



Report of the 14th Session of the Compliance Committee

Yogyakarta, Indonesia 15–17 May 2017

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 2017. Report of the 14th Session of the Compliance Committee. Yogyakarta, Indonesia, 15–17 May 2017. IOTC–2017–CoC14–R[E], 56 pp



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

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

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

Contact details:

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

ACRONYMS

CMM	Conservation and Management Measure (of the IOTC; Resolutions and Recommendations)
CoC	Compliance Committee of the IOTC
CPCs	Contracting Parties and Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties
EEZ	Exclusive Economic Zone
FAD	Fish Aggregation Device
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
IOC	Indian Ocean Commission
IOTC	Indian Ocean Tuna Commission
ISSF	International Seafood Sustainability Foundation
IUU	Illegal, unreported and unregulated
LSTLV	Large-scale tuna longline vessel
PEW	PEW Charitable Trust
SC	Scientific Committee of the IOTC
SCAF	Standing Committee on Administration and Finance
UNCLOS	United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea
VMS	Vessel Monitoring System

HOW TO INTERPRET TERMINOLOGY CONTAINED IN THIS REPORT

The CoC14 Report has been written using the following terms and associated definitions so as to remove ambiguity surrounding how particular paragraphs should be interpreted.

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	6
1. OPENING OF THE SESSION	7
2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE SESSION	7
3. ADMISSION OF OBSERVERS	7
4. OVERVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF IOTC CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT MEASURES	8
4.1 Summary report on the level of compliance	8
4.2 IOTC regional observer programme for at-sea transshipments	9
4.3 Review of reference fishing capacity and fleet development plans (FDP)	9
5. NATIONAL REPORTS ON THE PROGRESS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT MEASURES (ARTICLE X.2 IOTC AGREEMENT)	10
6. REVIEW OF THE COUNTRY BASED COMPLIANCE REPORTS.....	10
6.1 Review of individual CPC Compliance Status against IOTC Conservation and Management Measures ..	10
6.2 Identification of challenges encountered in the implementation of IOTC Resolutions; CPC information on its compliance status (reasons, problems, etc.)	11
6.3 Discussion on follow-up on individual compliance status including identifying opportunities to assist in raising the level of implementation of Resolutions (inter-sessional process, and 2018 Compliance Committee discussions).....	11
7. REVIEW OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RELATED TO IUU FISHING ACTIVITIES IN THE IOTC AREA OF COMPETENCE.....	12
7.1 Complementary compliance elements for discussion	12
7.2 Summary of possible infractions reported by observers under the Regional observer program (IOTC at-sea Transshipment Programme)	13
7.3 Identification of repeated possible infringements under the Regional observer programme	13
7.4 Reporting of vessels in transit through waters of the UK(OT) for potential breach of IOTC Conservation and Management Measures	14
8. REVIEW OF THE PROVISIONAL IUU VESSELS LIST AND OF THE INFORMATION SUBMITTED BY CPCs RELATING TO ILLEGAL FISHING ACTIVITIES IN THE IOTC AREA OF COMPETENCE – RESOLUTION 11/03.....	14
8.1 2016 IOTC IUU Vessels List - review	14
8.2 2016 IOTC IUU Vessels List – review of vessels previously listed.....	16
8.3 Provisional IUU Vessels List - Consideration of other vessels.....	16
9. REVIEW OF DRIFTING FAD MANAGEMENT PLANS – RESOLUTION 15/08.....	17
10. UPDATE ON PROGRESS REGARDING THE PERFORMANCE REVIEW – COMPLIANCE RELATED ISSUES	18
11. REVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS REQUIRING INTERSESSIONAL ACTIONS, FROM CoC13 AND THE 20TH ANNUAL SESSION	18
11.1 Implementation of Recommendations of the Compliance Committee and Commission meeting in 2016	18
12. ACTIVITIES BY THE IOTC SECRETARIAT IN SUPPORT OF CAPACITY BUILDING FOR DEVELOPING CPCs – RESOLUTION 16/10	18
13. REVIEW OF REQUESTS FOR ACCESS TO THE STATUS OF COOPERATING NON-CONTRACTING PARTY – APPENDIX III OF THE IOTC RULES OF PROCEDURE (2014)	19
13.1 Liberia.....	19
13.2 Djibouti	19
13.3 Senegal.....	19
13.4 Bangladesh	19
14. OTHER BUSINESS	19
14.1 Date and Place of the 15 th and 16 th Sessions of the Compliance Committee	19
15. ELECTION OF THE CHAIRPERSON AND VICE-CHAIRPERSON OF THE COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE.....	20
16. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE 14TH SESSION OF THE COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE.....	20

APPENDIX I LIST OF PARTICIPANTS 21

APPENDIX II AGENDA FOR THE 14TH SESSION OF THE COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE 24

APPENDIX III LIST OF DOCUMENTS 25

APPENDIX IV - STATEMENTS..... 29

APPENDIX V REFERENCE FISHING CAPACITY AND FLEET DEVELOPMENT PLAN 34

APPENDIX VI IOTC IUU VESSELS LIST/PROVISIONAL IUU VESSELS LIST..... 38

APPENDIX VII CoC: UPDATE ON PROGRESS REGARDING RESOLUTION 16/03 – ON THE SECOND PERFORMANCE REVIEW FOLLOW–UP..... 48

APPENDIX VIII CONSOLIDATED SET OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 14TH SESSION OF THE COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE (15–17 MAY 2017) TO THE COMMISSION 54

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 14th Session of the Compliance Committee (CoC) of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) was held in Yogyakarta, Indonesia, from 15–17 May 2017. A total of 86 individuals attended the Session, comprised of 71 delegates from 23 Contracting Parties (Members), 3 delegates from 2 Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties, and 12 Observers, including 4 Invited Experts. The list of participants is provided at Appendix I. A welcoming statement was given by Dr. Reza Shah Pahlevi, Director of Fisheries Resources Management, Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries of Indonesia. The meeting was opened by the Chairperson, Mr. Herminio Tembe (Mozambique). The following are a subset of the complete recommendations from the CoC14 to the Commission, which are provided at Appendix VIII.

Summary report on the level of compliance

- CoC14.04 ([Para 18](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that Resolution 15/04 be revised next year to introduce a clear procedure and criteria to determine when a vessel shall or not to be included in the IOTC Record of Authorized Vessels.
- CoC14.05 ([Para 19](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that IOTC should further work on a scheme for the assessment of compliance to develop a structured approach for cases of infringements, better reflecting critical compliance issues and partial compliance.

IOTC regional observer programme for at-sea transshipments

- CoC14.06 ([Para 28](#)) **NOTING** that there are 7 carrier vessels operating under the at-sea transshipment programme that are flagged to non-CPCs of the IOTC (Kiribati, Panama and Singapore), the CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the concerns of carrier vessels flagged to non-CPCs that are involved in at-sea transshipment operations in the IOTC area of competence be addressed by submitting a proposal to amend Resolution 14/06 for this purpose.

Review of reference fishing capacity and fleet development plans (FDP)

- CoC14.08 ([Para 37](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the IOTC Secretariat analyse FDPs submitted in the light of the provisions of Resolution 15/11, notably those introducing new vessels/capacity in the FDPs.
- CoC14.09 ([Para 38](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that CPCs having provided a FDP which has not been fully implemented provide information on the reasons as to why the FDP has not been implemented and to detail the way forward.

National reports on the progress of implementation of Conservation and Management Measures (Article X.2 IOTC Agreement)

- CoC14.10 ([Para 44](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that those CPCs (Eritrea, Guinea, India, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Yemen, Bangladesh and Djibouti) who have not submitted their national 'Reports of Implementation' for 2016 do so within 30 days after the end of the Commission meeting. The Chair of the CoC, with the assistance of the IOTC Secretariat shall follow-up with each such CPC to ensure a national 'Reports of Implementation' is submitted for publication on the IOTC website and to inform CPCs during the Commission meeting and then also via an IOTC Circular once each report is received.

Follow-up on individual compliance status

- CoC14.14 ([Para 62](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission and Scientific Committee validate the information provided by CPCs related to the implementation of the Resolution 16/01 on the reduction of catch of yellowfin tuna by all CPCs.
- CoC14.15 ([Para 63](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that for CPCs failing to provide nominal catch data, that a reference to consequences of the Commission invoking Resolution 16/06 be included in their feedback letter.

Adoption of the report of the 13th Session of the Compliance Committee

- CoC14.37 ([Para 141](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission consider the consolidated set of recommendations arising from CoC14, provided at [Appendix VIII](#).

1. OPENING OF THE SESSION

1. The 14th Session of the Compliance Committee (CoC) of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) was held in Yogyakarta, Indonesia, from 15–17 May 2017. A total of 86 individuals attended the Session, comprised of 71 delegates from 23 Contracting Parties (Members), 3 delegates from 2 Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties, and 12 Observers, including 4 Invited Experts. The list of participants is provided at [Appendix I](#). A welcoming statement was given by Dr. Reza Shah Pahlevi, Director of Fisheries Resources Management, Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries of Indonesia. The meeting was opened by the Chairperson, Mr. Herminio Tembe (Mozambique).
2. The CoC **RECALLED** that the purpose of the Compliance Committee meeting is to strengthen compliance amongst Contracting Parties (Members), and Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties (CPCs) by firstly reviewing progress made during the intersessional period, identifying outstanding issues of non-compliance as well as identifying the challenges and difficulties that each CPC and notably developing coastal States are facing in enforcing and complying with IOTC Conservation and Management Measures (CMMs), and finally to encourage such improvement during the next intersessional period.

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE SESSION

3. The CoC **ADOPTED** the Agenda as provided at Appendix II. The documents presented to the CoC are listed at Appendix III.
4. The CoC **NOTED** the statements from Mauritius, the United Kingdom (OT) and France (OT) provided at Appendix IV.

3. ADMISSION OF OBSERVERS

5. The CoC **RECALLED** the agreement made by the Commission in 2012 that meetings of the Commission and its subsidiary bodies should be open to participation by observers from all those who have attended the current and/or previous sessions of the Commission. Applications by new Observers should continue to follow the procedure as outlined in IOTC Rules of Procedure (2014).
6. Pursuant to Article VII of the Agreement establishing the IOTC, the CoC admitted the following observers, as defined in Rule XIV of the IOTC Rules of Procedure (2014):
 - a) Rule XIV.1. The Director-General or a representative designated by him, shall have the right to participate without vote in all meetings of the Commission, of the Scientific Committee and of any other subsidiary body of the Commission.
 - i. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)
 - b) Rule XIV.2. Members and Associate Members of the Organization that are not Members of the Commission are, upon their request, invited to be represented by an observer at sessions of the Commission.
 - i. Russian Federation
 - ii. United States of America
 - c) Rule XIV.4. The Commission may, on their request, invite intergovernmental organizations having special competence in the field of activity of the Commission, to attend such of its meetings as the Commission may specify.
 - i. Indian Ocean Commission (IOC)
 - d) Rule XIV.5. The Commission may invite, upon request, non-governmental organizations having special competence in the field of activity of the Commission to attend such of its meetings as the Commission may specify. The list of the NGOs wishing to be invited will be submitted beforehand by the Secretary to the Members of the Commission. If one of the Members of the Commission objects giving in writing its reasons within 30 days, the matter will then be subject to decision of the Commission out of session by written procedure.
 - i. International Seafood Sustainability Foundation (ISSF)
 - ii. PEW Charitable Trusts (PEW)
 - iii. Stop Illegal Fishing

Invited experts

- e) Rule XIV.9. The Commission may invite consultants or experts, in their individual capacity, to attend the meetings or participate in the work of the Commission as well as the Scientific Committee and the other subsidiary bodies of the Commission.
 - i. Taiwan, Province of China

4. OVERVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF IOTC CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT MEASURES

4.1 Summary report on the level of compliance

7. The CoC **NOTED** paper IOTC–2017–CoC14–03, which summarised the level of compliance by IOTC Contracting Parties (Members) and Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties (CNCP), collectively termed CPCs, to some of the more prominent IOTC Resolutions adopted by the Commission. The report is based on information available to the IOTC Secretariat as of 8th April 2017.
8. The CoC **NOTED** the marginal improvement in the levels of compliance by some CPCs in 2016, and there are still many CPCs not meeting their obligations to provide information under the various CMMs covered in the paper. The Committee **NOTED** with concerns that five Members of the Commission have consistently failed, over a number of years, to provide information to explain their level of implementation of IOTC obligations. Some of the required information is not only important to ensure the completeness of datasets, but also to allow the Scientific Committee to carry out the tasks foreseen in the Agreement, as well as for the CoC to fully assess the level of compliance of CPCs with the CMMs to monitor the catch and capacity of fleets actively fishing for tuna and tuna-like species under the mandate of IOTC.
9. The CoC **NOTED** that there is a slight increase in the level of compliance with the requirement to provide mandatory statistics for IOTC species (Resolutions 15/02) and the submission of mandatory statistics for sharks (Resolution 05/05). The CoC also **NOTED** that the overall increase in the level of implementation of the regional observer scheme (Resolution 11/04) is attributed to the increased level of coverage for the purse seiners, while for other gears the level of coverage remains below the required 5% level of coverage.
10. The CoC **ENCOURAGED** CPCs to continue to increase their efforts to comply with the requirements of the three Resolutions (15/02 on mandatory data, 05/05 for data on sharks and 11/04 on the regional observer scheme) identified as being the ones with lowest levels of compliance.
11. The CoC **REMINDED** all CPCs and the IOTC Secretariat of the need to respect the deadlines of the processes established in the IOTC Rules of Procedure (2014). The CoC also **NOTED** that some CPCs were still providing additional information well past the agreed deadlines.
12. The CoC **RECALLED** that all other papers are due 30 days prior to the commencement of the CoC Session, in accordance with the IOTC Rules of Procedure (2014), as Rule XI, Appendix V, para. 6 indicates that the procedures of the CoC shall be governed mutatis mutandis by the Rules of Procedure of the Commission, which require all papers to be submitted and made public no later than 30 days prior to the start of the Session in question.
13. The CoC **NOTED** the delay for the IOTC Secretariat to make documents public no later than 30 days prior to the start of the Session, which was due to the consultation process to finalise the Compliance Report and ancillary reports.
14. Some CPCs suggested that the IOTC Secretariat include the following information in the Compliance Reports: 1) payment of the IOTC Contribution, and 2) participation in IOTC meetings (SC, SCAF, CoC and Session of the Commission).

Recommendation/s

15. The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the 15 days deadline relating to the submission of information and reports should be respected by all CPCs, but that an additional seven days will be allowed for CPCs to interact with the Secretariat.
16. The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the IOTC Secretariat shall not register new vessels without LOA on the IOTC Record of Authorised Vessels.
17. The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the IOTC Secretariat continue to work intersessionally with CPCs to identify and resolve gaps in the mandatory information provided for the IOTC Record of Authorised Vessels and that the

IOTC Secretariat provide to the next CoC a document outlining the gaps in the IOTC Record of Authorised Vessels.

18. The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that Resolution 15/04 be revised next year to introduce a clear procedure and criteria to determine when a vessel shall or not to be included in the IOTC Record of Authorized Vessels.
19. The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that IOTC should further work on a scheme for the assessment of compliance to develop a structured approach for cases of infringements, better reflecting critical compliance issues and partial compliance.

