

INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION
PERMANENT WORKING GROUP ON FLEET CAPACITY

MINUTES OF THE 4TH MEETING
Panama City, Panama
July 31-August 2, 2000

AGENDA

1. Opening of the meeting
2. Adoption of the agenda
3. Review of the information paper prepared by IATTC staff
4. Review of the IATTC Resolution on fleet capacity of October 1998
5. Consideration of future capacity limitations
6. Other business
7. Place and date of next meeting
8. Adjournment

DOCUMENTS

1. Background document on fleet carrying capacity, July 2000

APPENDICES

1. List of attendees
2. Proposal on the capacity of the tuna fleet operating in the eastern Pacific Ocean
3. Proposal by the tuna industries of Ecuador and Mexico
4. Resolution on the capacity of the tuna fleet operating in the eastern Pacific Ocean
5. Statement by the delegation of Colombia
6. Statement by OSPESCA

The 4th Meeting of the Permanent Working Group on Fleet Capacity was held in Panama City, Panama, from July 31 to August 2, 2000. It was attended by representatives of the governments of Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, European Community, France, Guatemala, Honduras, Japan, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Spain, United States of America, and Venezuela, and of the following non-governmental organizations: Conservation International and World Wildlife Fund. The attendees are listed in Appendix 1.

1. Opening of the meeting

The Administrator of the Maritime Authority of Panama welcomed the delegations. Dr. Robin Allen, Director of the IATTC, stated that the delegate from Vanuatu was unable to attend, and that he had been asked to keep the delegate informed of developments during the meeting.

The Chairman of the Working Group, Ing. Arnulfo Franco, announced that Guatemala became a member of the Commission on July 27, 2000.

2. Adoption of the agenda

The provisional agenda was approved without modifications.

3. Review of the information paper prepared by IATTC staff

Dr. Allen presented the background document prepared for the meeting by the IATTC staff, noting that it included a mechanism for quantifying the criteria for allocation of capacity as requested by Working Group. He said that the examples presented were not proposals. He explained that at its last meeting the Working Group had agreed that cubic meters would be used for measuring fleet capacity; however, capacities in cubic meters were not yet available for all vessels, so metric tons (mt) were used in the document. The Chairman asked for questions and comments.

Costa Rica expressed a reservation regarding the results in the document.

El Salvador also expressed its reservations about the document, since it did not contemplate the rights of coastal states. Guatemala also expressed a reservation about the numbers presented.

Nicaragua expressed a reservation about the coordinates of the boundaries of the zones of national jurisdiction used in the calculations.

With respect to the target capacity level of 135,000 mt, the European Community suggested that other scenarios be considered, reflecting different levels of effort and catch by species for the various modes of fishing, thus allowing a wider range of possibilities to be considered.

4. Review of the IATTC Resolution on fleet capacity of October 1998

Dr. Allen reviewed the resolution on fleet capacity of October 1998, noting that this was currently the only agreed basis for limiting capacity.

5. Consideration of future capacity limitations

The Chairman presented an initial proposal for limiting the carrying capacity of the purse-seine fleet. Some delegations supported the proposal, while others expressed reservations. However, the Working Group agreed the proposal could serve as a basis for negotiations.

France noted that, since Belize was excluded from the resolution, Honduras should also be excluded, since it was not present at the meeting. Venezuela commented that Honduras intended to attend, and since it was a coastal country it should not be excluded.

Ecuador expressed concern that the proposal went against the previous work done by the Working Group, noting that a reduction in fleet size could not be achieved simply at the expense of those countries with large tuna industries, which had invested a great deal in the fisheries sector. He suggested the level of real investment as the basis for determining the capacity for each country, and also proposed that the carrying capacity for individual vessels be limited to 1,500 mt and net depth to 25 fathoms, and that the entry of new vessels to the fishery be prohibited. The United States shared some of the concerns expressed regarding an increase in fleet capacity, but agreed that the rights of the coastal states should be taken into account. He proposed that the Working Group agree on initial capacity limits acceptable to all first, recognizing that in the short term the capacity could increase, and then address the long-term aspects of the problem, implementing a progressive reduction.

