EEZ.

78. The TCAC **NOTED** that a member expressed their view that the baseline component should be kept as a small percentage of the TAC.
79. The TCAC **NOTED** the request by China to have a separate baseline quota for China and Taiwan, Province of China. The TCAC further **NOTED** that to accommodate this, the allocation framework would need to clearly specify this and not simply refer to CPCs as this would exclude this possibility. The TCAC **NOTED** that the chair in consultation with China will propose options at the TCAC16.
80. The TCAC **NOTED** that a member expressed their view that a decision on this baseline component is dependent on the weighting of the other components in the allocation framework and therefore reserved comment on this issue at this time.

## 12. COMPLIANCE

81. The TCAC **NOTED** the discussion of compliance history as an allocation criterion and whether/how allocations should be adjusted in response to future compliance, and what violations should be considered.
82. The TCAC **AGREED** compliance is fundamental to the successful implementation of an allocation regime. The TCAC **NOTED** that many members agreed that compliance should only apply to the application of the regime and should not include past compliance issues.
83. The TCAC **REQUESTED** that the Chair develop an option paper to be presented at TAC16 that would provide guidance on how this issue is addressed in other RFMOs, include discussions held at the TCAC13 and provide options for assessing and addressing compliance.
84. The TCAC **NOTED** that IOTC currently has no systematic sanction mechanism and **AGREED** that this would be needed to ensure compliance with the allocation framework. This could include concepts such as payback mechanisms for overcatch as is carried out in other RFMOs.
85. The TCAC **NOTED** the differing opinions on how compliance could be incorporated into the allocation framework, with some preferring it to be a factor used when estimating the allocation whilst other felt it should simply be used to assess the implementation of the framework and adjust future quotas.
86. The TCAC **NOTED** that the following components could be useful for the addressing compliance:
- Potential penalties for non-compliance with the regime (such as payback mechanisms).
  - Potential penalties for non-provision of data (pursuant to Resolutions 15/01 and 15/02)
  - Potential penalties for other non-compliance issues that can be discussed and agreed.
  - Possible options to acknowledge the limited capacity of some members, noting that these members fully acknowledge the importance of compliance.
87. The TCAC **NOTED** that several members expressed their view that the non-provision of data should result in no quota. The members expressed their view that without data, the framework cannot be monitored or implemented effectively.
88. The TCAC **NOTED** that some members were of the opinion that the IOTC Compliance reports in their entirety should be used to evaluate compliance as these are readily available and assessed by the CoC each year and that selecting only a few CMMs to include would result in additional debate. The TCAC **NOTED** that other members were of the opinion that only selected relevant Resolutions should be taken into consideration.
89. The TCAC **NOTED** a suggestion that penalties for non-compliance could be adjusted to incentives for compliance. In this case members would receive a percentage of their initial quota that would be increased over time as their compliance with the framework improved.
90. The TCAC **NOTED** that the financial contributions by members to the IOTC are currently partially based on annual catches. A member noted that once an allocation regime is adopted, this would affect the annual catches reported by members and in turn would affect their contributions. Compliance with the allocation framework is therefore key to ensure the financial stability of the Commission.

## 13. RESOLUTION

91. The TCAC **DISCUSSED** the process for drafting a Resolution.

92. The TCAC **NOTED** that the drafting of a Resolution text would be tasked to the Chair and that this would be dependent on the progress made at TCAC16. Should sufficient progress be made and agreement reached on several components, the Chair, with assistance from the vice-Chairs would develop a structure for the text for consideration at TCAC17.

## 14. CHAIRS SUMMARY

93. The Chair thanked the TCAC for a successful meeting and highlighted the fruitful discussions that had taken place and noted that he would not provide a separate summary.

## 15. OTHER BUSINESS

### 15.1. 2026 meeting schedule and host nominations

94. The TCAC **ACKNOWLEDGED** the offer from Australia to host the next physical session of the TCAC from the 3 – 6 February 2026. The TCAC **THANKED** Australia for their generous offer and accepted the invitation.
95. The TCAC **AGREED** to the need to extend the meeting to four days to accommodate three days of discussion and a day for report review and adoption.

### 15.2. Future of the TCAC

96. The TCAC **NOTED** the concern expressed by several members regarding the lack of progress made on allocation discussions over the 15 years of the existence of the TCAC.
97. The TCAC **REQUESTED** the Chair to lead bilateral meetings with CPCs, inviting the CPCs who have firm positions arguing points to the constructive discussion.
98. The TCAC **AGREED** that a discussion on the future of the TCAC should be held at TCAC16. The TCAC **NOTED** that although progress had been made during TCAC15, members were urged to show flexibility moving forward to ensure the allocation process could continue.
99. The TCAC **NOTED** that TCAC16 would be a defining meeting and should no significant progress be made on the key issues discussed during TCAC15, members would need to conclusively discuss as to whether or how the process should continue. The TCAC16 would also discuss revising the current workplan if appropriate. Accordingly, the Chair stated that a dedicated item would be included in the agenda of TCAC16 to discuss the future of the TCAC. The Chair would then report this to the Commission for its consideration.

## 16. ADOPTION OF REPORT

The report of the 15th Session of the Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria (IOTC–2025–TCAC15–R) was **ADOPTED** on the 17 July 2025.

