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The 65th meeting of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC) was held in La Jolla, California, USA, on October 4-10, 1999.

1. **Opening of the meeting**

   The meeting was called to order by Dr. Robin Allen, Director of the IATTC, on October 4, 1999, at 9:50 a.m. He called for nominations for Chairman of the meeting. The representative of Mexico nominated the United States, and this was seconded by the representative of Nicaragua and passed by the membership. Mr. Svein Fougner of the United States assumed the position of Chairman. He called upon the heads of the member and observer delegations to introduce themselves and the other members of their delegations. These, and the members of the IATTC staff who were present, are listed in Appendix 1 of these minutes.

   The representative of Mexico called attention to the fact that Mr. Brian Hallman, who had represented the United States at many of the IATTC and intergovernmental meetings over the years, had recently retired from government service and become an IATTC employee. Everyone wished him well in his new position.

2. **Adoption of the agenda**

   After a short discussion, it was agreed that another item, *Resolution on bycatch*, would be added between Items 8 and 9 of the draft agenda.

3. **Arrangements for working groups on finance, fleet capacity, and the IATTC Convention**

   The representative of Costa Rica asked if meetings of different working groups would be held concurrently, and pointed out that that would be a hardship for his delegation, which consisted of only two people. He was assured that that would not be the case. It was suggested that the working group on finance include only representatives of members of the IATTC, but the representatives of nearly all the other states said that those states intended to become members and that they wished to attend, so it was agreed that they could do so.

4. **Review of the fishery in 1999**

   The Chairman called upon Dr. Allen to review the fishery for tunas in the eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO) during 1999.

   Dr. Allen said that the catches of yellowfin, skipjack, and bigeye had all been above average in 1999, and that the catch to date of skipjack had already exceeded that for all of 1978, the previous record year. The cumulative catches to date of all three species exceeded those of 1997 and 1998. The catch rates have been greater than those of the first half of 1998, but there was an El Niño event during the first half of 1998, and the catch rates of yellowfin and skipjack tend to be depressed during such events.

   a) **Yellowfin**

   He then spoke about the current status of the yellowfin stock in the EPO. The average maximum sustainable yield (AMSY) of 270,000 metric tons (mt) is obtainable, with the current age composition of the catch, with fishing effort of about 20,000 to 22,000 Class-6 days. The effort was about optimum during 1991-1993, but since then it has been increasing. The average weight of the fish caught in the EPO during 1996-1998 was less than the average weight during most years of the 1985-1995 period; however, the mean weight in 1999 was slightly greater than in 1998. The reduction in average weight had occurred over all set types. During the first half of 1999 the catches of fish between about 70 and 90 cm in length in unassociated schools was less than during the same period of previous years, which is a matter of concern to the IATTC staff, as these fish should provide the bulk of the catch of yellowfin associated with dolphins next year.
The 63rd meeting of the IATTC in June 1999 adopted a resolution establishing a catch quota of 225,000 mt for yellowfin tuna in the Commission’s Yellowfin Regulatory Area (CYRA) during 1999, with provisions for the Director to increase it by up to three increments of 15,000 mt each if circumstances warranted. On September 13 Dr. Allen had announced that he had decided to increase the quota by one increment, to 240,000 mt, and that he expected that the quota would be reached by October 14. There was extensive discussion of Dr. Allen’s decision to allow the addition of only one increment. He pointed out that (1) the stock assessment presented in June showed the sustainable yield for the EPO in 1999 was about 260,000 mt, (2) the stock size was slightly less than that which would support the AMSY, (3) the fishing effort in the EPO during 1999 would be about 28,000 Class-6 days, which would further reduce the stock size unless the recruitment was above average during 1998 and/or 1999, and (4) since June the size composition data had shown large catches of small yellowfin and a relative paucity of yellowfin in the 70- to 90-cm group. He noted the restrictions would not apply to the area outside the CYRA, where most of the yellowfin caught are larger, older fish. The representative of the United States said that the Commission should affirm its original decision, as expressed in the resolution of the 63rd meeting of the IATTC. Many of the attendees wondered whether additional increments would be warranted if the catches of smaller, younger yellowfin in the CYRA were reduced, which would be the case if, in accordance with a resolution of the 64th meeting of the IATTC in July 1999, sets on all types of floating objects were banned when the catch of bigeye in the entire EPO reached 40,000 mt. Virtually all of their queries are covered in seven written questions submitted by the representative of Mexico. These, and Dr. Allen’s answers, follow:

1. What was the result of the assessment (MSY) for yellowfin tuna, inside and outside the CYRA, presented at the meeting in Guayaquil in June [1999]? Dr. Allen noted that Figure 22 of Background Paper 2, *Assessment of yellowfin tuna in the eastern Pacific Ocean*, presented at the Guayaquil meeting, shows that the estimated AMSY for yellowfin in the EPO is about 270,000 mt and that it is obtainable with an effort of about 20,000 to 22,000 Class-6 days. It was estimated that the stock was a little below the optimum size in 1999, and that the sustainable yield for that year was 260,000 mt. The effort in 1999 is expected to reach about 28,000 days. He added that the modeling was done for the EPO, but that the recommendation had been for the CYRA, as most of the yellowfin caught outside the CYRA are larger, older fish.