The European Community supported this approach, but opposed the proposal to limit the size of vessels, arguing that larger vessels are no more harmful to the resource than any other vessel, but are simply more efficient economically. It viewed these proposals as protectionist measures which curbed free competition and were designed to exclude the European Community from the fishery.

Guatemala commented that it was important to leave open the possibility of the technological progress that these large vessels represented.

The heads of delegations met in closed session, and prepared a second draft proposal (Appendix 2), based on the Chairman's proposal, reflecting some of the concerns expressed and proposals made. However, Mexico maintained the reservations expressed previously regarding the Chairman's proposal, and some specific inconsistencies it contained; Mexico recognized the rights of coastal states, but the proposed capacity allocations effectively allowed the fleet to grow unchecked.

El Salvador expressed concern about the lack of progress in the negotiations, noting that the 45-day voluntary extension of the limits imposed by the October 1998 resolution had expired. It also stated that it was requesting a capacity allocation of 4,000 mt for 2000-2001 and 5,000 mt for 2001-2002.

France noted that it was not included in the table of capacity allocations, and requested that its right to develop its tuna industry be recognized, as in the October 1998 resolution, with an allocation of 4,000 mt which France would undertake to not exceed.

There was a general agreement that requests by Costa Rica, Colombia, and Peru should be noted in a footnote to the draft resolution

The Ecuadorian and Mexican industries, observing that the increases in the draft resolution posed a threat to the sustainability of the resource, presented an alternative proposal (Appendix 3).

Honduras apologized for its late arrival, and stated that it had initiated the process of joining the IATTC and agreed to comply with the resolutions of the Commission.

World Wildlife Fund expressed its hope that the Working Group could agree on a permanent fleet capacity limit and on a plan to reduce the capacity progressively to 135,000 mt within a specified time frame. They were extremely concerned with the increased capacity in the new draft, and stressed the importance of recognizing that a capacity limit was a first step to managing the fisheries effectively, and needed to be agreed at this meeting.

It was not possible to resolve all the differences of opinion about the draft resolution contained in Appendix 2 at the meeting. The Working Group did agree on a more general resolution expressed (Appendix 4), without specific national limits, which recognized that the current fleet capacity was excessive and provided a time limit on the development and implementation of a

plan to reduce the capacity to a level compatible with the resource.

Several delegations expressed the importance of having the record show that “ongoing efforts” in the resolution adopted (Appendix 4) referred to the capacity limits in the second draft proposal (Appendix 2).

Colombia and the Organización del Sector Pesquero y Acuícola del Istmo Centroamericano (OSPESCA) both made statements (Appendices 5 and 6)

6. Other business

No other business was discussed.

7. Place and date of next meeting

To be decided later.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m. on Wednesday, August 2.

Appendix 1.

**INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION
COMISION INTERAMERICANA DEL ATUN TROPICAL**

**PERMANENT WORKING GROUP ON FLEET CAPACITY
GRUPO DE TRABAJO PERMANENTE SOBRE LA CAPACIDAD DE LA FLOTA**

**July 31-August 2, 2000 – 31 de julio-2 de agosto de 2000
Panamá, R.P.**

ASISTENTES - ATTENDEES

PAISES MIEMBROS – MEMBER COUNTRIES

COSTA RICA

**HERBERT NANNE ECHANDI
GEORGE HEIGOLD
INCOPECA**

**ASDRUBAL VAZQUEZ
SARDIMAR
JUAN MORA CERDAS
Buro Marítimo de Costa Rica**

ECUADOR

**RAFAEL TRUJILLO BEJARANO
LUIS TORRES NAVARRETE
Ministerio de Comercio, Industria y Pesca
RUBEN RIVADENEIRA
Embajada de Ecuador en Panamá
CESAR ROHON HERVAS
CARLOS CALERO CALDERON
ROBERTO AGUIRRE
Cámara Nacional de Pesquería**