4.2 IOTC regional observer programme for at-sea transshipments

20. The CoC **NOTED** paper IOTC–2017–CoC14–04a and 4b, which provided reports on the observer programme to monitor at-sea transhipment by large-scale tuna longline fishing vessels in the IOTC area of competence.
21. The CoC **NOTED** that eight fleets have submitted information on carrier vessels authorised to receive at-sea transshipments from their large-scale tuna longline fishing vessels (LSTLVs). This represents a total of 82 carrier vessels that have been expressly authorised to receive at-sea transshipments from participating fleets in the programme.
22. The CoC **NOTED** that there are 82 carrier vessels listed in the IOTC Record of Authorised Vessels which have been authorised by the fleets participating in the at-sea transhipment programme, which included 7 carrier vessels that are flagged to non-CPCs of the IOTC (Kiribati, Panama and Singapore).
23. The CoC **NOTED** that there has been a significant increase in the number of at-sea transshipments in 2016, which puts it on par with the first year of the Programme, in 2009. A total of 1,215 at-sea transhipment operations have been observed, in which 62,756 metric tons of fish were transshipped.
24. The CoC **NOTED** the statement from Mauritius Appendix IV
25. One CPC **NOTED** that the at-sea transhipment programme contributes to increasing the global fishing effort, reducing the quality of inspection and control of possible infringements, and does not favour the development of the ports of coastal States. Some CPCs emphasized that at-sea transshipments are essential to the normal operations of large-scale tuna longline vessels and that the current at-sea transhipment programme works well in its function of monitoring at-sea transshipments.
26. The CoC **NOTED** that some CPCs were of the opinion that the increase of transhipment activities in 2016 is not a compliance issue and further explained that the increase in transhipment activities is a result of strategic decision based on favourable market conditions to have product reaching the market as soon as possible.
27. The CoC **NOTED** that Seychelles is analysing data on the increase of the transhipment activity (354%) for its fleets in 2016 and Seychelles indicated that it shall provide feedback to the IOTC Secretariat.

Recommendation/s

28. **NOTING** that there are 7 carrier vessels operating under the at-sea transhipment programme that are flagged to non-CPCs of the IOTC (Kiribati, Panama and Singapore), the CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the concerns of carrier vessels flagged to non-CPCs that are involved in at-sea transhipment operations in the IOTC area of competence be addressed by submitting a proposal to amend Resolution 14/06 for this purpose.

4.3 Review of reference fishing capacity and fleet development plans (FDP)

29. The CoC **NOTED** papers IOTC–2017–CoC14–05 Rev2, IOTC–2017–CoC14–05 Add1 and IOTC–2017–CoC14–05 Add2, which summarise the information available to the IOTC Secretariat in accordance with IOTC Resolution 15/11 On the implementation of a limitation of fishing capacity of Contracting Parties and Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties, to assist CPCs in assessing compliance with the limitation on fishing capacity, in particular with the provisions of paragraphs 1, 6 and 8 of the Resolution (Appendix V).
30. The CoC **NOTED** that the trends in overall fishing capacity can be assessed by comparing the active capacity in 2016 with the reference active capacity in 2006 or 2007. Capacity in 2016 reflects a decrease in fishing pressure, relative to 2006 or 2007 levels.
31. The CoC **NOTED** that in relation to tropical tunas, the results indicate that the active capacity in 2016 (537,031 tons) has decreased relative to the baseline capacity of 2006 (698,876 tons), and it was around 40% of the reference limit capacity of 1,365,489 tons, that was expected for 2016. The lower than expected value is the results of reductions in capacity of most fleets, and also the failure of the majority of CPCs with a fleet development plan, to implement the plan.

32. The CoC **NOTED** that in relation to the albacore and swordfish fishery, the results indicate that the active capacity in 2016 (31,797 tons) has decreased relative to the baseline capacity of 2006 (58,757 tons), and it was around 32% of the reference limit capacity of 99,203 tons, that was expected for 2016.
33. The CoC **NOTED** that some CPCs without a baseline capacity for both fisheries, had vessels active in both fisheries during 2016. The CoC further **NOTED** that one CPC had surpassed its reference capacity in this fishery during 2016. The CoC **AGREED** that the discussions would be deferred to the Plenary.
34. The CoC **NOTED** that there were issues of concerns on the implementation of Resolution 15/11 and there is a need to rectify the tables referencing to the fishing capacity of 2016 (Document IOTC-2017-CoC14-05).
35. The CoC **NOTED** that currently Resolution 15/11 indicates that the implementation period covers the years 2015 and 2016, and the decision of 20th Session of the Commission to extend its application up to the 21st Session of the Commission.

Recommendation/s

36. The CoC **NOTED** the inclusion of the capacity for the fleet of Taiwan, Province of China, as requested by the 20th Session of the Commission and **RECOMMENDED** that, in the future, information continue to be provided on that fleet in the document dealing with capacity limitations.
37. The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the IOTC Secretariat analyse FDPs submitted in the light of the provisions of Resolution 15/11, notably those introducing new vessels/capacity in the FDPs.
38. The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that CPCs having provided a FDP which has not been fully implemented provide information on the reasons as to why the FDP has not been implemented and to detail the way forward.

5. NATIONAL REPORTS ON THE PROGRESS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT MEASURES (ARTICLE X.2 IOTC AGREEMENT)

39. The CoC **NOTED** that in 2017, a total of 27 national 'Reports of Implementation' were provided by CPCs (25 Members and two Cooperating Non-Contracting Party), up from 26 in 2016, up from 24 in 2015 and 25 in 2014. Nineteen CPCs submitted their 'Reports of Implementation' on or before the deadline and eight CPCs submitted their reports after the deadline. The importance of the timely submission of national 'Reports of Implementation' by all CPCs was highlighted.
40. The CoC **REMINDED** CPCs of their obligation under Article X.2 of the IOTC Agreement to transmit to the Commission a national 'Reports of Implementation' on the actions it has taken to make effective the provisions of the IOTC Agreement and to implement Resolutions adopted by the Commission. Such 'Reports of Implementation' shall be sent to the Executive Secretary of the Commission not later than 60 days before the date of the following regular session of the Commission.
41. The CoC **AGREED** that specifics relating to each national 'Reports of Implementation' would be considered in conjunction with Agenda item 6, on the country based Compliance Reports prepared by the IOTC Secretariat.
42. The CoC **NOTED** the statements of Mauritius referring to Tromelin Island, and the statement of France (OT) provided at Appendix IV.
43. One CPC **NOTED** that catch data provisions should be implemented according to Resolutions 15/01 and 15/02 and, therefore, that all catches of IOTC species should be provided to the IOTC Secretariat and to the IOTC Scientific Committee. The same CPC proposed to further discuss this issue in the Commission.

Recommendation/s

44. The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that those CPCs (Eritrea, Guinea, India, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Yemen, Bangladesh and Djibouti) who have not submitted their national 'Reports of Implementation' for 2016 do so within 30 days after the end of the Commission meeting. The Chair of the CoC, with the assistance of the IOTC Secretariat shall follow-up with each such CPC to ensure a national 'Reports of Implementation' is submitted for publication on the IOTC website and to inform CPCs during the Commission meeting and then also via an IOTC Circular once each report is received.

6. REVIEW OF THE COUNTRY BASED COMPLIANCE REPORTS

6.1 Review of individual CPC Compliance Status against IOTC Conservation and Management Measures

45. The CoC **NOTED** that the IOTC Secretariat circulated the assessment criteria to CPCs to understand the process of how the Compliance Reports are compiled, including information on the year being assessed for each

requirement and **REQUESTED** the IOTC Secretariat to continue to provide the assessment criteria prior to the commencement of the compliance process every year.

46. The CoC **NOTED** that no CPCs provided a response or comments on the assessment criteria. The CoC **URGED** CPCs to provide their comments on the assessment criteria, when they are circulated in preparation for the next CoC.
 47. The CoC **NOTED** the country based Compliance Reports (IOTC-2017-CoC14-CR01 to CR35) for each CPC, prepared by the IOTC Secretariat, which indicated an increase in the number of CPCs that have achieved progress in their compliance level during the intersessional period of 2016/2017. The CoC further **NOTED** that the compliance level of some CPCs has decreased, while the compliance rate of other CPCs has not changed. The development of these reports, based on the responses provided in the Compliance Questionnaires and the Reports of Implementation, in addition to the discussion on the identification of areas of non-compliance, was aimed at improving the understanding and implementation of IOTC Resolutions by all CPCs.
 48. The CoC **AGREED** to individually assess Contracting Parties and Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties (CPCs) for their respective compliance with IOTC Resolutions and associated reporting requirements. Based on the CPC presentations, and the examination of the country based Compliance Report and the national 'Reports of Implementation', substantial variations in the degree of compliance by each CPC was evident.
 49. The CoC **INVITED** the IOTC Secretariat to present information on the fleets from Taiwan, Province of China, operating in the IOTC area of competence.
 50. At the invitation of the CoC the invited experts from Taiwan, Province of China, provided an overview of the actions that they have taken to comply with all IOTC Resolutions.
 51. The CoC **NOTED** the actions taken by the fleet of longliners from Taiwan, Province of China. The Compliance Report, and the 'Report of Implementation' made available by Taiwan, Province of China, to the IOTC Secretariat, can be made available to CPCs upon request.
- 6.2 Identification of challenges encountered in the implementation of IOTC Resolutions; CPC information on its compliance status (reasons, problems, etc.).**
52. **NOTING** the responses from CPCs on non-compliance issues, the CoC **AGREED** to include the difficulties in implementation being experienced by each CPC in the 'Letter of feedback on compliance issues'.
 53. The CoC **NOTED** that many CPCs are failing to provide nominal catch data, as per the requirements of Resolutions 15/02, 05/05 and 16/06, and that this could trigger the prohibition to retain the missing reported species on board of the vessels of the referred CPCs.
- 6.3 Discussion on follow-up on individual compliance status including identifying opportunities to assist in raising the level of implementation of Resolutions (inter-sessional process, and 2018 Compliance Committee discussions).**
54. The CoC **AGREED** that the individual compliance status should be summarised and will constitute the content of the 'feedback letters on compliance issues', that will be addressed to the Heads of Delegation during the 21st Session of the Commission (S21) by the Chair of the Commission, including the challenges being experienced by CPCs in implementing the IOTC Resolutions.
 55. The CoC **NOTED** that nine CPCs (Members: Eritrea, Guinea, India, Madagascar, Sierra Leone, Sudan and Yemen; CNCPs: Bangladesh and Djibouti) were not present at CoC14 and **AGREED** that attendance by all CPCs at each CoC meeting is essential to the effective operation of the Commission.
 56. The CoC **NOTED** that only 22 CPCs have provided a response to the Letter of Feedback issued at the last Session of the Commission.
 57. The CoC **NOTED** the absence of two Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties (Djibouti and Bangladesh) at the CoC14 and **REITERATED** that when countries are requesting the renewal of their CNCP status they have to participate in the work of the CoC and the Commission.
 58. The CoC **NOTED** that the methodology of assessing CPCs to their reporting obligations can be further refined.

Recommendation/s

59. The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission agree to the development and distribution of letters of feedback by the IOTC Chair, highlighting areas of non-compliance to relevant CPCs, together with the difficulties and challenges being faced. The development of follow-up actions on the issues contained in the letters of feedback, including potential capacity building activities to address these matters, particularly for developing coastal States needs to be developed and funded appropriately.

60. The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the responses to the feedback letters be made available to CPCs at the future Compliance Committee meetings.
61. The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the IOTC Secretariat reach out to some of the CPCs via their Representatives to the FAO or the FAO Representatives to these CPCs, to understand the reasons for their lack of engagements with the Commission, and, where possible, for the IOTC Secretariat to undertake missions to these CPCs.
62. The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission and Scientific Committee validate the information provided by CPCs related to the implementation of the Resolution 16/01 on the reduction of catch of yellowfin tuna by all CPCs.
63. The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that for CPCs failing to provide nominal catch data, that a reference to consequences of the Commission invoking Resolution 16/06 be included in their feedback letter.
64. The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the IOTC Secretariat continues to follow up with Sierra Leone with regards to its commitments to the Commission, given its complete absence from participating in the IOTC meetings since becoming a Member of the Commission.

7. **REVIEW OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RELATED TO IUU FISHING ACTIVITIES IN THE IOTC AREA OF COMPETENCE**

7.1 **Complementary compliance elements for discussion**

65. The CoC **NOTED** paper IOTC–2017–CoC14–08a_Rev1, which reports on several vessels involved in possible IUU fishing activities in the IOTC area of competence. The information concerning these vessels is for the consideration of CPCs and for them to take any action that they may feel is appropriate, at the 14th Session of the Compliance Committee.
66. The CoC **NOTED** the statement from Mauritius provided at Appendix IV

EPHRAEEM 1 and VAAZHVIN MANNA

67. The CoC **NOTED** the information provided by UK (OT) regarding the fishing vessels EPHRAEEM 1 and VAAZHVIN MANNA, which outline the activities of these two vessels in the waters of the UK (OT) and the outcome of the legal proceedings.

Recommendation/s

68. The CoC **NOTED** the lack of engagement from India and **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission express strong concerns to India through the Letter of Feedback.

KAVIDYA, LAKPRIYA 5 and SUPERFRESH 2

69. The CoC **NOTED** that under the bilateral arrangement established between UK (OT) and Sri Lanka in order to combat IUU, these vessels were reported to the Sri Lankan Authorities who have indicated that they will take action against the owner/master under the provisions of national fisheries legislation.

JIN SHYANG YIH 668

70. The CoC **NOTED** the information provided by Thailand regarding the fishing vessel JIN SHYANG YIH 668.

Recommendation/s

71. The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that Thailand should continue to keep CPCs informed of progress of Thailand's investigation and report back to the Commission via the IOTC Secretariat. The IOTC Secretariat shall, notify the Commission via a Circular following the receipt of the report from Thailand, on the findings of the investigations.

YUTUNA NO.1, YUTUNA NO.3, ABUNBANT 1, ABUNBANT 3, ABUNBANT 6, ABUNBANT 9, ABUNBANT 12, SHUN LAI and SHENG JI QUN 3

72. The CoC **NOTED** the information from Bolivia and requested that this information be considered together with Paper IOTC-2017-CoC14-07, on the deliberations of the vessels in the Provisional IUU Vessels List.

CERIBU, MOOK ANDAMAN 018, MOOK ANDAMAN 028, YU LONG 6, YU LONG 125 and HUNG CHI FU 68

73. The CoC **ACKNOWLEDGED** the update provided by Thailand regarding the fishing vessels CERIBU, MOOK ANDAMAN 018, MOOK ANDAMAN 028, YU LONG 6, YU LONG 125 and HUNG CHI FU 68.

Recommendation/s

74. The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that Thailand provide an update on the ongoing court case, once concluded.

7.2 Summary of possible infractions reported by observers under the Regional observer program (IOTC at-sea Transshipment Programme)

75. The CoC **NOTED** paper IOTC–2017–CoC14–08b, which provided a summary of possible infractions of IOTC regulations by large-scale fishing vessels (LSTLVs/carrier vessels), as recorded by observers deployed under the Programme during 2016, in line with the requirement of IOTC Resolution 14/06 On establishing a programme for transshipment by large-scale fishing vessels.
76. The CoC **NOTED** that a total of 474 possible infractions were recorded in 2016 (301 in 2015, 380 in 2014, 840 in 2013 and 169 in 2012). These possible infractions were recorded and communicated to the concerned fleets participating in the at-sea Transshipment Programme, as and when the concerned deployment reports were approved by the IOTC Secretariat. The possible infractions consisted of the following:
- a) 131 (105 in 2015, 197 in 2014, 549 in 2013 and 77 in 2012) cases where vessel skippers failed to provide fishing logbooks for inspection, or the logbooks were not printed and bound.
 - b) 121 (130 in 2015, 106 in 2014, 157 in 2013 and 40 in 2012) related to marking of vessels;
 - c) 87 (17 in 2015, 25 in 2014, 85 in 2013 and 36 in 2012) inspections where vessel skippers failed to provide valid fishing licenses or authorizations to fish.
 - d) 134 (45 in 2015, 52 in 2014, 43 in 2013 and 12 in 2012) vessels where there was either no VMS on board or where the VMS was not in operation.
 - e) One instance of transshipment outside the at-sea Transshipment Programme recorded during 2016.
77. **NOTING** that all observer reports for the IOTC at-sea Transshipment Programme, are forwarded to the fleets concerned for their information, the CoC **REMINDED** the fleets to review the reports and follow-up on the irregularities identified, where required. In order to facilitate this task, the IOTC Secretariat shall continue to highlight the issues identified by observers when sending the reports to the fleets concerned.