2. Do you agree that fishing on juveniles poses additional dangers, considering the low catches of yellowfin around 80 cm, shown in the size distribution? Dr. Allen replied that the staff had carried out simulations of 15 different scenarios, which were presented at the 63rd meeting of the IATTC in June 1999 in the document *Estimated Effects of Various Restrictions on the Fishery for Tunas in the Eastern Pacific Ocean*. If fishing on floating objects were eliminated the catches of yellowfin would increase slightly. If all fishing for yellowfin not associated with dolphins were eliminated the catches of yellowfin would increase by about 40,000 mt.

3. What are the catches of yellowfin of about 80 cm in 1995, 1996, and 1999? Dr. Allen said that he could not give precise answers to this question without more time, but that the annual catches of yellowfin between about 70 and 90 cm were about 40,000 mt in 1995 and 1996 and about 50,000 mt in 1997 and 1998. So far in 1999 they had been about 20,000 mt, and, if the fishery were not restricted, they would be about 34,000 mt for the entire year.

4. Given the level of recruitment in 1999 and the need to conserve this cohort for the fishery in subsequent years and the sustainability of the resource itself, what measures would you suggest applying? Dr. Allen said that large amounts of 50-cm fish have been caught during 1999, but that it is too early to tell whether this is due to above-average recruitment during 1999 or concentration of fishing on small fish. He said that, in general, the catches of small fish should be minimized so they could later be taken as larger fish.
5. If fishing on FADs in the CYRA were prohibited when 240,000 tons are reached, would the danger to the yellowfin stock be reduced? Dr. Allen replied that the danger would consist of reduction in the catches and catches per unit of effort of yellowfin in subsequent years. He said that fishing on FADs accounts for only about one-sixth of the catch of small yellowfin, and that prohibition of FAD fishing after 240,000 mt of yellowfin had been caught would reduce the catch of small yellowfin by only about 3 percent.

6. If fishing on FADs and schoolfish in the CYRA were prohibited when 240,000 tons are reached, would the danger to the yellowfin stock be reduced? Dr. Allen said that in this case the benefits would be more significant, as it would reduce the catches of small yellowfin by about 21 percent, or 20 percent if fishing on FADs continued until November 8.

7. If fishing on FADs and schoolfish is prohibited from the date on which 240,000 tons are reached, the level corresponding to one increment, with analyses of the data available, is it possible to conclude that if the maximum catch recommended in the resolution (270,000 tons) is permitted, the yellowfin stock would be substantially harmed, as indicated in the resolution? Dr. Allen stated that there are many uncertainties involved, but referred to the three principal reasons for choosing only one increment: (1) The 50-cm fish which were present in the catches in such large numbers should be protected, even if they are the result of greater-than-average recruitment during 1999. Cessation of fishing on schools and FADs would do that. (2) The 70- to 90-cm fish which were scarce at present would enter the fishery for dolphin-associated fish in 2000, and the catches of these fish should be restricted now. Banning fishing on floating objects and unassociated fish would have approximately the same effect as restricting the fishery in the CYRA. (3) The sustainable yield for the EPO was currently 260,000 mt. Cessation of fishing on FADs and unassociated schools would increase the average size of fish in the catch for the remainder of the year, which would have the effect of increasing the sustainable yield to about 270,000 mt.

Mexico and the United States each presented a draft resolution for implementing the resolution of the 63rd Meeting of the IATTC for a yellowfin tuna conservation program for 1999. After considerable discussion, during which the environmental community made a statement (Appendix 2), and consultation among the governments, a resolution for implementing the catch limit for yellowfin tuna in 1999 (Appendix 3) was adopted.

b) Bigeye

The 64th meeting of the IATTC in July 1999 adopted a resolution calling for the cessation of fishing for tunas associated with floating objects after the purse-seine catch of bigeye tuna in the EPO during 1999 had reached 40,000 mt. On September 29 Dr. Allen had announced that the IATTC staff expected that the 40,000 mt would be reached on or about October 12. There was a lengthy discussion of this matter. Among the points made were: (1) while the projection was made using average catch rates for the year, the amounts of bigeye caught during recent weeks were less than they had been for most of the year, so it appeared that less than 40,000 mt of bigeye would be caught if fishing on floating objects ceased on October 12; (2) the observers on the vessels might be overestimating the amounts of bigeye caught; (3) the average weights of bigeye caught in association with floating objects were the greatest since 1995, which might indicate that the situation was less serious than previously thought.

In response to a question, Dr. Allen said that the catches of bigeye are estimated at three stages: (1) catches by vessels still at sea are estimated from information sent by radio to the fishing company by the captain or, if that is not available, by deriving an estimate based on the number of days that the vessel has been at sea; (2) when the vessel returns to port information from either the vessel’s logbook or the observer’s records, whichever is available first, replaces the radio reports or estimate; and (3) when unloading weights are available they are substituted for the information from the logbook or observer. Dr. Allen said that records for 1998 and for about 20 trips in 1999 showed that the vessel captains tend to underes-
timate the unloading weights of bigeye by about 30 percent, and that the observers tend to overestimate them by about 30 percent. These two biases tend to cancel each other out. It was agreed that more sampling of the fish unloaded at the canneries is needed, to improve the estimates of the species composition of the catch.

Dr. Allen was asked to reassess the likely date at which a catch of 40,000 mt of bigeye from the EPO would be reached, taking into account all aspects of the discussion. He noted that the recent weekly estimates of the catch of bigeye were much lower than the average of the first eight months of 1999, and that it was not possible to forecast whether the rates would remain low in the future. However, using a smoothed average of recent catches as the best approximation for the catch rates over the next few weeks, he estimated that the likely date on which 40,000 mt would be reached was November 8, and it was agreed that purse-seine fishing on floating objects would be stopped then in the EPO unless there were significant changes in the reported catches.