**AGUSTIN JIMENEZ SANTISTEVAN
Pespaca-Pesquera del Pacifico C.A.
HECTOR G. VILLEGAS
TUNLO, S.A.
ABEL PALADINES
BERNARDO BUEHS
ATUNEC
BRUNO LEONE
Compañía Anilisa, S.A**

EL SALVADOR

**MARGARITA S. DE JURADO
JORGE SUAREZ
Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería**

**BORIS SANDOVAL
Consulado de El Salvador en Panamá
ABDON ENRIQUE AGUILLON
Ministerio de Economía**

FRANCE - FRANCIA

**PATRICK BOURSIN
FRANK TECOURT
Embajada de Francia en Panamá**

GUATEMALA

**JULIO HERNANDEZ ESTRADA
MAURICIO MEJIA ESCALANTE
Ministerio de Agricultura, Ganadería y
Alimentación
MARIELLA VELEZ DE GARCIA
Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores**

**MARIA OLGA MENENDEZ
AGEXPRONT
MANUEL ODILO ROMERO
Rianxeira America, S.A.**

JAPAN – JAPON

**NOBUYUKI YAGI
Embassy of Japan in Washington, D.C.**

**EIKO OZAKI
Fed. of Japan Tuna Fisheries Cooperative
Associations**

MEXICO

JERONIMO RAMOS PARDO
GUILLERMO COMPEAN JIMENEZ
Secretaría de Recursos Naturales y Medio Ambiente
CLAUDIO HERMOSILLO
Embajada de México en Panamá

JOSE JUAN VELAZQUEZ CARDENAS
ALFONSO ROSIÑOL
CARLOS HUSSONG
CANAINPESCA
JOSE CARRANZA
Pesca Azteca, S.A. de C.V.

NICARAGUA

MIGUEL ANGEL MARENCO
ADPESCA/MEDEPESCA

PANAMA

ARNULFO FRANCO
EPIMENIDES DIAZ
FERNANDO ALFARO
Autoridad Marítima de Panamá
LUIS DORATI
Tri-Marine International
HUGO ALSINA LAGOS
Overseas Tuna Pacific, S.A.
TRIGILIO GIANFRANCO
CONPESPASA/Gianfranco Agency, S.A.
LUIS SAN MIGUEL
ALEXIS SILVA
IGNACIO GOMEZ
Caribbean Fishing Trading S.A.

FOTIS LYMBEROPULOS
Julie L, S.A.
CIRIACO GAMECHO
IBON GAMECHO
ATUNBI, S.A.
ROY RIVERA
ROCMAR, S.A.
ANA MARIA LEGENDRE
VIRGINIA DE PIRRO
International MarConsult (IMC)
ALFONSO PAZ
San Marino Fishing, Inc./Genesis Fishing, Inc

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA - ESTADOS UNIDOS DE AMERICA

WILLIAM GIBBONS-FLY
BRENT STEWART
Department of State

PATRICIA DONLEY
National Marine Fisheries Service

VANUATU

MITZI GOMEZ
Jorge Fishing, Inc.

VENEZUELA

JEAN FRANCOIS PULVENIS
SANTOS VALERO
Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores
MABEL CAROLINA BELTRAN
LUIS MARRERO
Ministerio de la Producción y el Comercio
FELIX GASTON ALCALA
CAVENPESCA/MAVESA

CARMELINA GENTILE
Inversiones Navieras Condesa de los Mares C.A.
LILLO MANISCALCHI
FEDECAMARAS
INOCENCIO NATOLI
Armador

PAISES NO MIEMBROS – NON-MEMBER COUNTRIES

COLOMBIA

RAMON MARTINEZ DE LEON
Embajada de Colombia en Panamá
CLARA GAVIRIA
Ministerio de Comercio Exterior
ARMANDO HERNANDEZ RODRIGUEZ
Cámara de Pesca - ANDI
ALVARO BUSTAMANTE STEER
ATUNEC

ALVARO NAVARRO COLEY
Atunes y Enlatados del Caribe
HUGO MARINO VILLA
GUILLERMO DAW
Grupo Alimentario de la Costa
MAYRA SOTOMAYOR CONSUEGRA
C.I. Vikingos de Colombia S.A

ESPAÑA - SPAIN

ERNESTO RIOS
Secretaría General de Pesca Marítima
JULIO MORON
OPAGAC
JOAQUIN GOMEZ VILLEGAS
ALBACORA, S.A.