7.3 Identification of repeated possible infringements under the Regional observer programme

78. The CoC **NOTED** paper IOTC–2017–CoC14–08b Add1, which provided a summary of repeated cases of possible infringements of IOTC regulations by large-scale fishing vessels (LSTLVs/carrier vessels), as recorded by observers deployed under the at-sea Transshipment Programme during 2016, in line with the requirement of IOTC Resolution 14/06 On establishing a programme for transshipment by large-scale fishing vessels.
79. The CoC **NOTED** that seven of the eight fleets, which participated in the at-sea Transshipment Programme have a record of repeated possible infringements in 2016 (Taiwan, Province of China: 68; China: 27; Japan: 20; Seychelles: 8; Malaysia: 3; Rep. of Korea: 2; Oman: 1).
80. The CoC **NOTED** that five (5) fleets have LSTLVs with 125 records of repeated possible infringements in 2016 that have a record of infringements in 2015.
- a) Twenty three (23) LSTLVs of the fleet of China have been identified as repeated potential offender in 2016. Seven of those 23 vessels have a record of possible infractions in 2015 (30 % re-incidence).
 - b) Sixty eight (68) LSTLVs of the fleet of Taiwan, Province of China, have been identified as repeated potential offender in 2016. Twenty seven of those 68 vessels have a record of possible infractions in 2015 (40% re-incidence).
 - c) Twenty (20) LSTLVs of the fleet of Japan have been identified as repeated potential offender in 2016. Fifteen of those 20 LSTLVs have a record of possible infractions in 2015 (75% re-incidence).
 - d) Three (3) LSTLVs of the fleet of Malaysia have been identified as repeated potential offender in 2016. The 3 LSTLVs have a record of possible infractions in 2015 (100% re-incidence).
 - e) One (1) LSTLV of the fleet of Oman has been identified as repeated potential offender in 2016. This LSTLV has a record of possible infractions in 2015 (100% re-incidence).
81. The CoC **NOTED** that two (2) fleets with LSTLVs with a record of repeated possible infringements in 2016, but there is no record of infringement in 2015.
- a) Two LSTLVs of the fleet of Korea have been identified as repeated potential offender in 2016.
 - b) Eight LSTLVs of the fleet of Seychelles have been identified as repeated potential offenders in 2016.
82. All the CPCs except for Oman, and the Invited Experts from Taiwan, Province of China, explained the results of their investigations and actions they have taken or will take to rectify the non-compliance cases.

Recommendation/s

83. The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that Oman provide the results of investigations of possible infractions identified by the IOTC Observers.

7.4 Reporting of vessels in transit through waters of the UK(OT) for potential breach of IOTC Conservation and Management Measures

84. The CoC **NOTED** paper IOTC-2017-CoC14-08c, which provides information from the United Kingdom (OT) on vessels in transit through the waters of UK (OT).

85. The CoC **NOTED** the high incidence of breach of IOTC Resolutions by vessels flagged to India and Sri Lanka, which were inspected in the waters of UK (OT).

86. The CoC **NOTED** the statement from Mauritius provided at Appendix IV.

Recommendation/s

87. The CoC **THANKED** the UK (OT) for its continued efforts in the detection of activities that continue to undermine Conservation and Management Measures adopted by the Commission and **RECOMMENDED** that the UK (OT) continue to provide such information to future meetings of the Compliance Committee.

8. REVIEW OF THE PROVISIONAL IUU VESSELS LIST AND OF THE INFORMATION SUBMITTED BY CPCs RELATING TO ILLEGAL FISHING ACTIVITIES IN THE IOTC AREA OF COMPETENCE – RESOLUTION 11/03

88. The CoC **NOTED** paper IOTC-2017-CoC14-07, which outlined the IOTC Provisional IUU Vessels List, and includes both the current list of IUU Vessels as well as those proposed for inclusion in the IOTC IUU Vessels List, in accordance with Paragraph 9 of IOTC Resolution 11/03 On establishing a list of vessels presumed to have carried out illegal, unregulated and unreported fishing in the IOTC Area.

8.1 2016 IOTC IUU Vessels List - review

ANEKA 228, ANEKA 228; KM., CHI TONG, FU HSIANG FA 18, FU HSIANG FA NO. 01, FU HSIANG FA, NO. 02, FU HSIANG FA NO. 06, FU HSIANG FA NO. 08, FU HSIANG FA NO. 09, FU HSIANG FA NO. 11, FU HSIANG FA NO. 13, FU HSIANG FA NO. 17, FU HSIANG FA NO. 20, FU HSIANG FA NO. 21, FU HSIANG FA NO. 211, FU HSIANG FA NO. 23, FU HSIANG FA NO. 26, FU HSIANG FA NO. 30, FULL RICH, GUNUAR MELYAN 21, HOOM XIANG 101, HOOM XIANG 103, HOOM XIANG 105, HOOM XIANG II, KIM SENG DENG 3, KUANG HSING 127, KUANG HSING 196, KUNLUN, MAAN YIH HSING, OCEAN LION, SAMUDERA PERKASA 11, SAMUDRA PERKASA 12, SHUEN SIANG, SIN SHUN FA 6, SIN SHUN FA 67, SIN SHUN FA 8, SIN SHUN FA 9, SONGHUA, SRI FU FA 168, SRI FU FA 18, SRI FU FA 188, SRI FU FA 189, SRI FU FA 286, SRI FU FA 67, SRI FU FA 888, TIAN LUNG NO.12, YI HONG 106, YI HONG 116, YI HONG 16, YI HONG 3, YI HONG 6, YONGDING, YU FONG 168 and YU MAAN WON.

89. The CoC **NOTED** that no new information was available for the below listed vessels.

1. ANEKA 228
2. ANEKA 228; KM.
3. CHI TONG
4. FU HSIANG FA 18
5. FU HSIANG FA NO. 01
6. FU HSIANG FA NO. 02
7. FU HSIANG FA NO. 06
8. FU HSIANG FA NO. 08
9. FU HSIANG FA NO. 09
10. FU HSIANG FA NO. 11
11. FU HSIANG FA NO. 13
12. FU HSIANG FA NO. 17

13. FU HSIANG FA NO. 20
14. FU HSIANG FA NO. 21
15. FU HSIANG FA NO. 21¹
16. FU HSIANG FA NO. 23
17. FU HSIANG FA NO. 26
18. FU HSIANG FA NO. 30
19. FULL RICH
20. GUNUAR MELYAN 21
21. HOOM XIANG 101
22. HOOM XIANG 103
23. HOOM XIANG 105
24. HOOM XIANG II
25. KIM SENG DENG 3
26. KUANG HSING 127
27. KUANG HSING 196
28. KUNLUN (TAISHAN)
29. MAAN YIH HSING
30. OCEAN LION
31. SAMUDERA PERKASA 11
32. SAMUDRA PERKASA 12
33. SHUEN SIANG
34. SIN SHUN FA 6
35. SIN SHUN FA 67
36. SIN SHUN FA 8
37. SIN SHUN FA 9
38. SONGHUA (YUNNAN)
39. SRI FU FA 168
40. SRI FU FA 18
41. SRI FU FA 188
42. SRI FU FA 189
43. SRI FU FA 286
44. SRI FU FA 67
45. SRI FU FA 888
46. TIAN LUNG NO.12
47. YI HONG 106
48. YI HONG 116
49. YI HONG 16
50. YI HONG 3
51. YI HONG 6

52. YONGDING (JIANFENG)
53. YU FONG 168
54. YU MAAN WON

Recommendation/s

90. The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the vessels listed in [para 89](#) remain on the IOTC IUU Vessels List as no further information was provided to the CoC14 during its deliberations.

8.2 2016 IOTC IUU Vessels List – review of vessels previously listed

YI HONG 6, YI HONG 16, YI HONG 106, YI HONG 116

91. The CoC **NOTED** that Thailand has provided new information for the below listed vessels.
1. YI HONG 6
 2. YI HONG 16
 3. YI HONG 106
 4. YI HONG 116

Recommendation/s

92. The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the names of the vessels listed in [para 91](#) be updated and that the vessels be kept on the IOTC IUU Vessels List.
93. The CoC **NOTED** the actions taken by Taiwan, Province of China, on the owner of the vessels and further **NOTED** that Taiwan, Province of China, proposed to provide the results of the prosecution of the owners, once the proceedings are terminated.

8.3 Provisional IUU Vessels List - Consideration of other vessels

ABUNDANT 6 (YI HONG 86), SHENG JI QUN 3, SHUN LAI (HSIN JYI WANG NO. 6), YUTUNA NO. 1 and YUTUNA 3 (HUNG SHENG NO. 166)

94. The CoC **NOTED** the information provided by Thailand in support of the proposed IUU listing for the vessels, ABUNDANT 6 (YI HONG 86), SHENG JI QUN 3, SHUN LAI (HSIN JYI WANG NO. 6), YUTUNA NO. 1 and YUTUNA 3 (HUNG SHENG NO. 166), flagged to Bolivia, in accordance with paragraph 9 of IOTC Resolution 11/03.
95. The CoC **NOTED** the responses provided by the Plurinational State of Bolivia which indicated that the vessels are not flagged to Bolivia.
96. The CoC **NOTED** the additional information provided by Thailand on the transshipments operations involving carrier vessels flagged to Taiwan, Province of China.
97. The CoC **NOTED** that Taiwan, Province of China, will cooperate with Thailand during the legal proceedings of the vessels proposed by Thailand.

Recommendation/s

98. **NOTING** the information provided by the Plurinational State of Bolivia the CoC was satisfied that the vessels, ABUNDANT 6 (YI HONG 86), SHENG JI QUN 3, SHUN LAI (HSIN JYI WANG NO. 6), YUTUNA NO. 1 and YUTUNA 3 (HUNG SHENG NO. 166), were flagless, and the CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission IUU list the vessels, ABUNDANT 6 (YI HONG 86), SHENG JI QUN 3, SHUN LAI (HSIN JYI WANG NO. 6), YUTUNA NO. 1 and YUTUNA 3 (HUNG SHENG NO. 166), at its 21st Session.
99. The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that Thailand provide the result of the legal proceeding on the proposed vessels and provide information on the vessels involved in transshipment activities.

BEO HINGIS, VACHANAM, BENAIHAH, CARMAL MATHA, DIGNAMOL I, KING JESUS SACRED HEART and WISDOM

100. In respect of the vessels flagged to India retained on the Provisional IUU vessels list intersessionally since 2015 and 2016, the CoC **NOTED** the information provided by UK (OT) in support of the proposed IUU listing for the vessels, BEO HINGIS, VACHANAM, BENAIHAH, CARMAL MATHA, DIGNAMOL I, KING JESUS, SACRED HEART and WISDOM, flagged to India, in accordance with paragraph 9 of IOTC Resolution 11/03.

Recommendation/s

101. **NOTING** the information provided by the UK (OT) the CoC was satisfied that the vessels, BEO HINGIS, VACHANAM, BENAIHA, CARMAL MATHA, DIGNAMOL I KING JESUS, SACRED HEART and WISDOM, flagged to India, and the CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission IUU list the vessels, BEO HINGIS, VACHANAM, BENAIHA, CARMAL MATHA, DIGNAMOL I, KING JESUS, SACRED HEART and WISDOM, at its 21st Session.

BOSIN, DIGNAMOL II, GREESHMA 1, ST MARYS I, ST MARYS II, JOSHVA and JOSHVA NO. 1

102. In respect of the vessels flagged to India retained on the Provisional IUU vessels list intersessionally since 2015 and 2016, the CoC **NOTED** the information provided by UK (OT) in support of the proposed IUU listing for the vessels, BOSIN, DIGNAMOL II, GREESHMA 1, ST MARYS I, ST MARYS II, JOSHVA and JOSHVA NO. 1, flagged to India, in accordance with paragraph 9 of IOTC Resolution 11/03.
103. The CoC **NOTED** that India has imposed fines on the vessels BOSIN, DIGNAMOL II, GREESHMA 1, ST MARYS I, ST MARYS II, JOSHVA and JOSHVA NO. 1, but the CoC was not in a position to judge if the fines were of adequate severity.

Recommendation/s

104. The CoC **AGREED** to remove the vessels BOSIN, DIGNAMOL II, GREESHMA 1, ST MARYS I, ST MARYS II, JOSHVA and JOSHVA NO. 1, flagged to India, from the Provisional IUU List and **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission expresses strong concerns to India, through the letter of feedback, and request that India provide additional information regarding actions taken over the vessels, the captain and the owners of these vessels.

EPHRAEEM and SHALOM

105. The CoC **NOTED** the information provided by UK (OT) in support of the proposed IUU listing for the vessels EPHRAEEM and SHALOM, flagged to India, in accordance with paragraph 9 of IOTC Resolution 11/03.
106. The CoC **NOTED** that India did not respond to the IOTC Circular 2017-051 – On the 2017 Provisional IUU list.
107. The CoC **NOTED** the statement of Mauritius and UK (OT) provided in Appendix IV.

Recommendation/s

108. **NOTING** that India was not present during the CoC14 to discuss the proposed IUU listing for the vessels and that India did not respond to the IOTC Circular 2017-051 – On the 2017 Provisional IUU list the CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission IUU list the vessels, EPHRAEEM and SHALOM, at its 21st Session.

9. REVIEW OF DRIFTING FAD MANAGEMENT PLANS – RESOLUTION 15/08

109. The CoC **NOTED** paper IOTC–2017–CoC14–10_Rev1, which outlined the DFAD management plans, made available by the IOTC Secretariat in accordance with IOTC Resolution 15/08, to assist CPCs in analysing the DFAD management plans, as required in paragraph 12, and in particular with the provisions of paragraph 11 of the Resolution.
110. The CoC **NOTED** that the following ten CPCs have purse seine vessels registered in the IOTC Record of Authorised Vessels: Australia, European Union (France, Italy and Spain), Indonesia, I.R. Iran, Japan, Rep. of Korea, Mauritius, Philippines, Seychelles and Thailand, From these ten CPCs, eight have provided a DFAD management plans, from which three CPCs have provided revised plans in the 2016/17 intersessional period:
- a) Australia (Received 01.05.14)
 - b) European Union (Received on 15.01.14 and updated 19.04.17 for Spain; France and Italy 17.03.14 and updated 13.04.17),
 - c) Indonesia (Received 12.01.15),
 - d) Iran, Islamic Rep. of (Received 26.01.14),
 - e) Japan (Received 25.12.13; revised plans received 26.12.14 and 10.04.17),
 - f) Republic of Korea (Received 31.12.13; revised plans received 16.03.16 and 21.03.17),
 - g) Mauritius (Received 14.03.14),
 - h) Seychelles (Received 27.04.15).

111. The CoC **NOTED** that Australia did not authorise FAD fishery in the IOTC area of competence during 2016.
112. The CoC **NOTED** that the CPC listed below have reported that it will provide its FAD management plan:
- a) Sri Lanka have indicated that their plans will be submitted.
113. The CoC **ENCOURAGED** the CPCs who have not yet submitted their DFAD management plan to do so as soon as possible.
114. In analysing the DFAD Management Plans, the CoC **NOTED** the following three distinct categories:
- a) DFADs management plans with all appropriate sections setting clear guidelines for the plan;
- b) Incomplete DFADs management plans with only some parts setting clear guidelines and other parts containing statements of intention on what will be undertaken in the future to respond to the requirements for those concerned sections, and,
- c) Totally incomplete DFADs management plans.
115. The CoC **NOTED** that the paper IOTC–2014–CoC14–10 Add_1, which is a compendium of the DFAD Management Plans submitted by CPCs to the IOTC Secretariat.