## APPENDIX 1. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

**CHAIRPERSON**

Mr Quentin Hanich  
[hanich@uow.edu.au](mailto:hanich@uow.edu.au)

**AUSTRALIA****Head of Delegation**

Mr Neil Hughes  
Department of Agriculture,  
Fisheries and Forestry  
[Neil.Hughes@aff.gov.au](mailto:Neil.Hughes@aff.gov.au)

**Alternate**

Mr George Day  
Department of Agriculture,  
Fisheries and Forestry  
[George.Day@aff.gov.au](mailto:George.Day@aff.gov.au)

**Advisor(s)**

Ms Lakshmi Gudipati  
Department of Agriculture,  
Fisheries and Forestry  
[Lakshmi.Gudipati@aff.gov.au](mailto:Lakshmi.Gudipati@aff.gov.au)

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

Mr Kim Newbold  
Independent Fishery  
Professional  
[knewbold@wn.com.au](mailto:knewbold@wn.com.au)

**BANGLADESH**

Absent

**CHINA****Head of Delegation**

Mr Jiangfeng Zhu  
Shanghai Ocean University  
[Jiangfeng\\_zhu@yeah.net](mailto:Jiangfeng_zhu@yeah.net)

**Alternate**

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

**Advisor(s)**

Ms Huihui Shen  
Shanghai Ocean University  
[hhshen@shou.edu.cn](mailto:hhshen@shou.edu.cn)

Ms Xiaolin Chu  
Shanghai Ocean University

[xlchu@shou.edu.cn](mailto:xlchu@shou.edu.cn)

Ms Yanan Li  
Shanghai Ocean University  
[ynli@shou.edu.cn](mailto:ynli@shou.edu.cn)

Ms Shu Su  
Shanghai Ocean University  
[ssu@shou.edu.cn](mailto:ssu@shou.edu.cn)

Ms Qiuning Li  
China Overseas Fisheries  
Association  
[liqiuning@cofa.net.cn](mailto:liqiuning@cofa.net.cn)

Mr Yan Li  
China Overseas Fisheries  
Association  
[liyan@cofa.net.cn](mailto:liyan@cofa.net.cn)

**COMOROS**

Absent

**EUROPEAN UNION****Head of Delegation**

Mr Marco Valletta  
DG MARE, B2  
[Marco.valletta@ec.europa.eu](mailto:Marco.valletta@ec.europa.eu)

**Advisor(s)**

Mr Benoit Marcoux  
DG MARE, B2  
[Benoit.MARCOUX@ec.europa.eu](mailto:Benoit.MARCOUX@ec.europa.eu)

Mr João Nunes  
DGRM  
[jnunes@dgrm.pt](mailto:jnunes@dgrm.pt)

Mr Ismael Yagüe Sabido  
Spanish Administration  
[iyague@mapa.es](mailto:iyague@mapa.es)

Mr David Nordlund Sierra  
Spanish Administration  
[dpnordlund@mapa.es](mailto:dpnordlund@mapa.es)

Ms Juliette Haziza  
DGAMPA  
[juliette.haziza@mer.gouv.fr](mailto:juliette.haziza@mer.gouv.fr)

Mr Michel Goujon

**ORTHONGEL**

[mgoujon@orthongel.fr](mailto:mgoujon@orthongel.fr)

Ms Armelle Denoize  
SAPMER  
[adenoise@sapmer.com](mailto:adenoise@sapmer.com)

Ms Elodie Desix  
SAPMER  
[edesix@sapmer.com](mailto:edesix@sapmer.com)

Mr Thomas Poirout  
CRPMEM de La Réunion  
tpoirout@crpmem.re

Mr Julio Moron Ayala  
OPAGAC  
[julio.moron@opagac.org](mailto:julio.moron@opagac.org)

**FRANCE(OT)****Head of Delegation**

Mr Mafal Thiam  
Direction générale des  
affaires maritimes, de la  
pêche et de l'aquaculture  
[mafal.thiam@mer.gouv.fr](mailto:mafal.thiam@mer.gouv.fr)

**INDIA****Head of Delegation**

Ms Neetu Prasad  
Department of Fisheries  
[jsfy@nic.in](mailto:jsfy@nic.in)

**Alternate**

Mr Mohammad Koya  
Department of Fisheries  
[fdc-india@dof.gov.in](mailto:fdc-india@dof.gov.in)

**Advisor(s)**

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

Mr Sreenath KR  
Fishery Survey of India  
[dg@fsi.gov.in](mailto:dg@fsi.gov.in)

Mr Sijo Varghese  
Fishery Survey of India  
[varghesefsi@hotmail.com](mailto:varghesefsi@hotmail.com)

Mr Eldho Varghese  
CMFRI



[eldhoiasri@gmail.com](mailto:eldhoiasri@gmail.com)

Ms Muktha Menon  
ICAR  
[muktham@gmail.com](mailto:muktham@gmail.com)

Mr Ansuman Das  
Fishery Survey of India  
[1006ansu@gmail.com](mailto:1006ansu@gmail.com)

Mr Manas Kumar Sinha  
Fishery Survey of India  
[manassinhafsi70@gmail.com](mailto:manassinhafsi70@gmail.com)

#### INDONESIA

##### Head of Delegation

Mr Hary Christijanto  
Ministry of Marine Affairs  
and Fisheries  
[hchristijanto@yahoo.com](mailto:hchristijanto@yahoo.com)

##### Alternate

Mr Gunawan Dwi Nugroho  
Ministry of Marine Affairs  
and Fisheries  
[gunawan.dn@gmail.com](mailto:gunawan.dn@gmail.com)

##### Advisor(s)

Ms Putuh Suadela  
Ministry of Marine Affairs  
and Fisheries  
[putuhsuadela@gmail.com](mailto:putuhsuadela@gmail.com)

Mr Indra Jaya  
Ministry of Marine Affairs  
and Fisheries  
[indrajaya123@gmail.com](mailto:indrajaya123@gmail.com)

Ms Jatu Fajarika  
Nugrohorukmi  
Ministry of Marine Affairs  
and Fisheries  
[jatu.fn@kkp.go.id](mailto:jatu.fn@kkp.go.id)

Ms Desri Yanti  
Ministry of Marine Affairs  
and Fisheries  
[multilateralmmaf@gmail.com](mailto:multilateralmmaf@gmail.com)

Mr Alza Rendian  
Ministry of Marine Affairs  
and Fisheries  
[alzarendian@gmail.com](mailto:alzarendian@gmail.com)

Ms Sri Rahayu  
Ministry of Marine Affairs  
and Fisheries  
[srirahayu.bon@gmail.com](mailto:srirahayu.bon@gmail.com)