5. Consideration of a bigeye quota for 2000

The US delegation had asked at the 63rd meeting that this issue be discussed at this meeting in order to allow management measures for 2000 to be considered earlier than would be possible if the matter were not discussed until the meeting in June 2000. Dr. Allen introduced Background Paper 2, which summarizes recent information from the fishery. The representative of the European Community said that it is not fair to restrict the purse-seine fishery, but not the longline fishery. It was noted that the objective was to reduce the catches of small bigeye and that, as some of the bigeye caught in association with floating objects are rather large, it would be beneficial for all concerned if ways to avoid catching small bigeye associated with floating objects could be found.

Finally, after an extensive debate, a resolution on the conservation of bigeye (Appendix 4) was adopted.

6. Report of the working group on fleet capacity, and decisions for 2000

After considering the progress made by the Permanent Working Group on Fleet Capacity, which took place in La Jolla, California, on October 8-9, 1999, the Commission agreed that the Working Group should reconvene on January 26-28, 2000, in San Jose, Costa Rica. The report of the Chairman of the Working Group is attached as Appendix 5.


The Commission approved a draft resolution prepared by the Working Group (Appendix 6). The Report of the Chairman of the Working Group, held in La Jolla on October 7-10, 1999, is attached as Appendix 7.

8. Report of the working group on the IATTC Convention

The Chairman of the Working Group reported on the deliberations which took place during the meeting of the Working Group. He said that he would prepare another draft negotiating text, and that the Working Group would meet again prior to the IATTC meeting in June 2000.

9. Resolution on bycatch

The Chairman called upon the United States to discuss the draft resolution on bycatch prepared by the U.S. delegation. The U.S representative said that this was based on the draft resolution presented at the 63rd meeting of the IATTC in June 1999, and was narrower in scope than the previous version. It applied mainly to the purse-seine fishery, but also acknowledged the need for bycatch reduction by other fisheries. During the ensuing discussion it was pointed out that there are special needs to minimize the bycatches of slow-growing, low-fecundity species such as sharks and sea turtles, and of species such as do-
rado and wahoo, for which there are important fisheries in many of the coastal nations of the EPO. After further discussion, a resolution was adopted (Appendix 8).

10. **Place and date of next meeting**
Dr. Allen said that the year 2000 would mark the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the IATTC, and that plans had been made to hold the regular meeting in June 2000 in Costa Rica, one of the two original member states. The meetings of the IATTC and the International Review Panel would be held in San Jose on June 12-19, preceded by a 1-day symposium on the management of world tuna fisheries on June 11. The proposal was approved.

11. **Election of officers**
Dr. Allen said that the IATTC Rules of Procedure state that there should be a Chairman and a Secretary, who will serve 1-year terms. It had not been known at the 63rd meeting of the IATTC where its next regular June meeting would be held, so the question had been deferred. The office of Secretary has not been filled for many years. It was agreed that Mr. Fougner would continue to serve as Chairman until the meeting in June 2000.

12. **Other business**
Dr. Allen informed the attendees about the 5th session of the Multilateral High-Level Conference on the Conservation and Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean, which took place in Honolulu, Hawaii, on September 5-16, 1999. Among the issues discussed were the status of Taiwan with regard to the proposed organization, the status of territories such as those of France and the United States, how scientific services would be provided, and the area of application of the proposed Commission, especially in the northern and western regions. He said that the eastern region of the proposed area extends to 150°W north of 4°S and to 130°W south of 4°S. Thus there would be an area south of 4°S between 130° and 150°W which would be under the purview of both the IATTC and the new organization. The plans are to meet again in April 2000 and to finish the negotiation of the Convention by June 2000.

13. **Adjournment**
The meeting was adjourned on October 10, 1999, at 7:45 p.m.
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STATEMENT BY THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL COMMUNITY

On behalf of the Center for Marine Conservation, the Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society, and the World Wildlife Fund, we would like to echo the sentiments of a number of the delegations that “Monday may have been the most difficult day in the recent history of the Commission.”

Let us be clear. The tuna-dolphin problem is not solved, nor is the tuna-dolphin problem separate from the conservation and management measures adopted by the Commission for tuna species. The Panama Declaration and the Agreement on the International Dolphin Conservation Program inextricably link dolphin conservation with both the long-term conservation and sustainability of the tuna fishery and bycatch reduction. Our organizations support the goals of this Agreement, not only for dolphin conservation, but also to secure effective conservation for fishery resources and the marine ecosystem in the eastern Pacific Ocean. We are still far from achieving these goals.

For several years we have promoted the work of this Commission as an international model for an effective fishery management agreement. However, upon facing the first true test, and the difficult management choices it presents, we fear the Commission may ignore the Director’s scientific advice and abandon the conservation and management recommendations adopted at the IATTC meeting in Guayaquil in June of this year.

The Commission must take decisive action, based on the best scientific advice available, recognizing that the science of fishery management is an imprecise art. The Commission must demonstrate that it has the courage of its convictions. We believe it is vital that the Commission act in a precautionary manner to protect the resource and implement and ensure compliance with the resolutions that it has adopted. The conclusion is obvious.

