

AGREEMENT THE INTERNATIONAL DOLPHIN CONSERVATION PROGRAM

MINUTES OF THE SIXTH MEETING OF THE PARTIES

Cartagena (Colombia)

29 October 2001

AGENDA

1. Opening of meeting
2. Election of Chairman
3. Adoption of agenda
4. Report of the International Review Panel
5. Proposed amendments to Annex IV of the AIDCP:
 - a. Section III (4): concurrence with a possible infraction
 - b. Section III (2): dates of reallocation of DMLs
 - c. Section II (1): determination of *force majeure* exemptions by the IRP
6. Per-stock per-year dolphin mortality caps
7. Assessment fees for Bolivian vessels
8. Establishment of an IATTC-AIDCP Joint Working Group on Fishing by Non-Parties
9. Other business
10. Place and date of next meeting
11. Adjournment

DOCUMENTS

MOP-6-04 AIDCP budget for 2002 and 2003

MOP-6-06 Allocation of per-stock, per-year dolphin mortality caps

APPENDICES

1. List of attendees
2. Report of the Presider of the 28th Meeting of the IRP
3. Observations on case 2001-375
4. Proposed amendments to Annex IV of the AIDCP

1. Opening of the meeting

The meeting was opened on October 29, 2001, by Dr. Robin Allen, Director of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC), which serves as the Secretariat to the Agreement on the International Dolphin Conservation Program. The attendees are listed in Appendix 1.

2. Election of Chairman

Dr. Isabel Cuervo, Secretary General of the Ministry of Foreign Trade of Colombia, was elected to chair the meeting. During the meeting she relinquished the position to Mr. Gonzalo Jiménez, of the Ministry of Foreign Relations of Colombia.

3. Adoption of the agenda

The provisional agenda was adopted with the deletion of item 9 (*U.S. decision framework for determining “significant adverse impact” on dolphin stocks*), with the undertaking that the matter would be addressed during the next Meeting of the Parties.

4. Report of the International Review Panel

The Presider of the 28th meeting of the IRP, Mr. Fabio Ávila, presented the report of that meeting (Appendix 2).

The Parties noted the recommendation of the IRP that the requests for DMLs received after the October 1 deadline be approved, and decided to discuss this further under the *Other business*.

The Parties discussed, as a separate matter, the situation of late DML requests from Bolivia. Bolivia explained that it was not able to meet the October 1 deadline for DML requests because it had formally agreed to provisionally apply the AIDCP on October 16, and asked for special consideration for approval of its DML requests so that its flag vessels could operate with DMLs and in accordance with the AIDCP during 2002. The Parties agreed to this request.

With regard to point 3 of the Presider’s Report, *Measuring performance in reducing dolphin mortality*, the Parties approved the Secretariat’s proposal regarding how to measure performance in reducing dolphin mortality.

With regard to point 5 of the Report, the Secretariat presented the two tables requested by the IRP, one with the IATTC contribution and one without, showing costs, revenue, proposed savings, and calculations of assessments on an equal basis, seeking to eliminate the deficit. These tables were discussed thoroughly by the meeting, and in the end the Parties asked that some of the information relating to costs be broken down into finer detail for discussion at the next meeting of the IRP. The Parties decided that, until any further decision is made on the matter, the vessel assessments would remain at US\$12.55 per cubic meter for all vessels and that all vessels would pay at that same rate.

Regarding point 6 of the report, the Chair noted that the IRP had sent to the Meeting of the Parties, for discussion and possible action, the disposition of case 2001-375, which involved a set with very high dolphin mortality. Dr. Allen presented a document entitled *Observations on case 2001-375* (Appendix 3), prepared by the government under whose jurisdiction the vessel was operating when the event occurred and explaining the actions taken.

After a very lengthy discussion, the Parties decided upon the following course of action:

1. The captain of the vessel would be permanently removed from the list of qualified captains. The Secretariat would inform the Parties of the name of the captain, and no Party would request that he be added to the list of qualified captains in the future.
2. The government under whose jurisdiction the vessel was operating at the time of the set in question should ensure the full application of Article XVI of the AIDCP, which addresses

compliance.

3. If the relevant government determines that the vessel continued to set on dolphins after the set in question, this would be considered to constitute a pattern of violations pursuant to the AIDCP, and in accordance with paragraph 7, Section I, Annex IV of the Agreement, the vessel would not be eligible to receive a DML for 2002.
4. The Secretariat would draft technical guidelines, for presentation at the next meeting of the IRP, designed to prevent high mortality in sets on large dolphin herds.

5. Proposed amendments to Annex IV of the AIDCP

The Secretariat presented a document containing three proposals for amendment of Annex IV of the AIDCP (Appendix 4). The Parties approved the second one, relating to paragraphs (2) and (3) of Section III of Annex IV, which establishes dates for the reallocation of DMLs, and thus the Agreement is considered amended as proposed as of October 29, 2001.