MANUEL CALVO
CalvoPesca, S.A.
ESTANISLAO GARAVILLA
Conservas Garavilla, S.A.

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY- COMUNIDAD EUROPEA

ERNESTO PENAS LADO
European Commission

HONDURAS

SERGIO GIRON SANCHEZ
Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería

PERU

ALFREDO CASTRO
JORGE LAZO
Embajada del Perú en Panamá

JORGE VERTIZ CALDERON
JORGE ZUZUÑAGA
EDUARDO PASTOR
GLADYS CARDENAS
Ministerio de Pesquería

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS - ORGANIZACIONES INTERNACIONALES

VIELKA MORALES
OSPESCA

MARIO GONZALEZ RECINOS
SICA-OSPESCA

NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS - ORGANIZACIONES NO GUBERNAMENTALES

ANDY OLIVER
World Wildlife Fund

ALEJANDRO ROBLES
Conservation International-México

IATTC - CIAT

ROBIN ALLEN, Director
PABLO ARENAS
MARCELA CAMPA

BRIAN HALLMAN
BERTA JUAREZ
NICK WEBB

Appendix 2.

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE CAPACITY OF THE TUNA FLEET OPERATING IN THE EASTERN PACIFIC OCEAN

02 AUGUST 2000

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

Aware that the issue of excess fishing capacity is of concern worldwide and is the subject of an International Plan of Action developed by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization;

Understanding that excess fishing capacity in a region makes it more difficult for governments to agree on and implement effective conservation and management measures for the fisheries of that region;

Concerned that fishing capacity in the eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO) has been increasing in recent years;

Believing that it is important to limit fishing capacity in the EPO in order to help ensure that the tuna fisheries in the region are conducted at a sustainable level;

Aware of the importance of tuna fishing to the economic development of the Parties, in particular the coastal states;

Committed to giving full effect to the relevant rules of international law, as reflected in the United Nations Law of the Sea Convention, including the rights and obligations of coastal states;

Recalling the resolution of the 62nd Meeting of the IATTC to limit the capacity of the tuna purse-seine fleet in the EPO during 1999;

Considering the conservation and management measures adopted by the IATTC, including measures related to fishing on fish-aggregating devices, and the prohibitions on the use of tender vessels and transshipments at sea; and

Seeking to address the problem of excess capacity in the tuna purse-seine fleet operating in the EPO by limiting such capacity to a level which, when viewed in relation to other agreed management measures and projected and actual levels of catch, will ensure that tuna fisheries in the region are conducted at a sustainable level:

Have agreed as follows:

1. For the purposes of this Resolution, the EPO is defined as the area bounded by the coastline of the American continent, the 40° North parallel, the 150° West meridian and the 40° South parallel.
2. To include in the Regional Vessel Register, contemplated in the resolution of the 66th Meeting of the Commission, the well volume in cubic meters and carrying capacity in metric tons that will serve as a basis for any decision on the capacity of the EPO fleet.
3. To limit, together with those states or regional economic integration organizations (REIOs) which have applied for membership of the Commission, the carrying capacity of their respective tuna purse-seine fleets operating in the EPO, in accordance with the following table:

	Carrying capacity (metric tons)
Colombia*	8,608
Costa Rica*	8,000
Ecuador	34,500
El Salvador	4,000
United States	8,969
Guatemala	5,050
Mexico	50,048
Nicaragua	4,000
Panama	5,600
European Union	9,595
Vanuatu	12,121
Venezuela	25,975
TOTAL	176,466