This Commission cannot take risks that will only result in the mismanagement of the fishery. It cannot afford to make the same mistakes made in so many other fishery management fora -- both ignoring the science and weakening previously adopted conservation and management measures. The long-term health of the fishery resources and industry is at stake. We urge the Commission to close both the bigeye and yellowfin tuna fisheries now.
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RESOLUTION FOR IMPLEMENTING THE CATCH LIMIT FOR YELLOWFIN TUNA IN 1999

10 October 1999

The Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC), having responsibility for the scientific study of the tunas and tuna-like fishes of the eastern Pacific Ocean, which for the purpose of this Resolution is the area bounded by the coastline of the Americas, the 40°N parallel, the 150°W meridian, and the 40°S parallel, and for the formulation of recommendations to the High Contracting Parties with regard to these resources, and having maintained since 1950 a continuing scientific program directed toward the study of those resources,

Recalling its Resolution on the conservation of yellowfin tuna approved at the 63rd meeting of the IATTC, and

Observing that the size of the purse-seine and baitboat fleet in the eastern Pacific Ocean has increased considerably, and that studies by the staff of the IATTC indicate that the maximum sustainable catch of yellowfin in the eastern Pacific Ocean can be realized with a purse-seine and baitboat fleet size of about 120,000 metric tons of capacity, and

Observing that currently the fishery for yellowfin tuna in the eastern Pacific Ocean includes a variety of fishing gears and methods of operation which require the implementation of differentiated management systems adapted to this complexity, and

Considering that most of the indicators and the scientific information presented by the Director of the IATTC indicate that in general the fishery is at a level which can support maximum catches close to those presented at the 63rd meeting of the IATTC, however,

Noting that fishing for juvenile yellowfin has increased considerably during 1999, and that these small fish must be protected,

Understanding that the yellowfin in the area west of the Commission’s Yellowfin Regulatory Area (CYRA) (as defined in the Resolution adopted by the Commission on May 17, 1962) and east of 150°W are of such a size that limiting the catches in that area is currently not necessary,

Notes that it may be necessary to limit the catch of yellowfin tuna in the CYRA during 1999, as provided for in the Resolution referred to in Paragraph 2 above, and

Noting that the resolution on bigeye tuna adopted at the 64th Meeting of the IATTC limits the catch of bigeye tuna taken in the purse-seine fishery in the EPO to 40,000 metric tons in 1999 by prohibiting sets on all types of floating objects at such time as the limit is reached, and that the Director notified the 65th Meeting that that limit would be reached on November 8, 1999,

The IATTC therefore recommends to the High Contracting Parties that a limitation on the catches of yellowfin in the CYRA is necessary before the end of 1999, and will take effect on the date on which the total catch of yellowfin tuna from the CYRA in 1999 reaches 240,000 metric tons. (This date will henceforth be referred to as the “closure date,” and the period beginning on the closure date and ending at midnight, December 31, 1999, will henceforth be referred to as the “restricted period.”) Further, on the basis of the analysis of the most recent information, presented by the Director of the IATTC, the limitation may be implemented on a differential basis. The limitation would be implemented as follows:

1. Purse-seine vessels and baitboats must refrain from fishing for yellowfin tuna in the following areas of the CYRA (the “restricted areas”) during the restricted period:
   a. The area between the coast of Mexico and longitude 125°W north of latitude 23°N, and
   b. The area between the coast of South America and longitude 85°W from latitude 5°N to latitude 5°S.
2. As of December 2, 1999, or the date on which a catch of 265,000 metric tons of yellowfin tuna is reached in the CYRA, purse-seine vessels with an observer aboard from the On-Board Observer Program established under the Agreement on the International Dolphin Conservation Program must refrain from fishing for yellowfin in the CYRA.

3. The landings of fish caught in the restricted areas during the restricted period or in the entire CYRA after the date established in section 2 above by any individual purse seiner with an observer aboard may include a maximum of 15 percent yellowfin (relative to its total catch of all species of fish during those periods) caught while fishing for other species of tunas.

4. Vessels with an observer aboard which are at sea on December 31, 1999, will not be subject to the 15-percent maximum after that date during the remainder of that trip.

5. Purse-seine vessels and baitboats without an observer aboard which are at sea on the closure date may continue to fish for yellowfin without restriction until they return to port for unloading.

6. Purse-seine vessels and baitboats without an observer aboard which are not at sea on the closure date, but which depart from port to fish for tunas during the restricted period, must refrain from fishing for yellowfin. The landings of vessels in this category, regardless of the date the trip is completed, may include a maximum of 15-percent yellowfin caught while fishing for other species of tunas.

The IATTC staff shall evaluate landings of small tuna during the period when this area closure is in effect in order to determine whether the actual reduction in catches of small yellowfin tuna is consistent with the expected reduction, and shall report on the results of that evaluation at the Meeting of the IATTC in June 2000.

The IATTC staff shall continue to review and study alternatives for reducing catches of small yellowfin tuna, including time and area closures, gear modifications, and other measures, and shall report on the results of this review at the Meeting of the IATTC in June 2000.

The Parties shall make all possible efforts to strengthen procedures for collecting data on catches and landings of yellowfin tuna.

The IATTC finally recommends that all member states and other interested states work diligently to achieve the implementation of this yellowfin conservation program for 1999.
Appendix 4.