Mr Marcus Daniel  
Wicaksono  
Ministry of Marine Affairs  
and Fisheries  
[marcusdanielw@gmail.com](mailto:marcusdanielw@gmail.com)

#### IRAN (ISLAMIC REP OF)

##### Alternate

Mr Fariborz Rajaei  
Iran Fisheries Organization  
[rajaeif@gmail.com](mailto:rajaeif@gmail.com)

#### JAPAN

##### Head of Delegation

Ms Chika Fukugama  
Fisheries Agency  
[chika\\_fukugama740@maff.go.jp](mailto:chika_fukugama740@maff.go.jp)

##### Alternate

Ms Yuka Matsuzawa  
Fisheries Agency  
[yuka\\_matsuzawa450@maff.go.jp](mailto:yuka_matsuzawa450@maff.go.jp)

##### Advisor(s)

Mr Takaaki Suzuki  
Fisheries Agency  
[takaaki\\_suzuki620@maff.go.jp](mailto:takaaki_suzuki620@maff.go.jp)

Mr Kiyoshi Katsuyama  
Japan Tuna Fisheries  
Cooperative Association  
[katsuyama@japantuna.or.jp](mailto:katsuyama@japantuna.or.jp)

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

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

#### KENYA

##### Head of Delegation

Mr Daniel Mungai  
State Department for the  
Blue Economy and Fisheries  
[karemeri@gmail.com](mailto:karemeri@gmail.com)

##### Alternate

Mr Davies Mukwabi  
State Department for the  
Blue Economy and Fisheries  
[dmakilla@yahoo.com](mailto:dmakilla@yahoo.com)

##### Advisor(s)

Ms Lucy Obungu  
State Department for the  
Blue Economy and Fisheries  
[lucy.ayugi@gmail.com](mailto:lucy.ayugi@gmail.com)

Ms Elizabeth Mueni  
State Department for the  
Blue Economy and Fisheries  
[emueni@gmail.com](mailto:emueni@gmail.com)

Mr Stephen Ndegwa  
State Department for the  
Blue Economy and Fisheries  
[ndegwafish@yahoo.com](mailto:ndegwafish@yahoo.com)

Ms Gladys Okemwa  
State Department for the  
Blue Economy and Fisheries  
[gladysokemwa@gmail.com](mailto:gladysokemwa@gmail.com)

Mr Jacob Ochiewo  
State Department for the  
Blue Economy and Fisheries  
[jacobochiewo@gmail.com](mailto:jacobochiewo@gmail.com)

Ms Nyakobi Waititu  
State Department for the  
Blue Economy and Fisheries  
[nyokabih@gmail.com](mailto:nyokabih@gmail.com)

Mr Benedict Kiilu  
State Department for the  
Blue Economy and Fisheries  
[kiilubk@gmail.com](mailto:kiilubk@gmail.com)

## KOREA

### Head of Delegation

Ms Jiyoung Oh  
Ministry of Oceans and  
Fisheries  
[im5g0@korea.kr](mailto:im5g0@korea.kr)

### Alternate

Ms Soomin Kim  
Korea Overseas Fisheries  
Cooperation Center  
[soominkim@kofci.org](mailto:soominkim@kofci.org)

### Advisor(s)

Ms Salsabilaizzati Syalianda  
Dongwon Industries Co., Ltd  
[salsa@dongwon.com](mailto:salsa@dongwon.com)

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

Ms Jiwon Kim  
Korea Overseas Fisheries  
Association  
[jwkim@kosfa.org](mailto:jwkim@kosfa.org)

## MADAGASCAR

### Head of Delegation

Mr Joseph Razafimandimby  
Ministère de la pêche et de  
l'économie bleue  
[mpeb.dgpa@gmail.com](mailto:mpeb.dgpa@gmail.com)

### Alternate

Mr Njaka Ratsimanarisoa  
Ministère de la pêche et de  
l'économie bleue  
[mpeb.dp@gmail.com](mailto:mpeb.dp@gmail.com)

### Advisor(s)

Mr Mahefa Randriamiarisoa  
Ministère de la pêche et de  
l'économie bleue  
[sgpt.dp.mrhp@gmail.com](mailto:sgpt.dp.mrhp@gmail.com)

Ms Zo Olive  
Rakotonanahary  
Ministère de la pêche et de  
l'économie bleue  
[znirintsoa@gmail.com](mailto:znirintsoa@gmail.com)

Mr Marolova  
Rasolomampionona  
Ministère de la pêche et de  
l'économie bleue  
[lovastat.mrhp@gmail.com](mailto:lovastat.mrhp@gmail.com)

Mr Lalaina Rakotonaivo  
WWF Madagascar  
[lrakotonaivo@wwf.mg](mailto:lrakotonaivo@wwf.mg)

## MALAYSIA

### Head of Delegation

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

### Advisor(s)

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

## MALDIVES

### Head of Delegation

Mr Hussain Sinan  
Ministry of Fisheries and  
Ocean Resources  
[hussain.sinan@fisheries.gov.mv](mailto:hussain.sinan@fisheries.gov.mv)

### Alternate

Mr Mohamed Alif Arif  
Ministry of Fisheries and  
Ocean Resources  
[mohamed.alif@fisheries.gov.mv](mailto:mohamed.alif@fisheries.gov.mv)

### Advisor(s)

Mr Mohamed Shimal  
Maldives Marine Research  
Institute  
[mohamed.shimal@mmri.gov.mv](mailto:mohamed.shimal@mmri.gov.mv)

## MAURITIUS

### Head of Delegation

Ms Marie Clivy Lim Shung  
Minsitry of Agro-Industry,  
Food Security, Blue  
Economy and Fisheries  
[clivilim@yahoo.com](mailto:clivilim@yahoo.com)

### Advisor(s)

Mr Danny Aubeeluck  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs,  
Regional Integration and  
International  
[Tradedaubeeluck@govmu.org](mailto:Tradedaubeeluck@govmu.org)