Recommendation/s

116. The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that those CPCs whose DFAD Management Plans do not meet the standard set out in the guideline in Annex 1 of Resolution 15/08, to submit a revised DFAD Management Plan meeting the guideline within 3 months after S21.

10. **UPDATE ON PROGRESS REGARDING THE PERFORMANCE REVIEW – COMPLIANCE RELATED ISSUES**

117. The CoC **NOTED** paper IOTC–2017–CoC14–06, which outlined the current status of implementation for each of the recommendations arising from the Report of the second IOTC Performance Review Panel, relevant to the CoC.

Recommendation/s

118. The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the IOTC Secretariat work with the concerned CPCs to refine the document IOTC–2017–CoC14–06 for presentation to the Commission (S21).

11. **REVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS REQUIRING INTERSESSIONAL ACTIONS, FROM COC13 AND THE 20TH ANNUAL SESSION**

11.1 *Implementation of Recommendations of the Compliance Committee and Commission meeting in 2016*

119. The CoC **NOTED** paper IOTC–2017–CoC14–11, which provided information on the progress made during the intersessional period, in relation to the recommendations for actions by the Chair of the Compliance Committee and the IOTC Secretariat.
120. The CoC **NOTED** that all the recommended actions from the Compliance Committee, for the Chair of the Compliance Committee and the Secretariat, had been fulfilled during the intersessional period.

12. **ACTIVITIES BY THE IOTC SECRETARIAT IN SUPPORT OF CAPACITY BUILDING FOR DEVELOPING CPCs – RESOLUTION 16/10**

121. The CoC **NOTED** paper IOTC–2017–CoC14–09 Rev1, which provided a summary of the activities undertaken by the IOTC Secretariat in support of implementation of Conservation and Management Measures (CMMs) adopted by the IOTC.
122. The CoC **NOTED** the efforts of the IOTC Secretariat to assist CPCs to improve their compliance level through targeted, in-country missions, including initiative to develop facilities to enable CPCs to implement port State measures (e-PSM) more effectively and to transpose IOTC CMMs into national legislation as required by Article X.2 of the IOTC Agreement.
123. The CoC **NOTED** the contribution of some CPCs in supporting the work of the IOTC Secretariat to provide support to some of the CPCs aimed at helping them to increase their level of compliance.

Recommendation/s

124. The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the IOTC Secretariat continue with those capacity building activities and strengthen activities that would allow CPCs to address the issue of mandatory statistics and the implementation of the Regional Observer Scheme.

13. **REVIEW OF REQUESTS FOR ACCESS TO THE STATUS OF COOPERATING NON-CONTRACTING PARTY – APPENDIX III OF THE IOTC RULES OF PROCEDURE (2014)**

125. The CoC **RECALLED** the deadline for the submission of applications to attain the status of Cooperating Non-Contracting Party of the Commission is 90 days prior to the annual Session of the Commission (15 February 2017 for S21), as stipulated in the IOTC Rules of Procedure (2014), Rule IX, Appendix III, para. 1:

“Any non-Contracting Party requesting the status of Cooperating Non-Contracting Party shall apply to the Executive Secretary. Requests must be received by the Executive Secretary no later than ninety (90) days in advance of an Annual Session of the Commission, to be considered at that meeting.”

13.1 Liberia

126. The CoC **NOTED** the application for Cooperating Non-Contracting Party status by Liberia (IOTC–2017–CoC14–CNCP01), which was received on 06th February 2017.
127. The CoC **NOTED** the intention of Liberia to engage only in transshipment activities and their commitment not to engage in harvesting activities of tuna and tuna like species under the mandate of the IOTC.

13.2 Djibouti

128. The CoC **NOTED** the application for Cooperating Non-Contracting Party status by Djibouti (IOTC–2017–CoC14–CNCP02), which was received on 08th February 2017.
129. The CoC **NOTED** that Djibouti was not present at the CoC14 and had not submitted all the required data in its application for renewal of its Cooperating Non-Contracting Party status.

13.3 Senegal

130. The CoC **NOTED** the application for Cooperating Non-Contracting Party status by Senegal (IOTC–2017–CoC14–CNCP03), which was received on 14th February 2017.
131. The CoC **NOTED** the continued commitment of Senegal to participate in the IOTC process.

13.4 Bangladesh

132. The CoC **NOTED** the application for Cooperating Non-Contracting Party status by Bangladesh (IOTC–2017–CoC14–CNCP04), which was received on 16th February 2017
133. The CoC **NOTED** that Bangladesh was not present at the CoC14.

Recommendation/s

134. The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission considers renewing the status of Liberia as Cooperating Non-Contracting Party of the IOTC.
135. **NOTING** that Djibouti was not present during the CoC14 to present their application for Cooperating Non-Contracting Party status, the CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission considers the application by Djibouti for the status of Cooperating Non-Contracting Party of the IOTC (IOTC–2017–CoC14–CNCP02) at S21, bearing in mind paragraph 82 of the Report of the 19th Session of the Commission.
136. **The** CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission consider renewing the status of Senegal as Cooperating Non-Contracting Party of the IOTC.
137. **NOTING** that Bangladesh was not present during the CoC14 to present their application for Cooperating Non-Contracting Party status, the CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission consider the application by Bangladesh for the status of Cooperating Non-Contracting Party of the IOTC (IOTC–2017–CoC14–CNCP04) at S21, bearing in mind paragraph 82 of the Report of the 19th Session of the Commission.

14. **OTHER BUSINESS**

14.1 **Date and Place of the 15th and 16th Sessions of the Compliance Committee**

138. The CoC participants were unanimous in **THANKING** Indonesia for hosting the 14th Session of the CoC and commended the local authorities of Indonesia on the warm welcome, the excellent facilities and assistance provided to the IOTC Secretariat in the organisation and running of the Session.

139. The CoC **NOTED** that the decision on when and who would host the 15th and 16th Sessions of the CoC in 2018 and 2019, respectively, would be decided during the 21st Session of the Commission.

15. ELECTION OF THE CHAIRPERSON AND VICE-CHAIRPERSON OF THE COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE

140. The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission endorses the nomination of Mr. Hosea Gonza Mbilinyi (Tanzania) as Chair of the Compliance Committee and of Ms Anne-France Mattlet (France) as Vice-chair of the CoC, for the next biennium.

16. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE 14TH SESSION OF THE COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE

141. The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission consider the consolidated set of recommendations arising from CoC14, provided at Appendix VIII.

142. The report of the 14th Session of the Compliance Committee (IOTC–2017–CoC14–R) was adopted on 17 May 2017.

APPENDIX I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

CHAIRPERSON

Mr Herminio **Tembe**
Ministry of Maritime, Inland Waters and Fisheries
Email: herminio.tembe948@gmail.com

VICE CHAIRPERSON

Mr Hosea Gonza **Mbilinyi**
Deep Sea Fishing Authority
Email: hoseagonza@yahoo.com

IOTC MEMBERS**AUSTRALIA****Head of Delegation**

Ms Susan **Howell**
Department of Agriculture and Water Resources
Email: susan.howell@agriculture.gov.au

Alternate

Mr Stuart **Curran**
Department of Agriculture and Water Resources
Email: Stuart.Curran@agriculture.gov.au

Advisor(s)

Angela **Abolhassani**
University of Tasmania
Email: angela.abolhassani.edu.au

CHINA**Head of Delegation**

Mr Liu **Liming**
Bureau of Fisheries
Email: bofduf@agri.gov.cn

Alternate

Dr Liu **Xiaobing**
Shanghai Ocean University
Email: xiaobing.liu@hotmail.com

Advisor(s)

Mr Xu **Liuxiong**
Shanghai Ocean University
Email: lxu@shou.edu.cn

Dr Zhu Jianfeng

Shanghai Ocean University
Email: jfzhu@shou.edu.cn

Ms Zhang Kairui

China Overseas Fisheries Association
Email: admin1@tuna.org.cn

COMOROS**Head of Delegation**

Mr. Ahmed Said **Soilili**
Direction Générale de Ressources Halieutiques
Email: ahmed_ndevo@yahoo.fr

Advisor(s)

Mr. Said **Boina**
Direction Générale de Ressources Halieutiques
Email: dalaili@live.fr

ERITREA

Absent

EUROPEAN UNION (MEMBER ORGANIZATION)**Head of Delegation**

Mr Orlando **Fachada**
Maritime Affairs and Fisheries
Email: orlando.fachada@ec.europa.eu

Alternate

Mr Luis **Molledo**
European Unions
Email: luis.molledo@ec.europa.eu

FRANCE**Head of Delegation**

Ms Anne-France **Mattlet**
Ministry of Environment, Sustainable development and Sea
Email: anne-france.mattlet@developpement-durable.gov.fr

Alternate

Mr Etienne **Klein**
Collecte Localisation Satellites
Email: eklein@cls.fr

GUINEA

Absent

INDIA

Absent

INDONESIA**Head of Delegation**

Mr Reza **Pahlevi**
Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries
Email: pahlevi.reza-nrmp@gmail.com

Alternate

Mr Saut **Tampubolon**
Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries
Email: s.tampubolon@yahoo.com

Advisor(s)

Mr Wanan Rowandi
Directorate of Fish Resources Management
Email: sayakanou@gmail.com

Mr Agustinus Anung Widodo

Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries
Email: anungwd@yahoo.com

Mr Adi Wicaksono

Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries
Email: adi.wicaksono@kcp.go.id

Prof. Wudianto

Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries
Email: wudianto59@gmail.com

Mrs Sofi Challatus Sofia

Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries
Email: challatus_sofia@gamil.co.id

Mrs Riana Handayani

Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries
Email: daya139@yahoo.co.id

Mrs Eva Suryaman

Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries
Email: sdi.djpt@yahoo.com

Mr Satya Mardi

Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries
Email: sdi.djpt@yahoo.com

Mrs Putuh Suadela

Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries
Email: putuhsuadela@yahoo.co.uk

Mr Faisal Ahmad

Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries
Email: foxtrot-out@yahoo.com

IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)**Head of Delegation**

Mr Fariborz **Rajaei**
Fisheries Department
Email: rajaeif@gmail.com

Alternate

Mr Mokhtar **Akhondi**
Fisheries Department
Email: akhondi2200@yahoo.com

JAPAN**Head of Delegation**

Mr Shingo **Ota**
Resources Management Department
Email: shingo_ota810@maff.go.jp

Alternate

Mr Ryo **Omori**
Resources Management Department
Email: ryo_omori330@maff.go.jp

Advisor(s)

Mr Takeru **Iida**
Fisheries Management Division
Email: takeru_iida150@maff.go.jp

KENYA**Head of Delegation**

Mr Benedict **Kiilu**
Kenya Fisheries Service
Email:

MADAGASCAR**Head of Delegation**

Absent

MALAYSIA**Head of Delegation**

Ms Tengku Balkis Binti **Tunku Shahar**
Department of Fisheries Malaysia
Email: balkis@dof.gov.my

Alternate

Mr, Sallehudin Bin **Jamon**
Department of Fisheries Malaysia
Email: allehudin_jamon@dof.gov.my

MALDIVES**Head of Delegation**

Dr Shiham Adam
Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture
Email: msadam@mrc.gov.mv

Alternate

Mr Hussain Sinan
Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture
Email: hussain.sinan@fishagri.gov.mv

Advisor(s)

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

MAURITIUS**Head of Delegation**

Ministry of Ocean Economy, Marine Resources, Fisheries and Shipping
Email: dnorungee@gmail.com

Alternate

Mr Anwar Sheik Mamode
Ministry of Ocean Economy, Marine Resources, Fisheries and Shipping
Email: asheik-mamode@govmu.org

MOZAMBIQUE**Head of Delegation**

Ms Claudia Tomas de Souza
Ministry of Sea, Inland Waters and Fisheries
Email: ctomas2013@gmail.com

Alternate

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

Advisor(s)

Mr Jorge Mafuca
Ministry of Sea, Inland Waters and Fisheries
Email: jorgemario@sapo.mz

OMAN

Absent with apologies

PAKISTAN**Head of Delegation**

Mr Muhammad Farhan Khan
Ministry of Ports and Shipping
Email: farhankhan704@gmail.com

PHILIPPINES**Head of Delegation**

Mr Peter Erick Cadapan
Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources
Email: pedang@yahoo.com

Alternate

Ms Rosanna Contreras
Federation of Fishing and Allied Industries
Email: fishing.federation@gmail.com

Advisor(s)

Mr Michael Buhisan
Marchael Sea Ventures Corporation
Email: msucopr0818@gmail.com

Mr Jose Ronald Jamilaren
Marchael Sea Venture Corporation
Email: JrcJamilaren@yahoo.com

REPUBLIC OF KOREA**Head of Delegation**

Ms Kim Jung-re
Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries
Email: rileykim1126@gmail.com
Riley112@korea.kr

Alternate

Ms. Miyoung Choi
Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries
Email: choimi@korea.kr

Advisor(s)

Mr. Ilkang Na
Korea Overseas Fisheries Association
Email: ikna@kosfa.org

Mr Jung-hee Yoo
Dongwon Industries
Email: gagame2@dongwon.com

Mr Junsu Song
Sajo Industries
Email: jssong@sajo.co.kr

SEYCHELLES**Head of Delegation**

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

Alternate

Mr. Vincent Lucas
Seychelles Fishing Authority
Email: vlucas@sfa.sc

Advisor(s)

Mr Roddy Allisop
Seychelles Fishing Authority
Email: rallisop@sfa.sc

SIERRA LEONE

Absent

SOMALIA**Head of Delegation**

H.E Abdullahi Omar Abshir
Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources
Email: abshirow@mfmr.gov.so

SOUTH AFRICA**Head of Delegation**

Mr Saasa Pheeha
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
Email: saasaP@daff.gov.za

Alternate

Mr Mqondisi Ngadlela
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
Email: MqondisiN@daff.gov.za

Advisor(s)

Ms Buyekezwa Mamaila
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
Email: BuyekezwaP@daff.gov.za

SRI LANKA**Head of Delegation**

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

THAILAND**Head of Delegation**

Mrs. Pattira Lirdwitayaprasit
Overseas Fisheries and Transshipment Control Division
Email: pattiral@hotmail.com

Alternate

Ms. Sampan Panjarat
Marine fisheries Research and Development Center
Email: spanjarat@yahoo.com

LT. Chirat Nuangsang
Overseas Fisheries and Transshipment Control Division
Email: capt.chirat@gmail.com

UNITED KINGDOM (OT)**Head of Delegation**

Dr Chris Mees
MRAG LTD.
Email: c.mees@mrags.co.uk

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA**Head of Delegation**

Mr Hosea Gonza Mbilinyi
Deep Sea Fishing Authority
Email: hoseagonza@yahoo.com

Alternate (s)

Mr Christian Nzowa
Deep Sea Fishing Authority
Email: christiannzowa@gmail.com

Advisor(s)

Mr Juma Omar Haji
Deep Sea Fishing Authority
Email: changaaweni@gmail.com

COOPERATING NON-CONTRACTING PARTIES

DJIBOUTI

Absent

BANGLADESH

Absent

LIBERIA**Head of Delegation**

Ms Yvonne Clinton

Liberia Maritime Authority

Email: Yvonne.Clinton@liscr.com

Mr Rafael Cigarruista

Liberia Maritime Authority

Email: rcigarruista@liscr.com**SENEGAL****Head of Delegation**

Mr Mamadou Seye

Ministry of Fisheries and Economy

Email: mdseye@gmail.com**OBSERVERS****FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION**