There was no objection in principle expressed by any Party to the first amendment proposed by the Secretariat, relating to paragraph 4 of Section III, which deals with the concurrence of Parties with possible infractions, but the meeting decided to defer formal action on the proposal until the next Meeting of the Parties.

With regard to third amendment proposed by the Secretariat, relating to paragraph 1 of Section II, which deals with decisions on *force majeure* exemptions, several delegations suggested modifications to the language proposed by the Secretariat, and it was decided to consider an amended proposal at the next meeting of the Meeting of the Parties.

6. Per-stock per-year dolphin mortality caps

The Secretariat presented document MOP-6-06 (attached), in which three options are proposed for the allocation of Stock Mortality Limits (SMLs):

1. The current system of global allocations;
2. Allocate SMLs in proportion to the country's DML;
3. Take into account the number of sets made on a stock by a country's fleet during the previous year and its DMLs for the following year.

The Parties agreed to discuss and analyze the proposal during the next Meeting of the Parties, following additional technical analysis by the Parties and discussions with IATTC staff.

7. Assessment fees for Bolivian vessels

Even though it had only acceded to the AIDCP very recently, the Parties agreed that, in accordance with the Agreement and past practice, Bolivia be required to pay the entire assessments for 2001 for its vessels, and not a prorated amount, as Bolivia had requested.

8. Establishment of an IATTC-AIDCP Joint Working Group on Fishing by Non-Parties

The Parties agreed to accept the resolution adopted by the IATTC in El Salvador during its 68^a Meeting to establish a joint IATTC-AIDCP working group on fishing by non-Parties, and agreed that the Secretariat should draft the terms of reference for this working group.

9. Other business

The question of the late requests for allocation of DMLs made by Colombia and Peru was broached, and the matter was discussed at length.

Some delegations expressed the view that late DML requests should not be accepted, either now or in the

future, since the Agreement establishes the clear deadline of October 1 for completing the required process for requesting allocation of DMLs for each country's fleet. While no delegation disagreed that this is the correct interpretation of the way the AIDCP should be implemented, some expressed the view that it was better to demonstrate flexibility regarding these particular late requests.

Ecuador pointed out that if the intention was to apply the Agreement strictly with regard to the date for submitting requests for DMLs, then the provision of the Agreement regarding the payments that should accompany such requests should also be applied strictly, since that is established as an essential requirement for the allocation of DMLs, and that none of the Parties had complied with this to date, and thus no country was entitled to be assigned a DML for its fleet.

In the end, the meeting agreed to accept the late DML requests, but asked that the record of the meeting reflect that this was an exceptional agreement not to be repeated in future.

10. Place and date of next meeting

The Parties agreed that their next meeting would be held in conjunction with the meeting of the IATTC scheduled for June 2002 in Mexico.

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned on 29 October 2001.

Appendix 1.

**INTERNATIONAL DOLPHIN CONSERVATION PROGRAM
PROGRAMA INTERNACIONAL PARA LA CONSERVACIÓN DE LOS DELFINES
6ª REUNION DE LAS PARTES--6TH MEETING OF THE PARTIES**

**29 de octubre de 2001– October 29, 2001
Cartagena (Colombia)**

ASISTENTES - ATTENDEES

BOLIVIA

YERKO GARAFULIC

Ministerio de Agricultura, Ganadería y Desarrollo Rural

COLOMBIA

ANA ISABEL CUERVO

CLARA GAVIRIA

MARIA EUGENIA LLOREDA

Ministerio de Comercio Exterior

FABIO AVILA ARAUJO

IVAN DARIO ESCOBAR

Instituto Nacional de Pesca y Acuicultura

GONZALO JIMENEZ

ANYURIVET DAZA

Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores

MARY LUZ CAÑON

HECTOR LEAL

ROSALBA VARGAS

Dirección General Marítima

ESTHER JULIA

PROEXPORT

ARMANDO HERNANDEZ

ANDI

ALVARO BUSTAMANTE S.

ALVARO BUSTAMANTE C.

ATUNEC

DIEGO CANELOS

ATUNAMAR

HUGO MARINO

GUILLEMO DAW

GRALCO

AUGUSTO ZARATE

Seatech International, Inc.

EDGAR ROMERO VASQUEZ

LUIS LOPEZ MARRUGO

C.I. Vikingos de Colombia, S.A.

GABRIEL CABRALES

SALTUN

JOHNNY ORDOSGOITIA

Asertunes Ltda.