Ms Veronique Garrioch  
IBL Seafood  
[vgarrioch@iblseafood.com](mailto:vgarrioch@iblseafood.com)

## MOZAMBIQUE

### Head of Delegation

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

### Alternate

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

## OMAN

### Head of Delegation

H.E. Eng. Yaqoob Al Busaidi  
Ministry of Agriculture,  
Fisheries and Water  
Resources  
[yaqoob.albusaidi@mafwr.gov.om](mailto:yaqoob.albusaidi@mafwr.gov.om)

### Advisor(s)

Mr Khaled Hamad Al Hedabi  
Ministry of Agriculture,  
Fisheries and Water  
Resources  
[Khaled.AlHedabi@mafwr.gov.om](mailto:Khaled.AlHedabi@mafwr.gov.om)

Mr Obaid Saleem Al Jassasi  
Ministry of Agriculture,  
Fisheries and Water  
Resources  
[Obaid.AJasasi@mafwr.gov.om](mailto:Obaid.AJasasi@mafwr.gov.om)

Mr Al-Mutasim Al Habsi  
Ministry of Agriculture,  
Fisheries and Water  
Resources  
[AlMutasim.AlHabsi@mafwr.gov.om](mailto:AlMutasim.AlHabsi@mafwr.gov.om)

Mr Jose Ramon Gallardo  
Ministry of Agriculture,  
Fisheries and Water  
Resources  
[ramon@g-gallardolegal.eu](mailto:ramon@g-gallardolegal.eu)

#### PAKISTAN

**Advisor(s)**  
Mr Syed Adeel Hassan  
Marine Fisheries  
Department  
[adeel.mfd@gmail.com](mailto:adeel.mfd@gmail.com)

#### PHILIPPINES

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

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

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

Mr Joem Moreno  
Bureau of Fisheries and  
Aquatic Resources  
[jmoreno@bfar.da.gov.ph](mailto:jmoreno@bfar.da.gov.ph)

Mr Benjamin Tabios, jr.  
Bureau of Fisheries and  
Aquatic Resources  
[benjotabios@gmail.com](mailto:benjotabios@gmail.com)

#### SEYCHELLES

**Head of Delegation**  
Mr Roy Clarisse  
Ministry of Fisheries and  
the Blue Economy  
[rclarisse@gov.sc](mailto:rclarisse@gov.sc)

#### Alternate

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

#### Advisor(s)

Mr Jan Robinson  
Seychelles Fisheries  
Authority  
[ceo@sfa.sc](mailto:ceo@sfa.sc)

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

Ms Irene Sirame  
Ministry of Fisheries and  
the Blue Economy  
[irene.sirame@gov.sc](mailto:irene.sirame@gov.sc)

Mr Selwyn Edmond  
SEAWARD  
[selwyn.edmond@seaward.sc](mailto:selwyn.edmond@seaward.sc)

#### SOMALIA

**Head of Delegation**  
Mr Abdi Dirshe  
Ministry of Fisheries and  
Blue Economy  
[dg@mfmr.gov.so](mailto:dg@mfmr.gov.so)

#### Alternate

Mr Abdullahi Abdi Addow  
Ministry of Fisheries and  
Blue Economy

[techadvisor@mfmr.gov.so](mailto:techadvisor@mfmr.gov.so)

#### Advisor(s)

Mr Stephen Mbithi Mwikya  
Ministry of Fisheries and  
Blue Economy  
[dr.stephenmbithi@gmail.com](mailto:dr.stephenmbithi@gmail.com)

Mr Abdirahim Ibrahim Sheik  
Heile  
Ministry of Fisheries and  
Blue Economy  
[abdirahim.ibrahim@dal.ca](mailto:abdirahim.ibrahim@dal.ca)

#### SOUTH AFRICA

**Head of Delegation**  
Mr Qayiso Mketsu  
Department of Forestry,  
Fisheries and the  
Environment  
[gaiso.mketsu@gmail.com](mailto:gaiso.mketsu@gmail.com)

#### Alternate

Mr Mandisile Mqoqi  
Department of Forestry,  
Fisheries and the  
Environment  
[MMqoqi@dffe.gov.za](mailto:MMqoqi@dffe.gov.za)

#### Advisor(s)

Mr David Wilson  
Department of Forestry,  
Fisheries and the  
Environment  
[davetroywilson@gmail.com](mailto:davetroywilson@gmail.com)

#### SRI LANKA

**Head of Delegation**  
Mr T.M.D.T Peiris  
Department of Fisheries  
and Aquatic Resources  
[dineshdfar@gmail.com](mailto:dineshdfar@gmail.com)

#### SUDAN

Absent

#### TANZANIA (UNITED REP. OF)

**Head of Delegation**  
Mr Zahor El Kharousy

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

**Alternate**

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

**Advisor(s)**

Mr Saleh A. Yahya  
Deep Sea Fishing Authority  
[saleh.yahya@dsfa.go.tz](mailto:saleh.yahya@dsfa.go.tz)

Mr Ismael A. Kimirei  
Deep Sea Fishing Authority  
[ismaelkimirei@tafiri.go.tz](mailto:ismaelkimirei@tafiri.go.tz)

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

Mr Christian A. Nzowa  
Deep Sea Fishing Authority  
[christian.nzowa@mlf.go.tz](mailto:christian.nzowa@mlf.go.tz)

Mr Mathew O. Silas  
Deep Sea Fishing Authority  
[mathew.silas@dsfa.go.tz](mailto:mathew.silas@dsfa.go.tz)

Ms Tumu A. Mussa  
Deep Sea Fishing Authority  
[tumu.mussa@dsfa.go.tz](mailto:tumu.mussa@dsfa.go.tz)

Mr Buriyan M. Hassan  
Deep Sea Fishing Authority  
[buriyan.hassan@dsfa.go.tz](mailto:buriyan.hassan@dsfa.go.tz)

Mr Daniel P. Kawiche

Deep Sea Fishing Authority  
[daniel.kawiche@dsfa.go.tz](mailto:daniel.kawiche@dsfa.go.tz)