Mr Christopher O'Brien

Email: Chris.O'Brien@fao.org**RUSSIAN FEDERATION**

Dr Sergei Leontiev

Email: leon@vniro.ru**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

Ms Melanie King

Email: Melanie.king@noaa.gov**INTERNATIONAL SEAFOOD SUSTAINABILITY FOUNDATION**

Ms Claire van der Geest

Email: cvandergeest@iss-foundation.org**PEW CHARITABLE TRUSTS**

Mr. Ryan Orgera

Email: rorgera@pewtrusts.org**INDIAN OCEAN COMMISSION**

Ms Jeromine Fanjanirina

Email: jeronime.fanjarinina@coi-ioc.org

Mr Nicolas Vuillaume

Email: nvuillaume@cls.fr**STOP ILLEGAL FISHING**

Mr. Per Erik Bergh

Email: pebergh@nfdi.info**INVITED EXPERTS**

Mr Ming-Fen Wu

Fisheries Agency

Email: mingfen@mstl.fao.gov.tw

Ms Shan-Wen Yang

Fisheries Agency

Email: shenwen@ofdc.org.tw

Dr Shih-Ming Kao

Fisheries Agency

Email: kaosm@udel.edu

Mr KEN Chien-Nan Lin

Fisheries Agency

Email: chiennan@mstl.fao.gov.tw**IOTC SECRETARIAT**

Dr Alejandro Anganuzzi

Indian Ocean Tuna Commission

Email: Alejandro.Anganuzzi@fao.org

Ms Wendy Perreau

Indian Ocean Tuna Commission

Email: Wendy.Perreau@fao.org

Mr Olivier Roux

Indian Ocean Tuna Commission

Email: Olivier@otolith.com

Mr Gerard Domingue

Indian Ocean Tuna Commission

Email: Gerard.Domingue@fao.org

Mr Howard Whalley

Indian Ocean Tuna Commission

Email: Howard.Whalley@fao.org

Mr Florian Giroux

Indian Ocean Tuna Commission

Email: Florian.Giroux@fao.org

Ms Mirose Govinden

Indian Ocean Tuna Commission

Email: mirose.govinden@iotc.org**INTERPRETERS**

Ms Anne Helene Trottier

Email: a.trottier@aiic.net

Mr Olivier Bonifacio

Email: bonifacio@aiic.net

Ms Claire Keefe-Fox

Email: claire.keefe@gmail.com

Mr Tyrone Carbone

Email: t.carbone@aiic.net

Mr Guillaume Fleury

Email: gfleury_sg@yahoo.com.sg

APPENDIX II
AGENDA FOR THE 14TH SESSION OF THE COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE

Date: 15–17 May, 2017

Location: Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Venue: Royal Ambarrukmo Yogyakarta Hotel

Time: 0900–1700 daily

Chair: Mr. Herminio Tembe, **Vice Chair:** Mr. Hosea Gonza Mbilinyi

OPENING OF THE SESSION (Chair)

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE SESSION (Chair)

ADMISSION OF OBSERVERS (Chair)

OVERVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF IOTC CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT MEASURES (Chair/Secretariat)

NATIONAL REPORTS ON THE PROGRESS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT MEASURES – Art X.2 IOTC Agreement (Chair/Secretariat)

REVIEW OF THE COUNTRY BASED COMPLIANCE REPORTS AND IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGES ENCOUNTERED IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF IOTC CMMS – Appendix V of the IOTC Rules of Procedure (Chair/Secretariat)

REVIEW OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RELATED TO IUU FISHING ACTIVITIES IN THE IOTC AREA OF COMPETENCE (Chair/Secretariat)

REVIEW OF THE PROVISIONAL IUU VESSELS LIST AND OF THE INFORMATION SUBMITTED BY CPCs RELATING TO ILLEGAL FISHING ACTIVITIES IN THE IOTC AREA OF COMPETENCE – Res. 11/03 (Chair/Secretariat)

REVIEW OF DFAD MANAGEMENT PLANS Res. 15/08 (Chair/Secretariat)

UPDATE ON PROGRESS REGARDING THE PERFORMANCE REVIEW – COMPLIANCE RELATED ISSUES (Chair/Secretariat)

REVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS REQUIRING INTERSESSIONAL ACTIONS, FROM CoC13 AND THE 20TH ANNUAL SESSION (Chair/Secretariat)

ACTIVITIES BY THE IOTC SECRETARIAT IN SUPPORT OF CAPACITY BUILDING FOR DEVELOPING CPCs – RES. 16/10 (Chair/Secretariat)

REVIEW OF REQUESTS FOR ACCESS TO THE STATUS OF COOPERATING NON-CONTRACTING PARTY - Appendix III of the IOTC Rules of Procedure (Chair/Secretariat)

OTHER BUSINESS (Chair)

Date and place of the 15th and 16th Sessions of the Compliance Committee

ELECTION OF A CHAIRPERSON AND VICE-CHAIRPERSON/S OF THE COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE, FOR THE NEXT BIENNIUM (Chair/CPCs)

ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE 14TH SESSION OF THE COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE (Chair)

APPENDIX III
LIST OF DOCUMENTS

Document	Title	Availability
IOTC-2017-CoC14-01a	Draft Agenda for the Fourteenth Session of the Compliance Committee	14 February 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-01b	Draft Annotated Agenda for the Fourteenth Session of the Compliance Committee	03 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-02	Draft list of documents for the Fourteenth Session of the Compliance Committee	24 April 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-03	Summary report on the level of compliance	11 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-04a	Report on Transshipment Resolution 14-06 – Secretariat’s Report	24 April 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-04b	A Summary of the IOTC Regional Observer Programme During 2016 – Contractor’s Report	24 April 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-05_Rev2	Report on the implementation of a limitation of fishing capacity of Contracting Parties and Cooperating non-Contracting Parties.	11 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-05 Add1	Collection of fleet development plans	17 April 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-05 Add2	Updated Fleet Development Plan of China	12 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-06	Performance review update (Resolution 16/03 – on the performance review follow-up)	24 April 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-07	The IOTC Provisional IUU Vessels List	01 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-08a_Rev1	Complementary elements for discussion under item 7 of the agenda for the Compliance Committee	24 April 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-08b	Summary report on possible infractions observed under the Regional Observer Programme	24 April 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-08b Add1	Identification of repeated possible infringements under the Regional Observer Programme	24 April 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-08b Add2	Response to 2016 possible infractions from Seychelles under the regional observer programme	24 April 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-08c	Reporting of vessels in transit through UK (OT) waters for potential breach of IOTC Conservation and Management Measures.	24 April 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-09_Rev1	Summary report on Compliance Support Activities	11 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-10_Rev1	Summary of Compliance with the drifting FADs Management Plans	25 April 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-10 Add1	Collection of drifting Fish Aggregating Devices Management Plans	25 April 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-11	Implementation of Recommendations relevant to the Compliance Committee	25 April 2017
Requests for the Cooperating non-Contracting Party status		

Document	Title	Availability
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CNCP01	Request for the status of Cooperating non-Contracting Party by Liberia	08 February 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CNCP02	Request for the status of Cooperating non-Contracting Party by Djibouti	08 February 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CNCP03	Request for the status of Cooperating non-Contracting Party by Senegal	14 February 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CNCP04	Request for the status of Cooperating non-Contracting Party by Bangladesh	19 February 2017
Compliance Reports – Members		
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CR01	Australia	02 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CR02_Rev1	China	11 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CR03	Comoros	02 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CR04	Eritrea	02 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CR05_Rev1	European Union	06 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CR06	France (Territories)	02 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CR07	Guinea	02 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CR08	India	02 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CR09	Indonesia	02 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CR10	Iran, Islamic Republic of	02 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CR11	Japan	02 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CR12_Rev2	Kenya	10 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CR13	Korea, Republic of	02 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CR14	Madagascar	02 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CR15	Malaysia	02 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CR16	Maldives	02 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CR17	Mauritius	02 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CR18	Mozambique	02 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CR19_Rev1	Oman	08 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CR20	Pakistan	02 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CR21	Philippines	02 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CR22	Seychelles	02 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CR23	Sierra Leone	02 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CR24	Somalia	02 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CR25	South Africa	02 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CR26	Sri Lanka	02 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CR27	Sudan	02 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CR28	Tanzania, United Republic of	02 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CR29	Thailand	02 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CR30	United Kingdom (Territories)	02 May 2017

Document	Title	Availability
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CR31	Yemen	02 May 2017
Compliance Reports – Cooperating non-Contracting Parties		
IOTC-2015-CoC12-CR32	Bangladesh	02 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CR33	Djibouti	02 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CR34	Liberia	02 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-CR35	Senegal	02 May 2017
Implementation Reports – Members		
IOTC-2017-CoC14-IR01	Australia	17 March 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-IR02	China	04 April 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-IR03	Comoros	17 March 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-IR04	Eritrea	Not submitted
IOTC-2017-CoC14-IR05	European Union	22 March 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-IR06	France (Territories)	17 March 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-IR07	Guinea	Not submitted
IOTC-2017-CoC14-IR08	India	Not submitted
IOTC-2017-CoC14-IR09	Indonesia	17 March 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-IR10	Iran, Islamic Republic of	15 March 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-IR11	Japan	17 March 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-IR12	Kenya	09 May 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-IR13	Korea, Republic of	17 March 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-IR14	Madagascar	05 April 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-IR15	Malaysia	28 February 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-IR16_Rev1	Maldives	21 April 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-IR17	Mauritius	17 March 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-IR18	Mozambique	17 March 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-IR19	Oman	16 March 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-IR20	Pakistan	09 April 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-IR21	Philippines	17 March 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-IR22	Seychelles	03 April 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-IR23	Sierra Leone	Not submitted
IOTC-2017-CoC14-IR24	Somalia	20 March 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-IR25	South Africa	17 March 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-IR26	Sri Lanka	15 March 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-IR27	Sudan	Not submitted
IOTC-2017-CoC14-IR28	Tanzania, United Republic of	17 March 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-IR29_Rev1	Thailand	17 March 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-IR30	United Kingdom (Territories)	13 February 2017

Document	Title	Availability
IOTC-2017-CoC14-IR31	Yemen	Not submitted
Implementation Reports– Cooperating non-Contracting Parties		
IOTC-2017-CoC14-IR32	Bangladesh	Not submitted
IOTC-2017-CoC14-IR33	Djibouti	Not submitted
IOTC-2017-CoC14-IR34	Liberia	16 March 2017
IOTC-2017-CoC14-IR35	Senegal	13 March 2017
Information Documents		
IOTC-2017-CoC14-Inf01	Indicative Schedule of the Fourteenth Session of the Compliance Committee	08 May 2017

APPENDIX IV - STATEMENTS**Agenda Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda and Arrangements for the Session****Statement by the Republic of Mauritius (1st statement)**

The Government of the Republic of Mauritius reiterates that the Chagos Archipelago, including Diego Garcia, and the Island of Tromelin form an integral part of the territory of the Republic of Mauritius.

The Government of the Republic of Mauritius reaffirms that it does not recognize the so-called “British Indian Ocean Territory” (“BIOT”) which the United Kingdom purported to create by illegally excising the Chagos Archipelago from the territory of Mauritius prior to its accession to independence, in violation of international law and of United Nations General Assembly Resolutions 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960, 2066 (XX) of 16 December 1965, 2232 (XXI) of 20 December 1966 and 2357 (XXII) of 19 December 1967. The dismemberment of the territory of Mauritius prior to independence is a matter of direct interest to all members of the United Nations which has historically played a central role in addressing decolonization.

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

Moreover, the Government of the Republic of Mauritius rejects the sovereignty claim of France over the Island of Tromelin as well as France’s claim to any sovereign right or jurisdiction over the Exclusive Economic Zone adjacent to the Island of Tromelin. Further, the Government of 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 Government of the Republic of Mauritius reaffirms that the Republic of Mauritius has full and complete sovereignty over the Island of Tromelin, including its maritime zones.

The Government of the Republic of Mauritius strongly objects to the use of terms such as “United Kingdom (OT)”, “UK (OT)”, “United Kingdom (territories)” and “UK (I.O. Territories)” in documents which have been circulated for this meeting, in so far as these terms purport to refer to the Chagos Archipelago as a British territory or to imply that the United Kingdom or the so-called “BIOT” is entitled to be a member of the IOTC.

The Government of the Republic of Mauritius also objects to the use of terms such as “France (OT)” and “France (Territories)” in documents which have been circulated for this meeting, in so far as these terms purport to refer to the Island of Tromelin as a French territory.

On 20 December 2010, the Republic of Mauritius initiated proceedings against the United Kingdom under Article 287 of, and Annex VII to, the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) to challenge the legality of the ‘marine protected area’ (‘MPA’) which the United Kingdom purported to establish on 1 April 2010 around the Chagos Archipelago. The Arbitral Tribunal constituted under Annex VII to UNCLOS to hear the dispute delivered its Award on 18 March 2015. The Tribunal ruled that in establishing the ‘MPA’ around the Chagos Archipelago, the United Kingdom breached its obligations under Articles 2(3), 56(2) and 194(4) of UNCLOS.

Since the ‘MPA’ purportedly established by the United Kingdom around the Chagos Archipelago has been held to be in breach of international law, it cannot be enforced. Any reference to or consideration given by the IOTC, including this Committee, to the purported ‘MPA’ in disregard of the Award will be in contradiction with the Tribunal’s ruling and international law. The Government of the Republic of Mauritius urges the Committee to ensure compliance with the Award of the Arbitral Tribunal constituted under Annex VII to UNCLOS.

In the light of the foregoing, the delegation of the Republic of Mauritius has no objection to the adoption of the draft agenda, subject to:

there being no discussions at this meeting on the ‘MPA’ purportedly established by the United Kingdom around the Chagos Archipelago which has been held to be illegal under international law; and

the Republic of Mauritius reserving its right to object to the consideration of any documents purportedly submitted by the United Kingdom, including in respect of the so-called “BIOT” which is not recognized by the Government of the Republic of Mauritius, and any other documents submitted by the Secretariat or any other party in relation to the so-called “BIOT”.

Should any document which purports to refer to the Chagos Archipelago as the so-called “BIOT” or as a British territory be considered, such consideration as well as any action or decision that may be taken on the basis of any such document cannot and should not be construed in any way whatsoever as implying that the United Kingdom has sovereignty or analogous rights over the Chagos Archipelago or that the United Kingdom or the so-called “BIOT” is entitled to be a member of the IOTC.

Further, any consideration of any document which purports to refer to the Island of Tromelin as a French territory or use terms such as “France (OT)” and “France (territories)” as well as any action or decision that may be taken on the basis of any such document, cannot and should not be construed in any way whatsoever as implying that France has sovereignty or analogous rights over the Island of Tromelin or that the Island of Tromelin is part of the French Southern and Antarctic Lands (TAAF) or the Scattered Islands/Iles Eparses or is a French territory.

The Republic of Mauritius also reserves all its rights under international law, including under Article XXIII of the Agreement for the Establishment of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission.

This statement is applicable to all agenda items under which the Chagos Archipelago and the Island of Tromelin are dealt with.

BRITISH INDIAN OCEAN TERRITORY

Statement by the United Kingdom (Territory)

With regard to Sovereignty

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

Whilst the United Kingdom does not recognise the Republic of Mauritius’ claim to sovereignty of the Chagos Archipelago, it has repeatedly undertaken to cede it to Mauritius, when no longer required for our defence purposes. We maintain that commitment, though it is for the UK alone to determine when this condition is met. In the meantime, these defence purposes contribute significantly towards global security, and are central to efforts at countering regional threats, including those from terrorism and piracy.

With regard to the right to participate at IOTC

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

With regard to the Marine Protected Area

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

The UNCLOS Tribunal was clear that it took no view on the substantive quality or nature of the MPA. Its concern was confined to the manner in which it was established. The Tribunal found that the UK needed to have further consultation

with Mauritius about the establishment of the MPA in order to have due regard to its rights and interests. We began implementation of the Tribunal’s Award with a series of bilateral talks but Mauritius have refused to engage on this following their insistence on being given a date for sovereignty transfer.