4. To recognize that Peru, which is not a High Contracting Party of the Commission but which is cooperating with the conservation and management measures of the Commission, has agreed to limit the carrying capacity of its tuna purse-seine fleet to 3,500 metric tons of carrying capacity*.
5. To not include in the Regional Vessel Register vessels flying the flags of states or REIOs that have not applied for membership of the Commission or that do not cooperate with the management and conservation measures adopted by the Commission.
6. To prohibit the entry of new vessels to the EPO purse-seine fleet except in the following cases: 1) to allow [El Salvador and Nicaragua to utilize] [the utilization of] the capacity assigned [to them] pursuant to this resolution; and 2) to replace vessels removed from the fleet, provided that any replacement does not result in the total capacity of any country's fleet exceeding the limit established for that country pursuant to this resolution.
7. [Vessels entering the fishery for the first time pursuant to paragraph 6 shall not exceed 1,500 metric tons or 2,100 cubic meters of well capacity. A one-time exception to this prohibition shall be allowed in the case of El Salvador.]
8. Notwithstanding the capacity limits set forth above, the Parties and states or REIOs that have applied for membership of the Commission acknowledge that the current level of fishing capacity is in excess of the optimal level required to efficiently harvest the tuna resources in the EPO. In this regard, they agree to develop and implement a plan to achieve a target level of 135,000 metric tons of carrying capacity, or such other limit as the Commission may decide, by January 1, 2005, as set forth in the following paragraph.
9. The Parties request that the IATTC staff, in cooperation with the Parties, prepare a comprehensive draft plan for regional management of fishing capacity in accordance with the FAO International Plan of Action for the Management of Fishing Capacity. The plan, once adopted, will serve as the basis for further action by the Commission with respect to the distribution and allocation of capacity within the EPO tuna fleet and, in particular, for achieving the reduction in overall fleet capacity set forth in paragraph 8 above.

This plan shall include an assessment of the impact of vessels of less than 250 metric tons carrying capacity on the fishery resources of the EPO with a view to considering how these vessels should be

* Costa Rica, Colombia, and Peru maintain long-term capacity requests of 14,030 mt, 12,000 mt, and 12,000 mt, respectively.

treated under the capacity limits adopted pursuant to this resolution.

In order to manage the fleet capacity better, the plan shall also take into account other relevant measures for managing the fishery, in particular measures [related to] [limiting] the use of fish-aggregating devices and the characteristics of fishing nets.

The plan shall also address the matter of the transfer of vessels included in the Regional Vessel Register among the states and REIO contemplated in this resolution.

10. Pending the development of the plan referred to in Paragraph 9, vessels included in the Regional Vessel Register may transfer to another state or REIO contemplated in this resolution with the mutual agreement of the states or REIO involved in the transfer with respect to the disposition of the corresponding carrying capacity, provided that there is no net increase in the sum of the respective capacity limits of those states or REIO.
11. As Belize and Honduras have not expressed an active interest in joining the IATTC or cooperating with the management and conservation measures adopted by the Commission, the Parties cannot continue to recognize the capacity allocations for these two states specified in the resolution of October 1998. Vessels flying the flags of these states, up to the capacity referred to in the October 1998 resolution for each of these states, may change flag to a state covered by this resolution. In such case, the capacity associated with the vessel shall be added to the capacity of the state to which the vessel is flagged.
12. From January 1, 2001, the implementation of this Resolution shall be evaluated by the Compliance Working Group.
13. The capacity levels established above shall not apply to a limit of 32 United States vessels authorized and licensed to fish in other areas of the Pacific Ocean under an alternative international fisheries management regime, and that may occasionally fish to the east of 150° West, provided that: a) the fishing activity of any such vessels in the EPO is limited to a single trip not to exceed 90 days in one calendar year; b) the vessels do not possess a Dolphin Mortality Limit; and c) the vessels carry an approved observer. A similar exception shall be considered for vessels from other countries with a similar record of participation in the EPO tuna purse-seine fishery and that meet the criteria listed above.
14. The Parties also acknowledge that France has expressed an interest in developing a tuna purse-seine fleet on behalf of its overseas territories in the EPO. Nothing in this resolution shall be considered to limit the right of France to develop such a fleet to the extent that such vessels are not operating under the jurisdiction of the European Union.