RESOLUTION ON BIGEYE TUNA

The Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC), having responsibility for the scientific study of the tunas and tuna-like fishes of the eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO), which for the purpose of this resolution is the area bounded by the coastline of the Americas, the 40°N parallel, the 150°W meridian, and the 40°S parallel, and for the formulation of recommendations to the High Contracting Parties with regard to these resources, and having maintained since 1950 a continuing scientific program directed toward the study of those resources:

Recalling the provisions of its Resolutions on the conservation and management of bigeye tuna in the EPO approved at the 61st and 64th meetings of the IATTC, including the establishment of a limit of 40,000 metric tons on the catch of bigeye tuna in the surface fishery in 1999, and

Considering the information presented by the IATTC staff and the report of the Bigeye Working Group on the need to take measures to ensure that catches of small bigeye by the surface fishery do not threaten the sustainable yield of bigeye tuna in the EPO, and

Reiterating the need for improved procedures for monitoring the fishery and estimating the total catch to ensure reliable data for all fisheries that take bigeye tuna, in particular the fishery on floating objects, and

Concerned about the reduction in the average size of bigeye tuna caught by the purse-seine fishery in the EPO during 1994-1998, and

Aware that there was an increase in the average size of the bigeye tuna in the catch of the surface fishery in 1999, the significance of which is unknown, and

Recognizing the uncertainties about the life history parameters of the bigeye stock, and

Observing that catches of bigeye tuna in 1999 were made at a faster rate than expected, resulting in considerable uncertainty and management difficulties for the surface fishing fleets of the EPO and for the IATTC, and

Desiring to avoid the difficulties that would arise in the year 2000 if bigeye catches in the surface fishery were to occur at the same rate as in 1999, such that the surface fishery could be faced with uncertainty and possibly unanticipated immediate closure of the fishery on floating objects in order to maintain the productivity of the bigeye stock, and

Noting that it is necessary to limit the catch of bigeye tuna by the surface fishery in the EPO in the year 2000:

Therefore recommends to the High Contracting Parties and non-parties under whose jurisdiction vessels operate in the EPO that they:

1. Provisionally agree to limit the catch of bigeye tuna in the purse-seine fishery in the EPO to 40,000 metric tons in 2000, this limit to be implemented by prohibiting sets on all types of floating objects if the limit is reached by the time of the Meeting of the IATTC in June 2000;

2. Review the status of the bigeye tuna stock and consider adjusting the catch limit for bigeye tuna at the Meeting of the IATTC in June 2000, including, as agreed in the Resolution of the 64th Meeting, consideration of further reductions in the catch of bigeye, taking into account:
   − the patterns of catches of bigeye tuna to that time;
   − any data available at that time on size composition of the bigeye catches;
   − the extent to which the total catch of bigeye tuna in the surface fishery in the EPO in 1999 exceeded the limit of 40,000 metric tons;
   − the information from research carried out in accordance with the resolution of the 64th Meeting;
− previous evaluations of the impact of catches by longline and small purse-seine vessels and of interactions between the longline and purse-seine fisheries;
− alternative methods for reducing the catch of juvenile bigeye tuna; and
− other relevant information provided for consideration by the IATTC.

3. Convene a Working Group prior to the Meeting of the IATTC in June 2000 to address the question of the methods for the collection of data for the fishery on fish-aggregating devices, and to recommend measures to improve the timeliness and accuracy of statistics needed to determine bigeye catches and landings, such that the reliability of calculations of catches and projections of catches into the future can be enhanced

4. Convene the scientific working group established by the Resolution of the 64th Meeting prior to the Meeting of the IATTC in June 2000 so that the conclusions and recommendations of the working group can be considered at that meeting.
The IATTC Permanent Working Group on Fleet Capacity held its second meeting in La Jolla, California, USA, on October 8-9, 1999, in conjunction with the 65th meeting of the IATTC, which took place on October 4-10. Ambassador Jean-François Pulvenis of Venezuela served as Chairman.

The meeting was called to order on October 8 at 5:15 p.m. Dr. Robin L. Allen, Director of the IATTC, reviewed Background Paper 1, *Considerations regarding limitations on the growth in carrying capacity of the tuna purse-seine fleet fishing in the eastern Pacific Ocean*, pointing out that limits on the capacity of the tuna purse-seine fleet in the eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO) in 1999 had been adopted at the 62nd meeting of the IATTC in October 1998. He said that the fishing effort exerted in the EPO during 1999 was expected to amount to about 28,000 Class-6 days by the end of the year. The average maximum sustainable yield of yellowfin tuna is obtainable with about 20,000 to 22,000 days of effort. In answer to a question as to why Table 4a included data for 1985-1998, but the averages in Table 4b were based on data for 1994-1998 only, Dr. Allen replied that it was thought that the data for 1994-1998 only would be more representative of recent years, but that the staff would recalculate Table 4b with the data for 1985-1998 and make it available the next day. Among the matters covered in the ensuing discussion were criteria for assignment of shares of the total allowance and methods of measuring capacity and conversion factors between these measures.

It was generally agreed that the average catches of tunas within the Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs) of the various countries would be an important consideration. The representatives of all the coastal states of the EPO expressed their wish to have shares in the total allowance, and several described their plans for acquiring fishing vessels and/or constructing tuna-processing facilities. It was pointed out that about 40 percent of the catch of tunas in the EPO comes from the EEZs of the coastal states and about 60 percent from the high seas. Historical participation in the fishery was also mentioned as a consideration, and it was pointed out that the sizes of the shares calculated on that basis would depend upon the years which were selected for the measurement of historical participation. The representative of Colombia pointed out that the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea gives coastal states jurisdiction over all living resources within their EEZs. The representative of Panama called attention to the fact that Article 5 of the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fishing states that recognition should be given to enhancing the ability of developing countries to develop their fisheries and to participate in high-seas fisheries. It was agreed that a formula for allocating allowances for the various nations would have to be seriously considered.