COSTA RICA

HERBERT NANNE ECHANDI

ASDRÚBAL VASQUEZ

JOSE LUIS ARAYA

INCOPECA

ECUADOR

RAFAEL TRUJILLO BEJARANO

LUIS TORRES NAVARRETE

Ministerio de Comercio Exterior,

Industrialización y Pesca

BERNARDO BUEHS

ATUNEC

JUAN CARLOS CALERO

DANILO COTRINO

Conservas Isabel Ecuatoriana, S.A.

JOSE LUIS FLORES

Seafman

LUIS E. GARCIA

LEGALSA, S.A.

EL SALVADOR

SONIA SALAVERRIA

CORALIA MOREIRA

Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería

EUROPEAN UNION – UNION EUROPEA

ROBERTO CESARI

European Commission

JUAN IGNACIO ARRIBAS

Ministerio de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentación

JAVIER ARIZ TELLERIA

Instituto Español de Oceanografía

GABRIEL SARRO

OPAGAC

GUATEMALA

FRATERO DIAZ

UNIPESCA

ODILO ROMERO

RIANXEIRA AMERICA, S.A.

MEXICO

MARA MURILLO

RICARDO BELMONTES

PEDRO ULLOA

Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería, Desarrollo Rural,
Pesca y Alimentación

LUIS FUEYO

SEMARNAT/PROFEPA

ERNESTO ESCOBAR

Pesca Azteca S.A. de C.V.

PANAMA

ARNULFO FRANCO

Autoridad Marítima

LUIS DORATI

MANUEL ZITO

Tri-Marine International

PERU

JULIO GONZALES

Ministerio de Pesquería

GLADYS CARDENAS

Instituto del Mar del Perú

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA - ESTADOS UNIDOS DE AMERICA

DAVID HOGAN

Department of State

VANUATU

HUGO ALSINA LAGOS

Office of Deputy Commissioner of Maritime Affairs

VENEZUELA

ALVIN DELGADO

Programa Nacional de Observadores

JON CELAYA

PROATUN

FRANCISCO ORTISI

JUAN MORA CERDAS

ATUMAR, S.A.

ORGANIZACIONES NO GUBERNAMENTALES--NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

NINA YOUNG

The Ocean Conservancy

ANDY OLIVER

World Wildlife Fund

SECRETARIADO – SECRETARIAT

ROBIN ALLEN, Director

DAVID BRATTEN

MARTHA GOMEZ

JOSHUE GROSS

BRIAN HALLMAN

BERTA JUAREZ

NICHOLAS WEBB

Appendix 2.

INTERNATIONAL DOLPHIN CONSERVATION PROGRAM INTERNATIONAL REVIEW PANEL 28TH MEETING

CARTAGENA (COLOMBIA)
OCTOBER 25-26, 2001

PRESIDER'S REPORT TO THE 6TH MEETING OF THE PARTIES

During its 28th Meeting, the IRP agreed to forward to the Meeting of the Parties for its consideration the following:

1. Agenda Item 6, *Review of vessels qualified to receive DMLs for 2002*:
 - a. the vessels whose requests for DMLs were received after the October 1 deadline should be considered qualified, but that Parties should in future make every effort to meet this deadline.
 - b. the vessel with two registrations clarify its status as soon as possible.
 - c. the vessels that have applied for DMLs but which were identified at the meeting as not yet qualified (including those whose captains are not on the list of AIDCP qualified captains) be considered qualified if they fulfil the requirements for qualification for a DML before the end of 2001.
 - d. the request by Venezuela for a DML for a vessel that is being purchased should be given favorable consideration, subject to the vessel being qualified at the time it is brought into the national fleet.
2. Agenda Item 7, *Determination of a pattern of violations*: the Secretariat was asked to add items to the table in the document *Confirmed infractions by vessels, 1999-2001*, and provide an analysis to the next meeting of the IRP.
3. Agenda Item 8, *Measuring performance in reducing dolphin mortality*: that the system for measuring performance proposed by the Secretariat be adopted.
4. Agenda Item 9, *Comparison of observer programs*: the Parties concerned shall strive to eliminate any differences in the results of the various components of the On-Board Observer Program.
5. Agenda Item 10, *Review of vessel assessments*: that the Parties should decide upon the level of vessel assessments for 2002. To assist in this effort, the Secretariat was asked to prepare two tables, one with the IATTC contribution and one without, showing costs, revenue, proposed savings, and calculations of assessments on an equal basis, seeking to eliminate the deficit.