Ms Keis I. Abdalla  
Deep Sea Fishing Authority  
[keis.abdalla@dsfa.go.tz](mailto:keis.abdalla@dsfa.go.tz)

Mr Valeli J. Bugota  
Deep Sea Fishing Authority  
[vbugota@wwftz.org](mailto:vbugota@wwftz.org)

**THAILAND**

**Head of Delegation**

Ms Sampan Panjarat  
Department of Fisheries  
[spanjarat@yahoo.com](mailto:spanjarat@yahoo.com)

**Advisor(s)**

Mr Woramate Chatinakrob  
Legal Affairs Division  
[woramate33600@gmail.com](mailto:woramate33600@gmail.com)

Ms Orawan Prasertsook  
Marine Fisheries Research  
and Development Division  
[orawanp.dof@gmail.com](mailto:orawanp.dof@gmail.com)

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

Mr Titipat Tongdonkruang  
Fisheries Foreign Affairs  
Division  
[g.titipat@gmail.com](mailto:g.titipat@gmail.com)

Mr Korawit Weerasuntorn

Fisheries Resources  
Management and Measures  
Determination Division  
[weerasuntorn@gmail.com](mailto:weerasuntorn@gmail.com)

Ms Prompan  
Hiranmongkolrat  
Fisheries Development  
Policy and Planning Division  
[prompan.hiranmongkolrat@gmail.com](mailto:prompan.hiranmongkolrat@gmail.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**

Mr Carlo Bella  
Department for  
Environment Food and  
Rural Affairs  
[Carlo.Bella@defra.gov.uk](mailto:Carlo.Bella@defra.gov.uk)

Mr Robbie Fisher  
Department for  
Environment Food and  
Rural Affairs  
[Robbie.Fisher@defra.gov.uk](mailto:Robbie.Fisher@defra.gov.uk)

Mr John Pearce  
Mrag  
[J.Pearce@mrag.co.uk](mailto:J.Pearce@mrag.co.uk)

**YEMEN**

Absent

Mr Chia-Chun Wu  
[jiachun@msl.f.gov.tw](mailto:jiachun@msl.f.gov.tw)

**INVITED EXPERTS**

Mr David Lee  
[davidlee@ofdc.org.tw](mailto:davidlee@ofdc.org.tw)

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

**OBSERVERS**

**AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL  
CENTRE FOR OCEAN  
RESOURCES AND SECURITY  
(ANCORS)**

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

Mr Kamal Azmi  
[kamala@uow.edu.au](mailto:kamala@uow.edu.au)

**MARINE AFFAIRS  
PROGRAM @ DALHOUSIE  
UNIVERSITY (MAP)**

Mr Scott Schrempf  
[sc348923@dal.ca](mailto:sc348923@dal.ca)

**EUROPECHE**

Ms Anne-France Mattlet  
[anne-france.mattlet@europeche.org](mailto:anne-france.mattlet@europeche.org)

**INTERNATIONAL SEAFOOD  
SUSTAINABILITY  
FOUNDATION (ISSF)**

Ms Kerrie Robertson

Mr Charles Edwards  
[cescapecs@gmail.com](mailto:cescapecs@gmail.com)

Mr Paul De Bruyn  
[Paul.DeBruyn@fao.org](mailto:Paul.DeBruyn@fao.org)

Ms Sylvia Kadenyi Amisi  
[sylviaamisi@yahoo.com](mailto:sylviaamisi@yahoo.com)

[krobertson@iss-foundation.org](mailto:krobertson@iss-foundation.org)

**INTERNATIONAL POLE-  
AND-LINE FOUNDATION  
(IPNLF)**

Ms Maia Perraudau  
[maia.perraudau@ipnlf.org](mailto:maia.perraudau@ipnlf.org)

**SUSTAINABLE FISHERIES  
AND COMMUNITIES TRUST  
(SFACT)**

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

Mr Valentin Schatz  
[v.j.schatz@gmail.com](mailto:v.j.schatz@gmail.com)

**IOTC CONSULTANT**

**IOTC SECRETARIAT**

Mr Emmanuel Chassot  
[Emmanuel.Chassot@fao.org](mailto:Emmanuel.Chassot@fao.org)

**INTERPRETERS**

Ms Evelyn Ndirangu-Ngari  
[wangecieve@gmail.com](mailto:wangecieve@gmail.com)

Ms Abbie Topping  
[Abbie.Topping@sfact.org](mailto:Abbie.Topping@sfact.org)

**SOUTH WEST INDIAN  
OCEAN TUNA FORUM  
(SWIOTUNA)**

Mr John Kareko  
[Jkarekok@gmail.com](mailto:Jkarekok@gmail.com)

Mr Divon Mwamba  
[Divonmwamba@swiotuuna.org](mailto:Divonmwamba@swiotuuna.org)

Mr Elijah Ngoa  
[elijahngo@tufakenya.com](mailto:elijahngo@tufakenya.com)

Mr Howard Whalley  
[Howard.Whalley@fao.org](mailto:Howard.Whalley@fao.org)

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

Mr Ephrem Kamanzi  
[ekamanzi@gmail.com](mailto:ekamanzi@gmail.com)

Mr Alfred Ndzu Fang  
[alfred\\_fang@yahoo.com](mailto:alfred_fang@yahoo.com)

**APPENDIX 2.****ADOPTED AGENDA OF THE 13<sup>TH</sup> TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ON ALLOCATION CRITERIA****Date:** 14 - 17 July, 2025**Location:** Zanzibar, Tanzania**Time:** 9:00AM – 8 hours, daily**Chairperson:** Mr Quentin Hanich