It was agreed that well volume is a fair basis for determining the capacities of vessels, but the IATTC staff has not yet been able to collect data on the well volumes of all the vessels of the fleet. A formula for converting tons of carrying capacity to total well volume was discussed, but it was recognized that some vessels pack their catches more densely in their wells than do others.

The representative of Nicaragua stated that the boundaries of its EEZ are not clear, and indicated that he wanted to record a reservation on the information on the catches within the EEZs in Table 4 of Background Paper 1. There was some discussion of present fleet sizes, and it was agreed that the various countries would supply information on the sizes of their respective fleets to the IATTC staff. The possibility that several countries might combine their capacity allocations was discussed. The representative of
Mexico stated that the fleets of some of the countries had exceeded the limits established in the resolution of the 62nd meeting of the IATTC. A draft proposal prepared by the United States was distributed to the attendees, but the representatives of Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Panama, and Peru said that they could not accept the proposal.

The working group agreed that it should meet again. A three-day meeting was proposed, which would preferably take place after the FAO Technical Consultation on the Measurement of Fishing Capacity scheduled for November 29-December 3, 1999. After some discussion, it was agreed that the meeting would take place on January 26-28, 2000, in San Jose, Costa Rica.

The meeting was adjourned on October 9 at 9:10 p.m.
RESOLUTION ON FINANCING THE INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION

10 October 1999

The Parties to the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC):

Understanding the importance of ensuring sufficient funding for the IATTC so that it may continue to implement effectively the agreed conservation and management program for the living marine resources of the eastern Pacific Ocean;

Aware that an effective system of financing should be equitable for all Parties and should be fully transparent;

Giving due consideration to the requirement in the Convention establishing the IATTC that the proportion of the expenses paid by each Party should be related to the proportion of the total catch utilized by that Party;

Believing that other factors may and should be taken into account in determining the proportion of the expenses paid by each Party;

Have agreed as follows:

1. To contribute to the budget of the IATTC for the financial year (FY) 2000 in accordance with the following schedule of payments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Payment (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>29,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>163,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>24,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>298,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>2,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>77,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,395,601</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. To continue working to develop a system of contributions under which each Party pays an equitable share of the Commission’s budget, with the goal of adopting the new system at the meeting of the IATTC in June 2000.

3. To submit the various possible systems for allocating the budget among Parties presented for consideration by the Finance Working Group (attached) for internal review in their respective countries, and come to the next meeting of the Finance Working Group, in January 2000, prepared to take decisions in this regard.

4. To consider their contributions of the budget of the IATTC for FY 2001 in the light of the understanding that it is the intention of the United States to reduce its contribution in FY 2001 to a level of approximately US$2.4 million, with the possibility of further reductions in subsequent years.

5. The actual contribution by each Party for FY 2001 shall be decided at the meeting of the IATTC in June 2000, based on the criteria and system established by the Finance Working Group and other developments, such as the entry of new Parties. Once the criteria and system for establishing the contributions for each Party are agreed by the Parties, and the corresponding contribution for FY 2001 is identified, each Party shall undertake the necessary internal procedures to ensure said contribution.
6. The Parties encourage non-parties that are interested in and participate in the work of the IATTC to make voluntary contributions to the budget of the IATTC during FY 2000 and 2001.
The IATTC Working Group on Finance held its first meeting in La Jolla, California, USA, on October 7-10, 1999, in conjunction with the 65th meeting of the IATTC, which took place on October 4-10. Dr. William Hogarth of the United States served as Chairman.

The meeting was called to order on October 7 at 2:45 p.m. The Chairman called the attendees’ attention to two documents, Background Paper 3, Possible systems of allocation of contributions to the budget of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, prepared by the IATTC staff, and a proposal for financing submitted by Panama (Appendix A). He pointed out that since the creation of the IATTC most of its budget has been paid by the United States, but that it is getting more difficult to get appropriations from the U.S. Congress. The representative of the United States agreed with the Chairman, and stated that it would be better for the IATTC if reductions in the U.S. contributions were agreed upon by the Commission than if they were imposed by the U.S. Congress.

The representative of the United States indicated that his country would be willing to contribute $2,800,000\footnote{All figures are in US dollars} for the 2000 fiscal year (FY 2000; October 1, 1999-September 30, 2000) and $2,400,000 for FY 2001, and the representative of Mexico indicated that his country would be willing to contribute $1,000,000 for FY 2000. The IATTC’s recommended budget for FY 2000 is $4,701,333, and a budget of $4,785,849 has been tentatively agreed on for FY 2001. In fact, the actual contributions have been less than the recommended budgets for many years, so a target of $4,400,000 for FY 2000 was used. Under these circumstances the other members of the IATTC would be asked to contribute approximately $600,000 for FY 2000 and $1,385,000 for FY 2001. (There are currently eleven members of the IATTC in all, but additional countries are likely to join in the near future.)

The 1949 Convention establishing the IATTC requires that the contribution of each member be related to the proportion of the catch of tunas in the eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO) “utilized” by that member. Also, there has traditionally been a minimum contribution of $500 for each member that does not utilize tunas caught in the EPO. “Utilization” is not defined in the Convention itself but in letters exchanged between Costa Rica and the United States, the two original members of the IATTC, at the time the Convention was negotiated. The definition of utilization could be modified without amending the Convention.