Mauritius suggests that the Marine Protected Area (‘MPA’) established within the Territory in 2010 by the UK has been ruled to be “illegal” by that same Arbitral Tribunal. That is not the case. The Tribunal’s Final Observation is: “In concluding that the declaration of the MPA was not in accordance with the provisions of the Convention, the Tribunal has taken no view on the substantive quality or nature of the MPA or the importance of environmental protection. **The Tribunal’s concern has been with the manner in which the MPA was established, rather than its substance.** It is now open to the Parties to enter into the negotiations that the Tribunal would have expected prior to the proclamation of the MPA, with a view to achieving a mutually satisfactory arrangement for protecting the marine environment, to the extent necessary under a “sovereignty umbrella”.”

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

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

Statement by the France (Territory)

France declares that it does not recognize the Mauritian declaration as having any legal value because it disregards the fact that the island of Tromelin is a French territory over which France exercises consistently full sovereignty. Thus, France enjoys sovereign rights or jurisdiction conferred to it by international law in the Exclusive Economic Zone adjacent to the island of Tromelin. The meetings of the Indian Ocean RFMOs are not the place to discuss issues of territorial sovereignty, but France stresses that it will continue to have a constructive dialogue with the Republic of Mauritius on this subject.

Statement by the Republic of Mauritius in response to UK’s and France’s Exercise of Right of Reply (2nd statement)

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

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

The Government of the Republic of Mauritius maintains in no uncertain terms that the ‘marine protected area’ (‘MPA’) purportedly established by the United Kingdom around the Chagos Archipelago is illegal and cannot be enforced. At paragraph 547(B) of its Award, the Arbitral Tribunal constituted in the case brought by the Republic of Mauritius against the United Kingdom under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) to challenge the legality of the purported ‘MPA’ declared that in establishing the purported ‘MPA’ around the Chagos Archipelago, the United Kingdom breached its obligations under Articles 2(3), 56(2) and 194(4) of UNCLOS.

Moreover, the Government of the Republic of Mauritius reiterates that the Island of Tromelin forms an integral part of the territory of the Republic of Mauritius and that it 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 Government of the Republic of Mauritius reaffirms that the Republic of Mauritius has full and complete sovereignty over the Island of Tromelin, including its maritime zones.

Since the United Kingdom and France purport to assert under the Agreement for the Establishment of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission and in this multilateral forum rights which they do not have over the Chagos Archipelago and the Island of Tromelin respectively, the Republic of Mauritius considers that it is entitled to raise issues relating to the Chagos Archipelago and the Island of Tromelin in this forum. These are no doubt multilateral and not bilateral matters. All the more so that item 87 of the agenda of the current session of the United Nations General Assembly relates to the Chagos Archipelago.

The Republic of Mauritius reserves its right to reply to any other issues raised by the United Kingdom and France in their respective statements.

Agenda Item 4 – Overview of the Implementation of IOTC Conservation and Management Measures

Statement by the Republic of Mauritius

The Government of the Republic of Mauritius reiterates the statements which it has made under agenda item 2.

The Government of the Republic of Mauritius notes with concern that the boundary lines delimiting the Exclusive Economic Zone of the Republic of Mauritius are not accurately depicted in Figure 3 on page 7 of the document entitled “A Summary of the IOTC Regional Observer Programme During 2016 – Annual Contractors’ Report, 31/03/2017” (IOTC-2017-CoC14-04b).

The Government of the Republic of Mauritius strongly objects to Figure 3 and reaffirms that the Chagos Archipelago and the Island of Tromelin form an integral part of the territory of the Republic of Mauritius.

Agenda Item 5: National Reports on the Progress of Implementation of Conservation and Management Measures

Statement by the Republic of Mauritius

The Government of the Republic of Mauritius reiterates the statements which it has made under agenda item 2.

The Government of the Republic of Mauritius strongly objects to Decree 2017-10 purportedly issued by the Préfet of the French Southern and Antarctic Lands (TAAF) on 5 February 2017 to prescribe rules governing fishing of tuna and other pelagic fishes in the Exclusive Economic Zones of the Scattered Islands/Iles Eparses.

The Government of the Republic of Mauritius rejects the sovereignty claim of France over the Island of Tromelin as well as France’s claim to any sovereign right or jurisdiction over the Exclusive Economic Zone adjacent to the Island of Tromelin.

The Government of the Republic of Mauritius reiterates that the Republic of Mauritius has full and complete sovereignty over the Island of Tromelin, including its maritime zones. The Government of the Republic of Mauritius also reaffirms that it does not recognize the validity of the inclusion of the Island of Tromelin in TAAF or the Scattered Islands/Iles Eparses.

Agenda Item 7: Review of Additional Information related to IUU Fishing Activities in the IOTC Area of Competence

Statement by the Republic of Mauritius

The Government of the Republic of Mauritius reiterates the statements which it has made under agenda item 2.

The Government of the Republic of Mauritius reaffirms that the Chagos Archipelago, including Diego Garcia, forms an integral part of the territory of the Republic of Mauritius and that it does not recognize the so-called “British Indian Ocean Territory” (“BIOT”).

As regards the document which the United Kingdom has purportedly submitted on reporting of vessels in transit through the Chagos Archipelago waters for potential breach of IOTC conservation and management measures (IOTC-2017-CoC14-08c), the Government of the Republic of Mauritius wishes to point out that the six transit reports from Mauritius-flagged vessels said to have been received by the so-called “BIOT Authority” were from private operators and were submitted without the knowledge and consent of the competent Mauritian authorities, and should not be construed in any way whatsoever as implying that the United Kingdom has sovereignty or analogous rights over the Chagos Archipelago.

Agenda Item 8: Review of the provisional IUU vessels list and the information submitted by CPCs relating to illegal Fishing activities in the IOTC Area of Competence

Statement by the Republic of Mauritius

The Government of the Republic of Mauritius reiterates the statements which it has made under agenda item 2.

The Government of the Republic of Mauritius reaffirms that the Chagos Archipelago, including Diego Garcia, forms an integral part of the territory of the Republic of Mauritius and that it does not recognize the so-called “British Indian Ocean Territory” (“BIOT”).

The Republic of Mauritius is the only State which has lawful authority to take any action in respect of the Chagos Archipelago, including reporting of any breach of any conservation and management measure of the IOTC in the maritime zones of the Republic of Mauritius around the Chagos Archipelago.

The Republic of Mauritius does not recognize the legality under international law of any act that the United Kingdom or the so-called “BIOT” has purported, or is purporting, to take in respect of the Chagos Archipelago. This includes, but is not limited to, measures taken by the United Kingdom or the so-called “BIOT” in respect of the Marine environment of the Chagos Archipelago.

The Republic of Mauritius reiterates that neither the United Kingdom, nor the so-called “BIOT” “UK-OT”, “United Kingdom (OT)”, “UK (Territories)” or “UK (I.O Territories)” is entitled to be a member of the IOTC.

The Republic of Mauritius cannot therefore endorse any recommendation for the inclusion of vessels reported by the “UK/UK(OT)” on the IUU vessel list.

The Republic of Mauritius reiterates that it does not condone IUU fishing and that it is not opposed to the adoption and implementation of any measure against IUU fishing provided that any such measure is taken in conformity with international law or implemented in adherence thereto, including the rights of the Republic of Mauritius under such law.

Statement by the United Kingdom (Territory)

The United Kingdom (Territory) reiterated its position that was expressed in its statement made at the start of the 14th Session of the Compliance Committee.

APPENDIX V
REFERENCE FISHING CAPACITY AND FLEET DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Table 1. The reference limits on fishing capacity based on the tonnage of vessels declared as active in 2006 – for tropical tunas.

CPCs		A. Reference 2006	B. Planned FDPs 2007- 2016	Reference capacity at 2016 (A+B)	Active capacity in 2016	Capacity to be added under Fleet Development Plan					
						2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	> 2021
Australia	(GT)	3,312		3,312							
China	(GT)	27,216	2,059	29,275	25,773						
Taiwan, China	(GT)	114,985		114,985	64,727						
Comoros	(GT)								6,000	6,000	4,000
Eritrea											
European Union	(GT)	101,233	10,824	112,057	80,931						
Guinea	(GRT)	1,439		1,439							
India	(GRT)	32,950	9,050	42,000	(1,550)	1,250	1,100	600	600		
Indonesia	(GT)	124,011	89,554	213,565	19,941						
Iran	(GT)	83,524	49,003	132,527	106,074	10,200	10,200	7,850	4,400		
Japan	(GT)	91,076		91,076	31,540						
Kenya	(GT)		3,000	3,000	193	3,340	4,400	1,410	4,400	1,940	11,810
Korea, Republic of	(GT)	23,002		23,002	17,693						
Madagascar	(GT)	263	709	972	178						
Malaysia	(GT)	2,299	15,334	17,633	1,295						
Maldives	(GT)		1,060	1,060	15,486	68	68	45	45		
Mauritius	(GT)	1,931	40,316	42,247	5,334	5,331					
Mozambique	(GT)		45,000	45,000	2,136	15,000	15,000	15,000	3,000	3,000	13,800
Oman	(GT)	3,126	10,610	13,736	443						5,730
Pakistan	(GT)		50,000	50,000	1,130						
Philippines	(GRT)	10,304		10,304							
Seychelles	(GT)	41,735	206,796	248,531	(68,547)						
Sierra Leone											
Somalia											
South Africa	(GT)	3,013	3,056	6,069	501						
Sri Lanka	(GT)	18,436	90,992	109,428	35,958	3,920	5,773	5,737	6,384		
Sudan											
Tanzania	(GT)				1,535						
Thailand	(GT)	13,771	39,250	53,021	200	7,500	11,250	6,750			
U. K. (I.O. Territories)	(GT)										
Yemen											
Bangladesh	(GT)				(55,246)						
Djibouti											
Senegal	(GRT)	1,250		1,250							
Total	(GRT + GT)	698,876	666,613	1,365,489	536,411	46,609	47,791	37,392	24,829	10,940	35,340
Difference relative to 2006 Baseline				195%	77%						301%

N.B. Estimates of capacity, figures in brackets, for CPCs that have not reported their active vessels list for 2016 are based on their list of authorised vessels on 14th April, 2017.

Table 2. The reference limits on fishing capacity based on the number of vessels declared as active in 2006 – for tropical tunas.

CPCs	A. Reference 2006	B. Planned FDPs 2008- 2016	Reference capacity at 2016 (A+B)	Active capacity in 2016	Capacity to be added under Fleet Development Plan						
					2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	>2021	
Australia	10		10								
China	67		67	54							
Taiwan, China	501		501	233							
Comoros								3	3	2	
Eritrea											
European Union	51	13	64	31							
Guinea	3		3								
India	70	67	137	(4)	7	6	5	5			
Indonesia	1,201	746	1,947	263							
Iran	992	335	1,327	1,203	14	14	10	4			
Japan	227		227	46							
Kenya		5	5	1	5	5	5	5	5	20	
Korea, Republic of	38		38	18							
Madagascar	2	34	36	7							
Malaysia	28	107	135	10							
Maldives		47	47	372	3	3	2	2			
Mauritius	8	39	47	2	2						
Mozambique		15	15	11	5	5	5	5	5	23	
Oman	24	65	89	1							35
Pakistan		150	150	10							
Philippines	18		18								
Seychelles	34	126	160	(82)							
Sierra Leone											
Somalia											
South Africa	13	10	23	3							
Sri Lanka	1,001	788	1,789	1,455	64	164	185	217			
Sudan											
Tanzania				3							
Thailand	9	170	179	1	30	35	35				
U. K. (I.O. Territories)											
Yemen											
Bangladesh				(247)							
Djibouti											
Senegal	3		3								
Total	4,300	2,717	7,017	4,057	130	232	247	241	13	80	

N.B. Estimates of number of vessels, figures in brackets, for CPCs that have not reported their active vessels list for 2016 are based on their number of authorised vessels on 14th April, 2017

Table 3. The reference limits on fishing capacity based on the tonnage of vessels declared as active in 2007 – for swordfish and albacore.

CPCs		A. Reference 2007	B. Planned FDPs 2007- 2016	Reference capacity at 2016 (A+B)	Active capacity in 2016	Capacity to be added under Fleet Development Plans						
						2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	>2021	
Australia	(GRT)				349							
China	(GT)		3,389	3,389	4,434	1,500	3,000	3,000	1,500			
Taiwan, China	(GT)	36,299		36,299	15,818							
Comoros	(GT)					880	660	660	440	440	110	
Eritrea												
European Union	(GT)	21,922	4,832	26,754	10,567				2143			
Guinea	(GRT)											
India	(GRT)											
Indonesia	(GT)											
Iran	(GT)											
Japan	(GT)											
Kenya	(GT)		3,000	3,000		1,200	140	1,200	670	1200	2680	
Korea, Republic of	(GT)											
Madagascar	(GT)											
Malaysia	(GRT)											
Maldives	(GT)											
Mauritius	(GRT)		6,000	6,000	450	2,000						
Mozambique	(GT)		9,000	9,000		3,000	3,000	3,000	3000	3000	10200	
Oman	(GT)											
Pakistan	(GT)											
Philippines	(GRT)											
Seychelles	(GT)	536		536								
Sierra Leone												
Somalia												
South Africa	(GT)		4,274	4,274	799							
Sri Lanka	(GT)		6,615	6,615		59	59	341	341			
Sudan												
Tanzania	(GT)											
Thailand	(GT)											
U. K. (I.O. Territories)	(GT)											
Yemen												
Bangladesh	(GT)											
Djibouti												
Senegal	(GRT)		3,336	3,336								
Total	(GRT+GT)	58,757	40,446	99,203	32,417	8,639	6,859	8,201	8,094	4,640	12,990	
Difference relative to 2006 Baseline				169%	55%						308%	

Table 4. The reference limits on fishing capacity based on the number of vessels declared as active in 2007 – for swordfish and albacore

CPCs	A. Reference 2007	B. Planned FDPs 2008- 2016	Reference capacity at 2016 (A+B)	Active capacity in 2016	Capacity to be added under Fleet Development Plans					
					2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	>2022
Australia				2						
China		10	10	13	5	10	10	5		
Taiwan, China	298		298	111						
Comoros					8	6	6	4	4	1
Eritrea										
European Union	72	32	104	44				25		
Guinea										
India										
Indonesia										
Iran										
Japan										
Kenya		5	5		2	2	2	2	2	8
Korea, Republic of										
Madagascar										
Malaysia										
Maldives										
Mauritius		15	15	5	5					
Mozambique		15	15		5	5	5	5	5	17
Oman										
Pakistan										
Philippines										
Seychelles	1		1							
Sierra Leone										
Somalia										
South Africa		6	6	5						
Sri Lanka		51	51		1	1	2	2		
Sudan										
Tanzania										
Thailand										
U. K. (OT)										
Yemen										
Bangladesh										
Djibouti										
Senegal		8	8							
Total	371	142	513	180	26	24	25	43	11	26

APPENDIX VI
IOTC IUU VESSELS LIST/PROVISIONAL IUU VESSELS LIST

IOTC IUU Vessels List (2016)

No.	Current name of vessel (previous names)	Current flag (previous flags)	Lloyds/IMO number	Photo	Call sign (previous call signs)	Owner / beneficial owners (previous)	Operator (previous operators)	Summary of IUU activities	Date included on IOTC IUU Vessels List
1	ANEKA 228	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	May 2015
2	ANEKA 228; KM.	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	May 2015
3	CHI TONG	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	May 2015
4	Fu Hsiang Fa 18	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	May 2015
5	FU HSIANG FA NO. 01	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	June 2014
6	FU HSIANG FA NO. 02	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	June 2014
7	FU HSIANG FA NO. 06	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	June 2014
8	FU HSIANG FA NO. 08	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	June 2014
9	FU HSIANG FA NO. 09	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	June 2014
10	FU HSIANG FA NO. 11	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	June 2014
11	FU HSIANG FA NO. 13	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	June 2014

No.	Current name of vessel (previous names)	Current flag (previous flags)	Lloyds/IMO number	Photo	Call sign (previous call signs)	Owner / beneficial owners (previous)	Operator (previous operators)	Summary of IUU activities	Date included on IOTC IUU Vessels List
12	FU HSIANG FA NO. 17	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	June 2014
13	FU HSIANG FA NO. 20	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	June 2014
14	FU HSIANG FA NO. 21¹	Unknown	Not Available	IOTC-2013-CoC10-07 Rev1	OTS 024 or OTS 089	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 07/02	May 2013
15	FU HSIANG FA NO. 21¹	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	June 2014
16	FU HSIANG FA NO. 23	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	June 2014
17	FU HSIANG FA NO. 26	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	June 2014
18	FU HSIANG FA NO. 30	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	June 2014
19	FULL RICH	Unknown (Belize)	Not Available	IOTC-2013-CoC10-08a	HMEK3	Noel International LTD (Noel International LTD)	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 07/02	May 2013
20	GUNJAR MELYAN 21	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 07/02	June 2008
21	HOOM XIANG 101	Unknown (Malaysia)	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	June 2014
22	HOOM XIANG 103	Unknown (Malaysia)	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	June 2014

¹ No information on whether the two vessels **FU HSIANG FA NO. 21** are the same vessels.