Appendix 3.

PROPOSAL BY THE FISHING INDUSTRY OF MEXICO AND ECUADOR

2 August 2000

The fishing industry of Mexico and Ecuador express their concern and do not accept the increase in the fleet quota because it goes against the interests of the sustainability of the recourse in accordance with the FAO Plan of Action for Development and the future of the industry, the fleet, and the generation of jobs.

We consider that fishing should be regulated in a global manner, on the basis of the actual existing capacity of 166,974 tons without increasing the capacity of the fleet, for which we propose:

1. No more vessels to enter the EPO.
2. Operative vessels no greater than 1,500 metric tons
3. Nets no greater than 22 strips deep
4. Respecting IATTC resolutions prohibiting the use of tender vessels, transshipments, etc.
5. Reduce and allocate the number of FADs per vessel, to which end the Commission shall present a study, for which we suggest a maximum number of 80 FADs per vessel.
6. Support the management of vessels of Classes 1 to 3 by the coastal states within their Exclusive Economic Zones
7. Maintain the moratorium on the fleet pending a permanent rational agreement that does not increase the capacity of the fleet, for which we propose the following mechanism
 - a. Mexico and Ecuador reduce or transfer 10% of their fleet capacity to countries that request development of their fleets
 - b. The support of Venezuela, Vanuatu, and the United States is hoped for to reach a suitable figure which will allow greater development if deserving investments on land are verified or to maintain a reserve buffer for decreasing of the capacity of the fleet in accordance with the IATTC reduction goal.
 - c. The adjustment requested by the European Union for its fleet is recognized.
 - d. Mexico supplies or transfers 6,000 tons to be distributed equitably to the Central American countries that have expressed their interest in participating in the fishery.
 - e. Ecuador transfers 3,500 tons to Colombia.
8. Establish a quota for bigeye for the fleet currently operating, this procedure will be established by the Commission in the same manner in which the Dolphin Mortality Limits are assigned.

Appendix 4.

INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION

**RESOLUTION ON THE CAPACITY OF THE TUNA FLEET OPERATING IN THE EASTERN
PACIFIC OCEAN**

19 August 2000

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

1. To call attention to the problem of excess capacity in the tuna purse-seine fleet in the eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO).
2. To endeavor to limit the total fleet capacity at levels which will ensure the sustainability of the tuna fisheries of the EPO.
3. To monitor, through the Permanent Working Group on Fleet Capacity, the capacity of the tuna purse-seine fleet operating in the EPO and consider any recommendations made by the Working Group. Given that the total fleet capacity is at a level which, without other measures, would adversely affect the level of sustainable catches of the tuna fisheries in the EPO, the Parties shall continue to consider action to ensure the sustainability of the fisheries.
4. To include in the Regional Vessel Register, contemplated in the resolution of the 66th Meeting of the Commission, the well volume in cubic meters and carrying capacity in metric tons that will serve as a basis for monitoring the capacity of the EPO fleet.
5. To not include in the Regional Vessel Register vessels flying the flags of states or regional economic integration organizations (REIOs) that have not applied for membership of the Commission or that do not cooperate with the management and conservation measures adopted by the Commission.
6. That the current level of fishing capacity is in excess of the optimal level required to efficiently harvest the tuna resources in the EPO. In this regard, they agree to develop and implement a plan to achieve a target level of 135,000 metric tons of carrying capacity, or such other limit as the Commission may decide, by January 1, 2005, as set forth in the following paragraph.
7. To request that the IATTC staff, in cooperation with the Parties, prepare a comprehensive draft plan for regional management of fishing capacity in accordance with the FAO International Plan of Action for the Management of Fishing Capacity. The plan, once adopted, will serve as the basis for further action by the Commission with respect to the distribution and allocation of capacity within the EPO tuna fleet and, in particular, for achieving a reduction in overall fleet capacity.
8. To acknowledge and affirm the right of coastal states and other states with a longstanding and significant interest in the tuna fisheries of the EPO to develop and maintain their own tuna fishing industries.
9. To acknowledge the commitment of each state and REIO to limit the capacity of its fleet operating in the EPO to a level consistent with the ongoing efforts of the Commission to establish a limit on the total capacity of the tuna purse-seine fleet operating in the EPO, and efforts to develop a capacity management plan pursuant to paragraphs 6 and 7 above.