The systems of assigning contributions employed by the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas and the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) and the system proposed for the Commission for the Conservation and Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean were reviewed. The contributions of the members to the IATTC budget under the

\footnote{All figures are in US dollars}
IOTC system, with base payments of: (1) (total budget x 0.1)/(number of members); (2) $5,000; and (3) $20,000, are shown in Appendix B.

It was pointed out that recent international agreements and proposed agreements call for transparency, and that information on utilization of tunas is much more difficult to obtain than information on landings of tunas.

The representatives of several nations noted that the $500 minimum contribution had not been changed since the IATTC was created, and that it should perhaps be increased. One scheme called for 20 percent of the budget to be divided equally among the members, but the representative of Panama pointed out that this would be an exorbitant amount for a country with only a small tuna industry.

The representative of France stated that his country’s position was that the financing of the IATTC should not be restructured until a new convention was adopted.

The representatives of several countries stated that requests for funds for the IATTC budget for FY 2000, and, in one case, FY 2001, had already been submitted to their respective congresses, and it was too late to revise these.

The IATTC’s income from money paid by the vessel owners to pay the costs of placing observers on their boats was noted, but it was agreed that this is not related to its regular budget.

Several drafts of a resolution for financing the IATTC were considered, and one was presented to the plenary. Financing of the IATTC will be considered further at the next meeting of the Working Group, scheduled for February 9-10, 2000.

The meeting was adjourned on October 10, 1999, at 12:30 p.m.
Appendix A.

PROPOSAL FOR FINANCING THE IATTC PRESENTED BY PANAMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Base contribution (US$)</th>
<th>GDP (A)</th>
<th>Catch (B)</th>
<th>Utilization (C)</th>
<th>A(B+C)</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>Variable assessment</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>26,672</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,186</td>
<td>58,304,992</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43,472</td>
<td>44,472.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>36,589</td>
<td>40,913</td>
<td>17,363</td>
<td>2,132,260,564</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1,589,809</td>
<td>1,590,808.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>3,417</td>
<td>58,875</td>
<td>103,412</td>
<td>554,534,679</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>413,459.78</td>
<td>414,459.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>28,857</td>
<td>27,558</td>
<td>74,738</td>
<td>2,951,955,672</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2,200,971.34</td>
<td>2,201,971.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,522</td>
<td>1,501</td>
<td>14,287</td>
<td>39,817,336</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29,687.71</td>
<td>30,687.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,586</td>
<td>55,898</td>
<td>49,762</td>
<td>167,576,760</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>124,944.85</td>
<td>125,944.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>3,032</td>
<td>8,763</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26,569,416</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,810.10</td>
<td>20,810.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,509</td>
<td>33,796</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,998,164</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38,024.11</td>
<td>39,024.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>3,151</td>
<td>67,438</td>
<td>30,526</td>
<td>308,684,564</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>230,154.50</td>
<td>231,154.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,708</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 11,000 6,290,702,147 100 4,690,333.00 4,701,333

Appendix B.

INDIAN OCEAN TUNA COMMISSION

Scheme for the Calculation of Contributions to the Administrative Budget of the Commission

1. Ten percent of the total budget of the Commission shall be divided equally among all the Members.

2. Ten percent of the total budget of the Commission shall be divided equally among the Members having fishing operations in the Area targeting species covered by the Commission.

3. Forty percent of the total budget shall be divided among the Members on the basis of per capita GNP for the calendar year three years before the year to which the contributions relate, weighted according to the economic status of the Members in accordance with the World Bank classification as follows and subject to change in the classification thresholds: high-income Members shall be weighted by the factor of 8; middle-income Members by the factor of 2; low-income Members by the factor of 0.