No.	Current name of vessel (previous names)	Current flag (previous flags)	Lloyds/IMO number	Photo	Call sign (previous call signs)	Owner / beneficial owners (previous)	Operator (previous operators)	Summary of IUU activities	Date included on IOTC IUU Vessels List
23	HOOM XIANG 105	Unknown (Malaysia)	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	June 2014
24	HOOM XIANG II	Unknown (Malaysia)	Not Available	IOTC-S14-CoC13-Add1	No Info	Hoom Xiang Industries Sdn. Bhd.	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 09/03	March 2010
25	KIM SENG DENG 3	Bolivia	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	May 2015
26	KUANG HSING 127	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	May 2015
27	KUANG HSING 196	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	May 2015
28	Kunlun (Taishan)	Equatorial Guinea	7322897	IOTC CIRCULAR 2015-004	3CAG	Stanley Management Inc	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	May 2015
29	MAAN YIH HSING	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	May 2015
30	OCEAN LION	Unknown (Equatorial Guinea)	7826233	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 02/04, 02/05, 03/05.	June 2005
31	SAMUDERA PERKASA 11	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	May 2015
32	SAMUDRA PERKASA 12	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	May 2015
33	SHUEN SIANG	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	June 2014 and May 2015
34	SIN SHUN FA 6	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	May 2015

No.	Current name of vessel (previous names)	Current flag (previous flags)	Lloyds/IMO number	Photo	Call sign (previous call signs)	Owner / beneficial owners (previous)	Operator (previous operators)	Summary of IUU activities	Date included on IOTC IUU Vessels List
35	SIN SHUN FA 67	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	May 2015
36	SIN SHUN FA 8	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	May 2015
37	SIN SHUN FA 9	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	May 2015
38	Songhua (Yunnan)	Unknown (Equatorial Guinea)	9319856	IOTC CIRCULAR 2015-004	3CAF	Eastern Holdings	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	May 2015
39	SRI FU FA 168	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	June 2014
40	SRI FU FA 18	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	June 2014
41	SRI FU FA 188	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	June 2014
42	SRI FU FA 189	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	June 2014
43	SRI FU FA 286	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	June 2014
44	SRI FU FA 67	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	June 2014
45	SRI FU FA 888	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	June 2014
46	TIAN LUNG NO.12	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	May 2015
47	YI HONG 3	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	May 2015

No.	Current name of vessel (previous names)	Current flag (previous flags)	Lloyds/IMO number	Photo	Call sign (previous call signs)	Owner / beneficial owners (previous)	Operator (previous operators)	Summary of IUU activities	Date included on IOTC IUU Vessels List
48	Yongding (Jianfeng)	Equatorial Guinea	9042001	IOTC CIRCULAR 2015-004	3CAE	Stanley Management Inc.	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	May 2015
49	YU FONG 168	Unknown	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	May 2015
50	YU MAAN WON	Unknown (Georgia)	Not Available	Not Available	No Info	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 07/02	May 2007

IOTC Provisional IUU Vessels List (May 2017)

51	ABUNDANT 1 (YI HONG 06)	Unknown	Not Applicable	Yes. Refer to report for this circular	CPA 226	Huang Jia Yi C/O Room 18-E Tze Wei Commercial Building, No.8 6 Th Road Lin Ya District, Kaohsiung, Taiwan, China	Mr. Hatto Daroi	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	May 2015
52	ABUNDANT 3 (YI HONG 16)	Unknown	Not Applicable	Yes. Refer to report for this circular	CPA 201	Huang Jia Yi C/O Room 18-E Tze Wei Commercial Building, No.8 6 Th Road Lin Ya District, Kaohsiung, Taiwan, China	Mr. Huang Wen Hsin	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	May 2015

No.	Current name of vessel (previous names)	Current flag (previous flags)	Lloyds/IMO number	Photo	Call sign (previous call signs)	Owner / beneficial owners (previous)	Operator (previous operators)	Summary of IUU activities	Date included on IOTC IUU Vessels List
53	ABUNDANT 6 (YI HONG 86)	Unknown	Not Applicable	Yes. Refer to report for this circular	CPA 221	Huang Jia Yi C/O Room 18-E Tze Wei Commercial Building, No.8 6 Th Road Lin Ya District, Kaohsiung, Taiwan, China	Mr. Huang Wen Hsin	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	Not Applicable
54	ABUNDANT 9 (YI HONG 116)	Unknown	Not Applicable	Yes. Refer to report for this circular	CPA 222	Huang Jia Yi C/O Room 18-E Tze Wei Commercial Building, No.8 6 Th Road Lin Ya District, Kaohsiung, Taiwan, China	Mr. Pan Chao Mao	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	May 2015
55	ABUNDANT 12 (YI HONG 106)	Unknown	Not Applicable	Yes. Refer to report for this circular	CPA 202	Huang Jia Yi C/O Room 18-E Tze Wei Commercial Building, No.8 6 Th Road Lin Ya District, Kaohsiung, Taiwan, China	Mr. Mendez Francisco Delos Reyes	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	May 2015

No.	Current name of vessel (previous names)	Current flag (previous flags)	Lloyds/IMO number	Photo	Call sign (previous call signs)	Owner / beneficial owners (previous)	Operator (previous operators)	Summary of IUU activities	Date included on IOTC IUU Vessels List
56	SHENG JI QUN 3	Unknown	Not Applicable	Yes. Refer to report for this circular	CPA 311	Chang Lin, Pao-Chun No. 161, San Min Rd. Yufu Village, Kaohsiung City, Taiwan, China	Mr. Chen, Chen-Tsai	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	Not Applicable
57	SHUN LAI (HSIN JYI WANG NO. 6)	Unknown	Not Applicable	Yes. Refer to report for this circular	CPA 514	Lee Cheng Chung No. 5 Tze Wei Road, Kaoshing, Taiwan, China	Mr. Sun Han Min	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	Not Applicable
58	YUTUNA 3 (HUNG SHENG NO. 166)	Unknown	Not Applicable	Yes. Refer to report for this circular	CPA 212	Yen Shih Hsiung Room 11 .E. No.3 Tze Wei Forth Road, Kaohsiung, Taiwan. China	Mr. Lee, Shih-Yuan	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	Not Applicable
59	YUTUNA NO. 1	Unknown	Not Applicable	Yes. Refer to report for this circular	CPA 302	Tseng Ming Tsai Room 11-E, No. 3 Tze Wei Fort Road, Kaohsiung, Taiwan, China	Mr. Yen, Shih-Shiung	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03	Not Applicable
60	BENIAIAH	INDIA	Not Applicable	Yes. Refer to report IOTC-2015-CoC12-07	Not Available	Mr Raju S/O (Son Of), John Rose Of 11-4-137 Kalingarajapura	Mr Chris Lukaj	Fishing without a licence in the waters of the UK (OT).	Not Applicable

No.	Current name of vessel (previous names)	Current flag (previous flags)	Lloyds/IMO number	Photo	Call sign (previous call signs)	Owner / beneficial owners (previous)	Operator (previous operators)	Summary of IUU activities	Date included on IOTC IUU Vessels List
						m, Ezudesam China Thurai Raju J S/O John Rose Of K R Puram, Chinnathurai, Thoothoor Po, K K Dist, Tamilnadu			
61	BEO HINGIS	INDIA	Not Applicable	Yes. Refer to report IOTC-2016-CoC13-07 Rev1	Not Available	Nasians. P S/O (son of) Peter.	hibu Stephen (Master)	Fishing without a licence and in possession of prohibited gear in the waters of the UK (OT)	Not Applicable
62	CARMAL MATHA	INDIA	Not Applicable	Yes. Refer to report IOTC-2015-CoC12-07	Not Available	Antony J S/O (son of) Joseph of D No 111-7-28. St Thomas Nagar, Thoothoor PO, KK Dist Tamilnadu	Mr Antony	Fishing without a licence in the waters of the UK (OT)	Not Applicable
63	DIGNAMOL 1	INDIA	Not Applicable	Yes. Refer to report IOTC-2015-CoC12-07	Not Available	Jelvis s/o Dicostan of 7/103 K R Puram, Thoothoor, KK	Mr James Robert	Fishing without a licence in the waters of the 11/03	Not Applicable

No.	Current name of vessel (previous names)	Current flag (previous flags)	Lloyds/IMO number	Photo	Call sign (previous call signs)	Owner / beneficial owners (previous)	Operator (previous operators)	Summary of IUU activities	Date included on IOTC IUU Vessels List
						Dist, Mamilnadu Mr SD. Jelvish, S/O Dikostan of 7/169 Wasol 2, Block Y, Yishming Block, , Thoothoor, Kanyakumam			
64	KING JESUS	INDIA	Not Applicable	Yes. Refer to report IOTC-2015-CoC12-07	Not Available	Unknown	Bibi S. R. Paul Miranda S	Fishing without a licence in the waters of the UK (OT)	Not Applicable
65	SACRED HEART	INDIA	Not Applicable	Yes. Refer to report IOTC-2016-CoC13-07 Rev1	Not Available	Metlan s/o (son of) Paniyadim	P. Newton (Master)	Fishing without a license in the waters of the UK (OT)	Not Applicable
66	VACHANAM	INDIA	Not Applicable	Yes. Refer to report IOTC-2016-CoC13-07 Rev1	Not Available	Satril T	J Robinson (Master)	Fishing without a license and use of prohibited gear in the waters of the UK (OT)	Not Applicable
67	WISDOM	INDIA	Not Applicable	Yes. Refer to report IOTC-2016-CoC13-07 Rev1	Not Available	Lowerence	Lawrence V (Master)	Fishing without a license and use of prohibited gear in the waters of the UK (OT)	Not Applicable
68	EPHRAEEM	INDIA	Not Applicable	Yes. Refer to report for this circular	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available	Fishing without a license, use of prohibited gear and no	Not Applicable

No.	Current name of vessel (previous names)	Current flag (previous flags)	Lloyds/IMO number	Photo	Call sign (previous call signs)	Owner / beneficial owners (previous)	Operator (previous operators)	Summary of IUU activities	Date included on IOTC IUU Vessels List
								logbook in the waters of the UK (OT)	
69	SHALOM	INDIA	Not Applicable	Yes. Refer to report for this circular	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available	Fishing without a license, use of prohibited gear and no logbook in the waters of the UK (OT)	Not Applicable

APPENDIX VII

CoC: UPDATE ON PROGRESS REGARDING RESOLUTION 16/03 – *ON THE SECOND PERFORMANCE REVIEW FOLLOW-UP*

(Note: numbering and recommendations as per Annex I of Resolution 16/03)

Reference #	Recommendation	Responsibility	Update/Status	Timeline	Priority
PRIOTC02.04 (para. 102)	<p>Compliance with data collection and reporting requirements</p> <p>The Commission, through its Compliance Committee, needs to strengthen its compliance monitoring in relation to the timeliness and accuracy of data submissions. To that end, the PRIOTC02 RECOMMENDED that:</p> <p>a) the Commission review its compliance monitoring program conducted by the Compliance Committee, including identification of priority obligations (e.g. timely and accurate data reporting, catch and effort limits, accuracy of the supplied registered fishing vessel information, etc.).</p>	Commission and Compliance Committee	To be developed/Ongoing: The IOTC should further develop a scheme for the assessment of compliance of a structured approach for cases of infringements, better reflecting partial compliance and critical compliance issues. However, since the 2011 Compliance Committee meeting, country-based reports have been prepared for this purpose on the basis of Resolution 10/09, which is now integrated into the IOTC Rules of Procedure, Appendix V.	Review annually at the Compliance Committee meeting.	High
	<p>b) the compliance monitoring program review all priority obligations and undertake the compliance review by obligation and by CPCs and that the Commission publish a report of each CPCs compliance by obligation and CPC. The reports of all Compliance Missions should be appended to the compliance report of that relevant CPC and where the CPC has identified an action plan, that they not be assessed for that obligation.</p>	Compliance Committee	To be developed/Ongoing: Idem	Review annually at the Compliance Committee meeting.	High

Reference #	Recommendation	Responsibility	Update/Status	Timeline	Priority
	<p>c) the Commission develop a scheme of responses (in accordance with the IOTC Rules of Procedure (2014) Appendix V, para. 3b (iv)) to priority non-compliance areas, including the preparation of CPC Implementation Action Plans that outline how the CPC will, over time, implement its obligations and alternative responses to serious violations of IOTC CMMs taking into account the FAOs Voluntary Guidelines for Flag State Performance. Reforms to the compliance monitoring program should include the ability of developing CPCs to identify (through the preparation of an Implementation Action Plan) and seek assistance for obligations that they are currently non-compliant with, including for example requesting capacity assistance, capacity building, resources, etc., to enable, overtime, implement its obligations.</p>	Commission and Compliance Committee	<p>To be developed/Ongoing: The IOTC should further develop a scheme for the assessment of compliance of a structured approach for cases of infringements, better reflecting partial compliance and critical compliance issues, however, a scheme of response to priority non-compliance areas is done through the Feedback Letter issued during the Commission meeting and forms the basis for the Secretariat, together with concerned CPCs, to develop the Compliance Action Plan.</p>	Review annually at the Compliance Committee meeting.	High
	<p>d) to facilitate thorough reviews of compliance, the Commission should invest in the development and implementation of an integrated electronic reporting program. This should include automatic integration of data from CPCs into the IOTC Secretariat's databases and automatic cross-referencing obligations and reports for the various obligations, in particular related to the provision of scientific data.</p>	Commission and Compliance Committee	<p>Ongoing: Draft technical specifications of an application has been developed.</p>	2016 onwards	Medium

Reference #	Recommendation	Responsibility	Update/Status	Timeline	Priority
PRIOTC02.09 (para. 129)	<p>Fishing capacity management The PRIOTC02 RECOMMENDED that:</p> <p>a) the IOTC should establish a stronger policy on fishing capacity to prevent or eliminate all excess fishing capacity, including options to freeze capacity levels as an interim measure, while alternative management measures are considered. As current capacity limits are generic and apply across all fleets and their ability to control catch of particular species is limited, therefore alternative management measures should be considered which may include spatial-temporal area closures, quota allocation, etc.</p>	Commission	Pending:	TBD	High / Medium
	<p>b) the Commission undertake a formal process to develop transfer mechanisms to developing coastal States, and in particular the least developed among them, with a view to realising their fleet development aspirations within sustainable levels.</p>	Commission	Pending	TBD	TBD
PRIOTC02.10 (para. 133)	<p>Compatibility of management measures The PRIOTC02 RECOMMENDED that if needed, CPCs request assistance from other CPCs or PRIOTC02.01 (para. 81) the IOTC Secretariat to assist in the assessment of the legal needs to effectively implement IOTC CMMs, noting that this process has already commenced with a number of IOTC Contracting Parties.</p>	Secretariat & CPCs	Ongoing: Ten developing CPCs have benefitted from assistance to transpose IOTC resolutions into their legal framework. An additional five years of funding for this type of assistance have been secured through extra-budgetary contributions.	Review annually at the Compliance Committee meeting.	High
PRIOTC02.13 (para. 144)	<p>Port State measures The PRIOTC02 RECOMMENDED that:</p> <p>a) since port State measures are critical for the control of fishing in the IOTC area and beyond, CPCs should take action to ratify the FAO Agreement on Port State Measures, and the Commission explore possible ways of including ports situated outside the IOTC area known to be receiving IOTC catches in applying port State measures established by the IOTC.</p>	Commission	Ongoing: 19 of the 35 CPCs have signed or ratified or accepted or approved or acceded to the FAO PSMA.	Review annually at IOTC meetings.	Medium