- 1. OPENING OF THE SESSION**
- 2. LETTERS OF CREDENTIALS AND ADMISSION OF OBSERVERS**
- 3. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE SESSION**
- 4. ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRS**
  - Nominations
  - Election
- 5. TCAC15 WORKPLAN**
  - Decision tree
- 6. CATCH ATTRIBUTION AND PROXIES**
  - Presentation of papers
  - Catch attribution
  - Biomass, EEZ size and proxies
- 7. JURISDICTION**
  - Presentation of paper
  - Jurisdiction of allocation regime
- 8. TRANSFERS AND TRANSITION**
  - Presentation of paper
  - Framework for transfers and transition
- 9. REFERENCE YEARS**
  - Presentation of catch histories
  - Shortlist reference year options
- 10. SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS OF DEVELOPING STATES**
- 11. BASELINE**
- 12. COMPLIANCE**
- 13. RESOLUTION**
  - Process for drafting resolution
  - Single multi-species resolution or multiple single-species resolutions
- 14. CHAIR’S SUMMARY**
- 15. OTHER BUSINESS**
  - 2026 meeting schedule and host nominations
- 16. ADOPTION OF REPORT**

### APPENDIX 3. LIST OF DOCUMENTS

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

Document	Title
IOTC-2025-TCAC15-01a	Draft: Agenda of the 15 <sup>th</sup> Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria
IOTC-2025-TCAC15-01b	Updated: Agenda of the 15 <sup>th</sup> Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria
IOTC-2025-TCAC15-01c	Indicative Schedule for the 15th Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria
IOTC-2025-TCAC15-02	Draft: List of documents of the 15 <sup>th</sup> session of the Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria
IOTC-2025-TCAC15-03	Draft TCAC Workplan
IOTC-2025-TCAC15-04	Chairs Explanatory Note
IOTC-2025-TCAC15-05	Chair's Paper on Transferability
IOTC-2025-TCAC15-06	Chair's Paper on Jurisdiction
IOTC-2025-TCAC15-07	Biomass indicators of potential use for allocation of the Total Allowable Catch in the Indian Ocean
IOTC-2025-TCAC15-08	Chair's Paper on Catch Attribution
<b>Information Papers</b>	
IOTC-2025-TCAC15-INF01	Catch data availability, estimations, and gaps relevant to the IOTC allocation process
IOTC-2025-TCAC15-INF02	Simulation tool for allocation criteria: Data, assumptions, and output
<b>Reference documents</b>	
IOTC-2025-TCAC15-REF01	Statement by Mauritius
IOTC-2025-TCAC15-REF02	Statement by France OT
<b>Datasets</b>	
IOTC-2025-TCAC15-DataSet01	Annual retained catches allocated between the high seas and National Jurisdiction Areas, 1950–2021
IOTC-2025-TCAC15- DataSet02	CPC and Coastal State Status
IOTC-2025-TCAC15- DataSet03	Annual retained catches, 1950–2023

**APPENDIX 4.****OPENING REMARKS BY MS AGNES MEENA, PERMANENT SECRETARY FOR LIVESTOCK AND FISHERIES OF THE UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA****MINISTRY OF LIVESTOCK AND FISHERIES**

**OPENING REMARKS BY MS. AGNES KISAKA MEENA, PERMANENT SECRETARY,  
MINISTRY OF LIVESTOCK AND FISHERIES OF THE UNITED REPUBLIC OF  
TANZANIA, AT THE 15TH MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ON  
ALLOCATION CRITERIA (TCAC15) OF THE INDIAN OCEAN TUNA COMMISSION  
(IOTC) HELD AT THE GOLDEN TULIP ZANZIBAR AIRPORT HOTEL ON 14TH JULY  
2025**

- 
- i. Mr. Zahor Kassim El Kharousy, Deputy Principal Secretary for the Ministry of Blue Economy and Fisheries of the Revolutionary Government of Zanzibar,
  - ii. Dr. Paul de Bruyn, Executive Secretary of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) and the Secretariat,
  - iii. Dr. Quentin Hanich and Dr. David Wilson, Chairperson and Vice-Chair Person of the Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria,
  - iv. Distinguished Delegates from Contracting and Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties,
  - v. Esteemed Observers,
  - vi. The Media,
  - vii. Ladies and Gentlemen,

**Good morning, Bonjour, Asalaam alaykum!**

- 1. It is truly an honour and privilege to welcome you all to the United Republic of Tanzania, and specifically to this beautiful island of Zanzibar — a historic gateway connecting continents, cultures, and indeed, oceans.
- 2. On behalf of the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania and the Revolutionary Government of Zanzibar, I extend our warmest greetings and full support for what we anticipate will be a productive and forward-looking **15th Meeting of the Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria (TCAC15)** of the IOTC.

**Distinguished Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen**



3. This meeting is taking place at a time when the concern of fair, equitable and sustainable access to tuna resources is more urgent than ever. The urgency for a fair and equitable allocation mechanism cannot be overstated. It is with great honor that I express our sincere appreciation to the Chairperson and the Secretariat for the comprehensive Summary Report of the Committee’s work to date, which outlines the progress made over the years on refining the allocation criteria, addressing the balance between historical catches, developmental rights, and sustainability imperatives. The report is an impressive testimony to the collective efforts, negotiations, and expert contributions that have brought us this far.

#### **Distinguished Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen**

4. I have learned that this meeting will consider several critical issues towards the finalization of this process, including “Catch Attribution and Proxies”, “Jurisdiction”, “Reference Years” and “Transfers and Transitions”. I therefore continue to believe that the collective wisdom, goodwill, and diversity and depth of experience gathered here today equip us well to analyse, refine, and transform into concrete recommendations to the Commission.
5. You will recall that, the negotiations began over 14 years ago, where the first meeting (TCAC1) was held in Nairobi, Kenya, in February 2011. I am inclined to believe, therefore, that the negotiations have not been easy. It is a fact that the differences in fishing capacity, access to data, and economic dependencies on tuna have made this process both politically sensitive and technically complex. Nonetheless, as we say in Swahili that **“haba na haba hujaza kibaba — little by little fills the measure”**, let us honor the legacy of this long-standing negotiation with openness, innovation, and solidarity. May the TCAC15 be the meeting that finally fills it. The outcomes of the TCAC’s work will determine the future of equitable access to shared tuna resources — a matter central to the sustainability of our ocean economies and the livelihoods of millions across our coastal States and the world at large.
6. The task before us at TCAC15 is critical. The decisions and recommendations we craft here will shape not only how the tuna stocks are shared — but how responsibility and opportunity are distributed among our nations. I urge all delegates to approach this meeting with the spirit of cooperation, solidarity, and commitment to sustainable development. Let us remember that our shared tuna stocks are not just commodities — they are lifelines for food and nutrition security, economic resilience, and inter-generational justice.