4. Forty percent of the total budget shall be divided among the Members in proportion to their average catch in the three calendar years beginning with the year five years before the year to which the contributions relate, weighted by a coefficient reflecting their development status. The coefficient of OECD members and EC shall be 1, and the coefficient of other Members shall be one-fifth.
IATTC budget contributions, FY 2001, based on IOTC formula, using GDP in place of GNP
Contribuciones al presupuesto de la CIAT, AF 2001, basadas en la fórmula de la CTOI, usando PIB en lugar de PNB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average catch</th>
<th>Per capita GDP classification</th>
<th>Catch indexed to per capita GDP</th>
<th>Shares indexed to GDP per cápita</th>
<th>Contribution by GDP</th>
<th>Contribution by catch per cápita</th>
<th>Base payment</th>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>Total contribution</th>
<th>Percent contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>119,646</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43,508</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>163,154</td>
<td>3.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>58,938</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11,788</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>84,309</td>
<td>43,508</td>
<td>59,823</td>
<td>187,640</td>
<td>3.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43,508</td>
<td>59,823</td>
<td>103,331</td>
<td>2.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57,852</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>478,585</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43,508</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>522,093</td>
<td>10.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>57,852</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57,852</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>478,585</td>
<td>413,778</td>
<td>43,508</td>
<td>59,823</td>
<td>995,694</td>
<td>20.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>México</td>
<td>143,563</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28,713</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>119,646</td>
<td>1,026,805</td>
<td>43,508</td>
<td>59,823</td>
<td>1,249,782</td>
<td>26.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43,508</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43,508</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panamá</td>
<td>7,836</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,567</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>119,646</td>
<td>11,210</td>
<td>43,508</td>
<td>59,823</td>
<td>234,187</td>
<td>4.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>32,538</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32,538</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>478,585</td>
<td>232,724</td>
<td>43,508</td>
<td>59,823</td>
<td>814,640</td>
<td>17.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>43,567</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8,713</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62,321</td>
<td>43,508</td>
<td>59,823</td>
<td>165,652</td>
<td>3.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>58,158</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11,632</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>119,646</td>
<td>83,192</td>
<td>43,508</td>
<td>59,823</td>
<td>306,169</td>
<td>6.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>402,453</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>152,803</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,914,340</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,914,340</strong></td>
<td><strong>478,585</strong></td>
<td><strong>478,585</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,785,849</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Average catch</th>
<th>Per capita GDP classification</th>
<th>Catch indexed to per capita GDP</th>
<th>Shares indexed to GDP</th>
<th>Contribution by GDP</th>
<th>Contribution by catch indexed to GDP</th>
<th>Base payment</th>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>Total contribution</th>
<th>Percent contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>146,120</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>151,120</td>
<td>3.16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>58,938</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11,788</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>102,964</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>114,839</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>11,875</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>584,481</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>589,481</td>
<td>12.32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>57,852</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57,852</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>584,481</td>
<td>505,334</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1,101,690</td>
<td>23.02%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>México</td>
<td>143,563</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28,713</td>
<td>146,120</td>
<td>1,254,006</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1,412,001</td>
<td>29.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panamá</td>
<td>7,836</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,567</td>
<td>146,120</td>
<td>13,690</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>171,685</td>
<td>3.59%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>32,538</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32,538</td>
<td>584,481</td>
<td>284,219</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>880,575</td>
<td>18.40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>43,567</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8,713</td>
<td>146,120</td>
<td>101,600</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>259,596</td>
<td>5.42%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>402,453</td>
<td>152,803</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4,785,849</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With US$5000 base payment – Con cuota base de US$5000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Average catch</th>
<th>Per capita GDP classification</th>
<th>Catch indexed to per capita GDP</th>
<th>Shares indexed to GDP</th>
<th>Contribution by GDP</th>
<th>Contribution by catch indexed to GDP</th>
<th>Base payment</th>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>Total contribution</th>
<th>Percent contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135,808</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>155,808</td>
<td>3.26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>58,938</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11,788</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>95,697</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>143,197</td>
<td>2.99%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>47,500</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>543,231</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>563,231</td>
<td>11.77%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>57,852</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57,852</td>
<td>543,231</td>
<td>469,670</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>1,060,401</td>
<td>22.16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>México</td>
<td>143,563</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28,713</td>
<td>135,808</td>
<td>1,165,504</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>1,348,811</td>
<td>28.18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>0.42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panamá</td>
<td>7,836</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,567</td>
<td>135,808</td>
<td>12,724</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>196,032</td>
<td>4.10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>32,538</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32,538</td>
<td>543,231</td>
<td>264,160</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>854,891</td>
<td>17.86%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>43,567</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8,713</td>
<td>135,808</td>
<td>94,430</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>277,738</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>58,158</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11,632</td>
<td>135,808</td>
<td>94,430</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>277,738</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>402,453</td>
<td>152,803</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4,785,849</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With US$20000 base payment – Con cuota base de US$20000
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Appendix 8.

RESOLUTION ON BYCATCH

10 October 1999

The Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC), meeting in La Jolla, California, on the occasion of its 65th Meeting:

Notes with appreciation the work to date of the Bycatch Working Group to examine the question of bycatches of all species taken in the tuna purse-seine fishery in the eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO), established at the 58th Meeting of the IATTC, held on June 3-5, 1997, in San Jose, Costa Rica;

Further notes that the Working Group has made good progress with respect to its first two terms of reference, and that a further meeting of the Working Group is tentatively scheduled for April 2000 to focus largely on the third term of reference, to “formulate and evaluate management schemes for reducing bycatch”;

Concerned about the bycatches and discards associated with the purse-seine fisheries in the EPO;

Noting the International Plan of Action for the Management of Sharks adopted by the FAO Committee on Fisheries in February 1999;

Recommends:

1. that the IATTC staff develop a mechanism for estimating the quantity and species of discards by tuna vessels fishing in the EPO from which such information is currently not available;

2. that the Bycatch Working Group present to the meeting of the IATTC in June 2000 recommendations on management measures to reduce bycatch in the purse-seine fishery;

3. that the IATTC staff develop and implement plans for the following research, in accordance with the budget approved by the IATTC, to support the work of the Bycatch Working Group and the development of measures to assess and reduce bycatch in the purse-seine fishery as well as in other fisheries, with a view to developing future recommendations with respect to these fisheries:
   • assess the impact of discards on species managed by the IATTC and how such discards may affect the management measures adopted by the IATTC for these species;
   • assess the effectiveness of gear modifications, such as size-sorting grids and other innovations, in reducing bycatch of juvenile tunas; and
   • estimate catches and the incidental fishing mortality of species such as sharks and rays and non-target species, for which the IATTC has identified a significant interaction with the target species, to further assess the impacts on these species.

4. that the appropriate provisions and recommendations of the FAO Plan of Action should be considered as an integral part of any bycatch management scheme adopted by the Commission; and

5. that States with purse-seine vessels fishing in the EPO require, in accordance with Article VI of the Agreement on the International Dolphin Conservation Program, the release of all sea turtles caught, and report on their number and the condition in which they were released, and that States with other types of fishing vessels operating in the EPO encourage these practices to the extent practicable.