Appendix 5.

STATEMENT BY THE DELEGATION OF COLOMBIA

**4th Meeting of the IATTC Permanent Working Group on Fleet Capacity
Panama City, 2 August 2000**

The Delegation of Colombia ratifies again the position presented at the various meetings of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC) and reiterates its reservation and disagreement with the capacity allocation in the draft Resolution agreed by the Working Group, since this is not congruent with Colombia's legitimate rights as a coastal state.

Colombia not only has sovereign rights over its Exclusive Economic Zone as a coastal state but also, in accordance with international treaties, enjoys the right to carry out fishing activities within its jurisdictional waters and on the high seas, and therefore, regional fisheries management agreements must respect the preferential status recognized for such states and in particular for developing countries, as in the case of our country.

In this context, it must be noted that cooperation among States should recognize the countries' need to improve capacity to utilize fisheries resources, including access to such resources, since this has repercussions on the generation of jobs, the food supply and economic growth.

The technical study prepared by the IATTC Secretariat, in response to the express request of the various delegations, without taking into account interests unrelated to a suitable measure for the preservation of the tuna resource, which took into account aspects such as catch of tunas within national Exclusive Economic Zones in the eastern Pacific Ocean; total catch of tunas in the EPO by national fleets; utilization of tuna caught in the EPO by processing plants on land; average carrying capacity of the fleet and economic considerations, resulted in an allocation of 10,984 tons, very close to the Colombian request of 12,000 tons.

Tuna is Colombia's main fisheries resource, generating more than 16,500 jobs, 70% of which are women heads of household, as well as significant and growing exports. It is also an important source of food for its population which is experiencing difficulties known to the international community.

Taking into account Colombia's legitimate rights and aspirations, we request that any resolution adopted expressly include the following: **"Colombia maintains its request for 12,000 tons of fleet capacity."**

We respectfully request that this statement be included in the final report of the IATTC Working Group and that it be noted in any draft resolution on this matter which may be presented to the Members of this Commission.

Appendix 6.

STATEMENT BY THE CENTRAL AMERICAN COUNTRIES

4th Meeting of the IATTC Permanent Working Group on Fleet Capacity Panama City, 2 August 2000

The Delegations of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and Panama, members of the Organización del Sector Pesquero y Acuícola del Istmo Centroamericano (OSPESCA);

CONSIDERING:

1. That with the aim of generating jobs, foreign exchange, improving food and nutritional security to raise the level and quality of life of our inhabitants, in recent years have made efforts to achieve the development of the fishing sector and y particularly of the tuna industry, fishery whose benefits most of the nations of the region have not enjoyed.
2. That as members of and participants in the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC) we have made and continue to make efforts to reach rational agreements on carrying capacity in the Eastern Pacific Ocean, together with the other participating countries;
3. That at all times the intention of Central America that such agreements be commonly agreed and equitable for the benefit of all the member countries of and participants in the IATTC has been manifest
4. That in the face of the inflexibility of certain extraregional countries which historically have exploited these resources, regarding the real, just and sovereign expectations of development of this fishery to which we Central American countries also are entitled;

DECLARE:

- I. That we six Central American countries will continue to develop our fisheries for the benefit of our populations, including the incorporation of clean technological innovations;
- II. Our firm resolve to take into account the principles that guarantee a sustainable development of the fisheries resources and in particular of highly migratory species, respecting management criteria such as the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fishing;
- III. Our disposition to continue the dialogue with the other countries participating in the Commission in order to harmonize criteria for the sustainable development of this fishery, taking into account our sovereign right to the utilization of the resources of highly migratory species.