#### **Distinguished Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen**

7. The United Republic of Tanzania, as a developing coastal State with aspirations to develop its fisheries sector, has actively engaged in these negotiations and has consistently advocated for an allocation framework that is fair, inclusive, and development-oriented. Tanzania Government have made significant advancement in fisheries policy and infrastructure, including the adoption of strong legal framework, the ongoing development of designated fish harbors, landing sites, cold storage, and vessel monitoring systems. These investments

position the country to sustainably harness tuna resources in its waters and actively participate in future allocation regimes.

#### **Distinguished Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen**

8. We all agree. It is high time that we made a decision. A decision to allow the tuna fish populations in our waters to recuperate from persistent illegal, unreported, and unregulated (IUU) fishing, and overexploitation. I sincerely hope that, with the wisdom, flexibility, and the strong and true collaborative spirit present in this room, we can finalize this important and long-awaited process as per the Chairperson's workplan. Let us all aim to be part of a history of a successful conclusion of the negotiations, and write a resounding Zanzibar Resolution on equitable Indian Ocean Tuna allocation.
9. The United Republic of Tanzania reaffirms its unwavering commitment to advancing the negotiations in the IOTC. However, the allocation regime must, recognize the special needs of developing coastal States, their sovereign rights under international law including for the artisanal fishers, and their aspirations to responsibly develop their fisheries.
10. Let me take this opportunity once again to sincerely thank the IOTC Secretariat, fellow CPCs, Observers and experts, our development partners and other stakeholders for their technical and financial support to this process. Specifically, I gratefully acknowledge the Deep Sea Fishing Authority (DSFA), Western Indian Ocean Marine Science Association (WIOMSA), National Bank of Commerce (NBC) and others for the generous financial support, which have made the hosting of this important meeting smooth and possible.

#### **Distinguished Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen**

11. Allow me to wish you successful deliberations and hope your stay in this spice island will be both productive and memorable. I encourage you to take a moment to experience the hospitality, culture, and heritage richness that the island offers. Nevertheless, you are also reminded to spare some of your time to go and visit some of our national parks on Tanzania mainland that offer some of the most spectacular wildlife and natural experiences in the world. These include Serengeti National Park, Tarangire National Park and Ngorongoro Crater just to mention a few where you will enjoy to see bunch of wild animals including large heads of elephants and tree-climbing lions and many more remarkable scenery.
12. With these few remarks, I now have the great honour to declare that the **15th Meeting of the Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria (TCAC15)** of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission is officially open. Thank you very much for your kind attention.

**APPENDIX 5.**  
**MEMBER STATEMENTS**

**15<sup>th</sup> Meeting of IOTC Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria**  
**14-17 July 2025, Zanzibar, Tanzania**

**Agenda Item 6: Catch Attribution and Proxies**

**Statement by the Republic of Mauritius**

The Republic of Mauritius reiterates the statements which it had made with regard to the Chagos Archipelago and the Island of Tromelin under agenda item 6 at the 10<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Technical Committee held from 20 to 23 June 2022 in Seychelles and which are annexed to the report of that meeting (Document IOTC-2022-TCAC10-R[E], Appendix 4).

The Republic of Mauritius also reaffirms that since the Chagos Archipelago and the Island of Tromelin form an integral part of its territory, no State other than the Republic of Mauritius can be granted any allocations in respect of the Chagos Archipelago and the Island of Tromelin.

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

**Agenda Item 7: Jurisdiction**

**Statement by the Republic of Mauritius**

The Republic of Mauritius reiterates that the Island of Tromelin forms an integral part of its territory and rejects France's sovereignty claim over that island as well as France's claim to any sovereign right or jurisdiction over the Exclusive Economic Zone adjacent to that island.

Moreover, the Republic of Mauritius does not recognize the validity of the inclusion of the Island of Tromelin in the French Southern and Antarctic Lands (TAAF) or the Scattered Islands/Iles Eparses.

The Republic of Mauritius reaffirms that it has full and complete sovereignty over the Island of Tromelin, including its maritime zones.

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

**15th Session of the IOTC Technical Committee on allocation Criteria****Zanzibar, Tanzania, July 14-17, 2025****Statement by the French Republic in response to the statement by the Republic of Mauritius**

In response to the declaration of the Republic of Mauritius, the French Republic reiterates the declaration relating to the island of Tromelin made at the 19th session of the Compliance Committee held from 08 to 10 and 12 May 2022 in the Seychelles, and which is annexed to the report of the quoted meeting (Document IOTC-2022-CoC19-R[E], Appendix 4) and which recalls that France does not recognize any legal value to the registration of this objection submitted to the IOTC Secretariat by the Republic of Mauritius, as it disregards the fact that Tromelin Island is a French territory over which France consistently exercises full sovereignty. The French Republic requests that this declaration be annexed to the report of this meeting.

## APPENDIX 6.

### OPTIONS FOR CATCH ATTRIBUTIONS

Catch attribution under this resolution shall be used solely for determining catch history criteria. Coastal State CPCs may, under mutually agreed terms, grant surplus quota resulting from the allocation process to Flag State CPCs. This provision shall not prejudice the sovereign rights of Coastal States under international law to grant access, nor their authority to set access fees and conditions for Flag States regarding surplus quota.