Reference #	Recommendation	Responsibility	Update/Status	Timeline	Priority
	b) the Commission, through its port State measures training, support the implementation, including support from FAO and other donors, of the requirements of the FAO PSMA and the IOTC Resolution 10/11 On port state measures to prevent, deter and eliminate illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing.	Commission	Ongoing: The IOTC has a well-established capacity building programme for the implementation of port State measures.	Review annually at IOTC meetings.	Medium
PRIOTC02.14 (para. 149)	Monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) The PRIOTC02 RECOMMENDED that: a) the IOTC should continue to develop a comprehensive monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) system through the implementation of the measures already in force, and through the adoption of new measures and tools such as a possible catch documentation scheme, noting the process currently being undertaken within the FAO.	Commission & Compliance Committee	To be developed/Ongoing: A CDS Working Group for the IOTC exists, but the virtual meetings of this Working Group had been suspended awaiting results from the FAO study on best practices for implementing a CDS.	Review annually at the Compliance Committee meeting.	Medium
	b) as a matter of priority review the IOTC monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) measures, systems and processes, with the objective of providing advice and guidance on improving the integration of the different tools, identification of gaps and recommendations on how to move forward, taking into consideration the experiences of other RFMOs, and that the review should be used as a basis for strengthening MCS for the purpose of improving the ability of the Commission to deter non-compliance and IUU fishing.	Commission & Compliance Committee	Planned: A review of existing IOTC MCS measures is planned to be conducted in 2017/2018 through extra-budgetary funds.	Review annually at the Compliance Committee meeting.	Medium

Reference #	Recommendation	Responsibility	Update/Status	Timeline	Priority
PRIOTC02.15 (para. 153)	Follow-up on infringements The PRIOTC02 RECOMMENDED that: a) the IOTC should establish a scheme of responses to non-compliance in relation to CPCs obligations, and task the Compliance Committee to further develop a structured approach for cases of infringement.	Commission & Compliance Committee	To be developed/Ongoing: Notably to be implemented through IOTC Resolution 16/06 On measures applicable in case of non-fulfilment of reporting obligations in the IOTC and Resolution 10/10 On market related measures.	Review annually at the Compliance Committee meeting.	High
	b) further develop an online reporting tool to facilitate reporting by CPCs and to support the IOTC Secretariat through the automation of identification of non-compliance.	Commission & Compliance Committee	Ongoing: Draft technical specifications of an application has been developed.	Review annually at IOTC meetings	Medium
	c) reasons for the non-compliance should be identified, including whether it is related to the measure itself, a need for capacity assistance or whether it is wilful or repeated non-compliance, and that the Compliance Committee provide technical advice on obligations where there are high level of CPCs non-compliance.	Commission & Compliance Committee	To be developed/Ongoing: A scheme of response to non-compliance areas is done through the Feedback Letter issued during the Commission meeting and forms the basis for the Secretariat, together with concerned CPCs, to develop the Compliance Action Plan. This will be further addressed by the WPICMM to enhance the technical capacity of CPCs.	Review annually at the Compliance Committee meeting.	High
PRIOTC02.18 (para. 169)	Fishing capacity The PRIOTC02 RECOMMENDED that the Commission consider non-compliance with fishing capacity related measures as a priority in the scheme of responses to non-compliance, in order to ensure the sustainable exploitation of the relevant IOTC species.	Commission & Compliance Committee	Pending: However, a scheme of response to non-compliance areas is done through the Feedback Letter issued during the Commission meeting.	Review annually at the IOTC meetings	High
PRIOTC02.21 (para. 204)	Cooperation with other RFMOs The PRIOTC02 RECOMMENDED that: a) the IOTC should further develop mutual recognition and possible exploration of cross-listings of IUU lists with other RFMOs to combat IUU activities globally.	Commission & Compliance Committee	Pending: This recommendation should be addressed at the next opportunity when IOTC Resolution 11/03 On establishing a list of vessels presumed to have carried out illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing in the IOTC area of competence is amended.	Review annually at the IOTC meetings	High

Reference #	Recommendation	Responsibility	Update/Status	Timeline	Priority
PRIOTC02.22 (para. 211)	b) the IOTC Secretariat in partnership with development agencies and organisations, should develop a five year regional fisheries capacity development program to ensure coordinated capacity building activities across the region.	Secretariat & Commission	Ongoing: Support have been made available by the World Bank, under the new SWIOFISH (2) project, for a duration of six years, with a total budget of approximately 3,000,000 USD, in order to assist eligible CPCs to strengthen their compliance with IOTC Resolutions and to build MCS capacity (IOTC Circular 2016-093).	Review annually at the Compliance Committee meeting.	Medium

APPENDIX VIII

CONSOLIDATED SET OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 14TH SESSION OF THE COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE (15-17 MAY 2017) TO THE COMMISSION

Summary report on the level of compliance

- CoC14.01 ([Para 15](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the 15 days deadline relating to the submission of information and reports should be respected by all CPCs, but that an additional seven days will be allowed for CPCs to interact with the Secretariat.
- CoC14.02 ([Para 16](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the IOTC Secretariat shall not register new vessels without LOA on the IOTC Record of Authorised Vessels.
- CoC14.03 (Para 17) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the IOTC Secretariat continue to work intersessionally with CPCs to identify and resolve gaps in the mandatory information provided for the IOTC Record of Authorised Vessels and that the IOTC Secretariat provide to the next CoC a document outlining the gaps in the IOTC Record of Authorised Vessels.
- CoC14.04 (Para 18) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that Resolution 15/04 be revised next year to introduce a clear procedure and criteria to determine when a vessel shall or not to be included in the IOTC Record of Authorized Vessels.
- CoC14.05 (Para 19) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that IOTC should further work on a scheme for the assessment of compliance to develop a structured approach for cases of infringements, better reflecting critical compliance issues and partial compliance.

IOTC regional observer programme for at-sea transhipments

- CoC14.06 ([Para 28](#)) **NOTING** that there are 7 carrier vessels operating under the at-sea transhipment programme that are flagged to non-CPCs of the IOTC (Kiribati, Panama and Singapore), the CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the concerns of carrier vessels flagged to non-CPCs that are involved in at-sea transhipment operations in the IOTC area of competence be addressed by submitting a proposal to amend Resolution 14/06 for this purpose.

Review of reference fishing capacity and fleet development plans (FDP)

- CoC14.07 ([Para 36](#)) The CoC **NOTED** the inclusion of the capacity for the fleet of Taiwan, Province of China, as requested by the 20th Session of the Commission and **RECOMMENDED** that, in the future, information continue to be provided on that fleet in the document dealing with capacity limitations.
- CoC14.08 ([Para 37](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the IOTC Secretariat analyse FDPs submitted in the light of the provisions of Resolution 15/11, notably those introducing new vessels/capacity in the FDPs.
- CoC14.09 ([Para 38](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that CPCs having provided a FDP which has not been fully implemented provide information on the reasons as to why the FDP has not been implemented and to detail the way forward.

National reports on the progress of implementation of Conservation and Management Measures (Article X.2 IOTC Agreement)

- CoC14.10 ([Para 44](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that those CPCs (Eritrea, Guinea, India, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Yemen, Bangladesh and Djibouti) who have not submitted their national 'Reports of Implementation' for 2016 do so within 30 days after the end of the Commission meeting. The Chair of the CoC, with the assistance of the IOTC Secretariat shall follow-up with each such CPC to ensure a national 'Reports of Implementation' is submitted for publication on the IOTC website and to inform CPCs during the Commission meeting and then also via an IOTC Circular once each report is received.

Follow-up on individual compliance status

- CoC14.11 ([Para 59](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission agree to the development and distribution of letters of feedback by the IOTC Chair, highlighting areas of non-compliance to relevant CPCs, together with the difficulties and challenges being faced. The development of follow-up actions on the issues contained in the letters of feedback, including potential capacity building activities to address these matters, particularly for developing coastal States needs to be developed and funded appropriately.

- CoC14.12 ([Para 60](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the responses to the feedback letters be made available to CPCs at the future Compliance Committee meetings.
- CoC14.13 ([Para 61](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the IOTC Secretariat reach out to some of the CPCs via their Representatives to the FAO or the FAO Representatives to these CPCs, to understand the reasons for their lack of engagements with the Commission, and, where possible, for the IOTC Secretariat to undertake missions to these CPCs.
- CoC14.14 ([Para 62](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission and Scientific Committee validate the information provided by CPCs related to the implementation of the Resolution 16/01 on the reduction of catch of yellowfin tuna by all CPCs.
- CoC14.15 ([Para 63](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that for CPCs failing to provide nominal catch data, that a reference to consequences of the Commission invoking Resolution 16/06 be included in their feedback letter.
- CoC14.16 ([Para 64](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the IOTC Secretariat continues to follow up with Sierra Leone with regards to its commitments to the Commission, given its complete absence from participating in the IOTC meetings since becoming a Member of the Commission.

Review of additional information related to IUU fishing activities in the IOTC area of competence

- CoC14.17 ([Para 68](#)) The CoC **NOTED** the lack of engagement from India and **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission express strong concerns to India through the Letter of Feedback..
- CoC14.18 ([Para 71](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that Thailand should continue to keep CPCs informed of progress of Thailand's investigation and report back to the Commission via the IOTC Secretariat. The IOTC Secretariat shall, notify the Commission via a Circular following the receipt of the report from Thailand, on the findings of the investigations.
- CoC14.19 ([Para 74](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that Thailand provide an update on the ongoing court case, once concluded.

Identification of repeated possible infringements under the Regional observer programme

- CoC14.20 ([Para 83](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that Oman provide the results of investigations of possible infractions identified by the IOTC Observers.

Reporting of vessels in transit through waters of the UK (OT) for potential breach of IOTC Conservation and Management Measures

- CoC14.21 ([Para 87](#)) The CoC **THANKED** the UK (OT) for its continued efforts in the detection of activities that continue to undermine Conservation and Management Measures adopted by the Commission and **RECOMMENDED** that the UK (OT) continue to provide such information to future meetings of the Compliance Committee.

Review of the provisional IUU vessels list and of the information submitted by CPCs relating to illegal fishing activities in the IOTC area of competence – Resolution 11/03

- CoC14.22 ([Para 90](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the vessels listed in [para 90](#) remain on the IOTC IUU Vessels List as no further information was provided to the CoC14 during its deliberations.
- CoC14.23 ([Para 92](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the names of the vessels listed in para 93 be updated and that the vessels be kept on the IOTC IUU Vessels List.
- CoC14. 24 ([Para 98](#)) **NOTING** the information provided by the Plurinational State of Bolivia the CoC was satisfied that the vessels, ABUNDANT 6 (YI HONG 86), SHENG JI QUN 3, SHUN LAI (HSIN JYI WANG NO. 6), YUTUNA NO. 1 and YUTUNA 3 (HUNG SHENG NO. 166), were flagless, and the CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission IUU list the vessels, ABUNDANT 6 (YI HONG 86), SHENG JI QUN 3, SHUN LAI (HSIN JYI WANG NO. 6), YUTUNA NO. 1 and YUTUNA 3 (HUNG SHENG NO. 166), at its 21st Session.
- CoC14. 25 ([Para 99](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that Thailand provide the result of the legal proceeding on the proposed vessels and provide information on the vessels involved in transshipment activities.
- CoC14.26 ([Para 101](#)) **NOTING** the information provided by the UK (OT) the CoC was satisfied that the vessels, BEO HINGIS, VACHANAM, BENAIHAH, CARMAL MATHA, DIGNAMOL I KING JESUS, SACRED HEART and WISDOM, flagged to India, and the CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission IUU list the vessels, BEO HINGIS, VACHANAM, BENAIHAH, CARMAL MATHA, DIGNAMOL I, KING JESUS, SACRED HEART and WISDOM, at its 21st Session.

CoC14.27 ([Para 104](#)) The CoC **AGREED** to remove the vessels BOSIN, DIGNAMOL II, GREESHMA 1, ST MARYS I, ST MARYS II, JOSHVA and JOSHVA NO. 1, flagged to India, from the Provisional IUU List and **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission expresses strong concerns to India, through the letter of feedback, and request that India provide additional information regarding actions taken over the vessels, the captain and the owners of these vessels.

CoC14.28 ([Para 108](#)) **NOTING** that India was not present during the CoC14 to discuss the proposed IUU listing for the vessels and that India did not respond to the IOTC Circular 2017-051 – On the 2017 Provisional IUU list the CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission IUU list the vessels, EPHRAEEM and SHALOM, at its 21st Session.

Review of drifting FAD management plans – Resolution 15/08

CoC14.29 ([Para 116](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that those CPCs whose DFAD Management Plans do not meet the standard set out in the guideline in Annex 1 of Resolution 15/08, to submit a revised DFAD Management Plan meeting the guideline within 3 months after S21.

Update on progress regarding the performance review – compliance related issues

CoC14.30 ([Para 118](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the IOTC Secretariat work with the concerned CPCs to refine the document IOTC-2017-CoC14-06 for presentation to the Commission (S21).

Activities by the IOTC Secretariat in support of capacity building for developing CPCs – Resolution 12/10

CoC14.31 ([Para 124](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the IOTC Secretariat continue with those capacity building activities and strengthen activities that would allow CPCs to address the issue of mandatory statistics and the implementation of the Regional Observer Scheme.

Review of requests for access to the status of Cooperating Non-Contracting Party – Appendix III of the IOTC Rules of Procedure (2014)

CoC14.32 ([Para 134](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission considers renewing the status of Liberia as Cooperating Non-Contracting Party of the IOTC.

CoC14.33 ([Para 135](#)) **NOTING** that Djibouti was not present during the CoC14 to present their application for Cooperating Non-Contracting Party status, the CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission considers the application by Djibouti for the status of Cooperating Non-Contracting Party of the IOTC (IOTC-2017-CoC14-CNCP02) at S21, bearing in mind paragraph 82 of the Report of the 19th Session of the Commission.

CoC14.34 ([Para 136](#)) **The CoC RECOMMENDED** that the Commission consider renewing the status of Senegal as Cooperating Non-Contracting Party of the IOTC.

CoC14.35 ([Para 137](#)) **NOTING** that Bangladesh was not present during the CoC14 to present their application for Cooperating Non-Contracting Party status, the CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission consider the application by Bangladesh for the status of Cooperating Non-Contracting Party of the IOTC (IOTC-2017-CoC14-CNCP04) at S21, bearing in mind paragraph 82 of the Report of the 19th Session of the Commission.

Election of the chairperson and vice-chairperson of the compliance committee

CoC14.36 ([Para 140](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission endorses the nomination of Mr. Hosea Gonza Mbilinyi (Tanzania) as Chair of the Compliance Committee and of Ms Anne-France Mattlet (France) as Vice-chair of the CoC, for the next biennium.

Adoption of the report of the 14th Session of the Compliance Committee

CoC14.37 ([Para 141](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission consider the consolidated set of recommendations arising from CoC14, provided at [Appendix VIII](#).