**Option 1** – Historical catches taken within waters under the national jurisdiction of a CPC shall be attributed to the coastal State CPC with sovereign jurisdiction over that area. To minimize economic disruption and maintain fishing and processing industry stability, this re-attribution shall be implemented through a phased transition over a defined period. During this transitional period:

- In Year 1, X% of the historical catch of a Flag State CPC in another CPC’s jurisdictional waters shall be attributed to the corresponding coastal State CPC.
- The remaining  $(100 - X)\%$  shall be reallocated in a stepwise manner over the following [Y]-year period, according to a pre-agreed schedule.

Coastal State CPCs may, under mutually agreed terms, grant surplus quota to Flag State CPCs.

This approach aims to balance the rights of coastal States with the economic interests of industrial fishing and processing CPCs, while ensuring a predictable and equitable transition.

**Option 2** - attributes catch history to the flag State, regardless of where the catches have been caught so to reflect the migratory nature of tuna species. Over a period of X years, Y% of the catches caught in the EEZ of a Coastal State will be gradually allocated to that Coastal State.

## APPENDIX 7.

### PROPOSALS TO USE EEZ SIZE AS A PROXY FOR INTEREST IN A FISHERY

#### Proposal 1 to use EEZ size as a proxy for interest in a fishery.

To allow CPCs with coastal rights in a fishery, but limited catch history or catch data, to claim a reasonable share of long-term allocation quotas, TCAC could recommend an approach as follows:

1. CPCs could choose either an average of their best X years catch in the reference period or a percentage share of agreed catch limits, based on the size of their EEZ as a percentage of the IOTC area of competence.
2. Preferred limits would be combined and the total of all claims scaled to agreed limits, and all CPCs claims expressed a percentage of agreed limits.

TCAC could consider weighting claims based on EEZ size to reflect potential biomass in CPCs EEZs. This could be based on existing information, or advice from the Secretariat on likely productivity with EEZs across the IOTC area.

#### India Suggestion

##### Proposal 2 to use EEZ size as a proxy for allocation of catch history in the allocation framework

To allow CPCs with coastal rights in a fishery, but limited catch history or catch data, to claim a reasonable share of long-term allocation quotas, TCAC could recommend an approach as follows:

1. CPCs (ideally Coastal states) with limited or no catch history, could avail a share of the allocation quota, **based on the size of their EEZ** (with suitable weightings\*) as a percentage of the IOTC area of competence **OR**,
2. CPCs (ideally, Coastal states) can use **a hybrid of catch history and percentage of EEZ size** to avail a share of the allocation quota
3. CPCs (ideally DWFNs) could choose **an average of their best X years' catch** in the reference period\*\*
4. The sum of all allocations, either through baseline, coastal state and historical and their sub-components, will be scaled to the TAC of each species obtained through stock assessment

*\*TCAC could consider weighting claims based on EEZ size to reflect potential biomass in CPCs' EEZs. This could be based on existing information (ex, Bioregions) or advice from SC on productivity with EEZs across the IOTC area.*

*\*\*As per UNCLOS, all the CPCs have equal rights to fishery resources in the High Seas. Accordingly, the **DWFNs shall reduce their catch share within a transition period** (to be determined by TCAC) to provide equal opportunities to all CPCs and maintain the TAC limit for sustainability.*

#### Somalia Suggestion

##### Proposal 3 to use EEZ size as a proxy for interest in a fishery

To allow CPCs with coastal rights in a fishery, but limited catch history or catch data, to claim a reasonable share of long-term allocation quotas, TCAC could recommend an approach as follows:

1. TCAC could use current data on total catches (all flags) for the 5 species, catch distribution in the 5 regions and any CPUE data to develop biomass predictions for each of the 5 iotc regions. [area productivity aspect]
2. TCAC could then apportion/extrapolate the total catches of each of the 5 IOTC regions between high seas and their EEZs.
3. CPCs then could choose EITHER an average of their best X years catch within their own EEZ in the reference period OR a percentage share of agreed catch limits in their region, based on the size of their EEZ as a percentage of their region (1 to 5).
4. Preferred limits would be combined and the total of all claims scaled to agreed limits, and all CPCs claims expressed a percentage of agreed limits.
5. TCAC could consider weighting claims based on EEZ size to reflect potential biomass in CPCs EEZs. This could be

based on existing information, and further advice from SC on likely productivity with EEZs across the specific IOTC area.

**Proposal 4**

In recognition of the sovereign rights of coastal States within the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ), a baseline allocation criterion could be developed based on a weighted approach that considers both the size of each EEZ and the distribution of biomass across the five IOTC regions. While the IOTC is currently unable to determine fine-scale biomass distribution by EEZ for any of its managed species, a suitable proxy for biomass could be developed in the future based on further scientific studies.

## APPENDIX 8.

### FRAMEWORK FOR TRANSFERABILITY

A Framework for Transferability shall provide sufficient transparency and accountability to ensure the integrity of agreed overall catch limits and the individual quota allocated to each Contracting Party (CP). TCAC **AGREED** that the following components shall be included in a transferability framework:

- Temporary transfers – CPs shall be able to sell, gift or trade quota to other CPs under terms mutually agreed by each CP. This can enable a market to develop that can provide benefits, while minimising disruption to existing operations. Temporary transfers shall not affect long-term allocation rights, and must be linked to a robust allocation system
- Membership – CPs shall only be able to transfer quota to other CPs. This ensures that all catches are reported and managed within IOTC jurisdiction.
- Timeframe – CPs shall only be able to record catch against transferred quota in the year that it was transferred. All transfers shall lapse on an agreed date. This ensures that transfers do not undermine sustainability goals and remain within scientifically recommended limits. Transfers must be notified by the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter.

Notification – Transfers shall be prohibited by the IOTC unless transfer notifications are submitted to the secretariat in a consistent format and within an agreed timeframe. Notifications shall be recorded in a manner that enables catches to be reported against the relevant quota. Notifications shall include information on: the CPs involved; the amount of quota traded (i.e. tonnage and species); and the terms of the transfer (i.e. gift, sale or trade). No authorisation by the IOTC is required. The transfer shall take effect upon receipt of the notification by the IOTC Executive Secretary. This shall then be circulated to all members.