The following elements shall be taken into account by the Secretariat for reducing costs: number of meetings, place of meetings (it is proposed that they should all be in La Jolla), and as far as possible ask the members to send small delegations.
6. Agenda Item 11, *Review of observer data*: that case no 2001-375 be reviewed by the Parties with a view to ensuring full compliance with the Agreement and to determining the effect of this case on the allocation of DMLs relevant to this case. United States proposes that in cases of sets with high mortality a mechanism for immediate verification should be established.
7. Agenda Item 14, *Report of the Permanent Working Group on Tuna Tracking*:
 - a. Tuna Tracking Forms (TTFs):
 - i. The Parties should strengthen their efforts to ensure that the original TTFs are collected, that a copy is sent to the flag state if necessary, and that the original is sent to the Secretariat

- within the period specified, and should consider whether a Party's failure to improve its performance in this respect should have consequences;
- ii. The Secretariat shall elaborate a flow chart illustrating the Tuna Tracking System and report to the Working Group on the *AIDCP Dolphin Safe* certificates issued and the corresponding TTFs received.
- b. Promotion and publicity of the *AIDCP Dolphin Safe* label:
 - i. The interested Parties should make every effort to both implement and promote the certification system as soon as possible;
 - ii. The Secretariat shall prepare for the next meeting of the Working Group a separate budget for a one-year campaign to promote the *AIDCP Dolphin Safe* label, whose cost will be borne by the interested Parties, including two visits to Europe and hiring a public relations firm.
 - c. The Secretariat shall redraft its proposal for collection of TTF data by observers outside the Agreement Area presented in document TT-8-06, taking account of the discussion at the meeting, in particular the idea of segregating tuna caught outside the Agreement Area.
 - d. The Secretariat shall communicate with those governments that have not yet submitted their National Tuna Tracking plans to urge them to do so before the next meeting of the Working Group.
8. Agenda Item 15, *Legal procedures for observers*: the Secretariat shall circulate the document presented by Mexico to the Parties, the Parties will provide any comments to the Government of Mexico, and the issue will be addressed at the next meeting of the IRP.
 9. Agenda Item 16, *Other business*:
 - a. the Secretariat shall examine the levels of dolphin mortality since 1999 and provide to the next meeting of the IRP proposals for reducing incidental dolphin mortalities, in accordance with the objectives of the AIDCP. These levels shall be presented in two tables, one including sets with high mortality and the other without.
 - b. to review the procedures for dealing with Special Problem Sets under the La Jolla Agreement at its next meeting and consider using those procedures when reviewing such sets in future.
 10. Agenda Item 17, *Place and date of next meeting*: the Panel decided to hold its 29th meeting in La Jolla, California, on 31 January and 1 February 2002.

Appendix 3.

Report: OBSERVATIONS ON CASE 2001 – 375

I. INTRODUCTION

Taking into account the lack of clarity regarding the report presented to the 28th Meeting of the International Review Panel, on case 2001 – 375, the Party Nation presents to the Meeting of the Parties a summary of the investigation carried out by the competent national authority, in order that the Parties may have all the facts.

II. SUMMARY OF THE INVESTIGATION BY THE COMPETENT AUTHORITY

In connection with the communication from the Secretariat to the Government of the Party Nation on the set presented in Case 2001 – 375 and in accordance with the provisions of the AIDCP, the Government carried out the respective investigation in order to determine the truth of the events reported by the Secretariat.

Evidence for the investigation

The investigation was based on the review of documentary data, as well as on interviews conducted with the observer, the vessel captain, the fishing captain and the crew.

Both the testimony and the information supplied by the Vessel Captain, the Fishing Captain and the Crew coincide in stating that during set 35, due to the malfunctions, the current and to the “irrational” behavior of the dolphins, a chance accident occurred, resulting in the death of 60 dolphins. On the other hand, the observer’s report indicated a higher mortality of dolphins.

As in all investigations both the testimonial and documentary evidence was evaluated, to determine the mortality. This evaluation produced the following results:

Regarding the suitability of the Observer it was established that: i) He is an administrative employee of the IATTC, a systems analyst who develops computer programs at the Secretariat; ii) It was his first trip, which shows his lack of experience and skill for the collection of data aboard a vessel; iii) He was not trained at a regular IATTC course; iv) In contravention of his functions and on his own initiative, he jumped into the water to help save the dolphins; and v) the observer himself accepted in his statement his unsuitability.

From the above, it is concluded that the observer was not a suitable person, nor was he sufficiently trained to carry out the functions of an observer. To which can be added the fact that he jumped into the sea and in rough waters, where it is very difficult for a person to observe and therefore, describe and record the events with accuracy.

Regarding the observer’s report, there are many incongruities with regard to the numbers recorded. First it indicates that a set was made on 3500 dolphins and the observer writes on page 5 of his report, corresponding to the mortality of dolphins and its causes that, “The Captain ordered the net to be cut and there some 1000 dolphins escaped, that was before backdown.” If the 3000 dolphins released by the backdown maneuver are added to this, plus 200 actively released, (as indicated in the same observer’s report) the total released is 4200. It is thus not understood how the observer establishes categorically that there was a higher mortality count, when the set was made only on 3500 and 4200 were released; mathematically he has no source for these numbers.

Furthermore, the crew’s estimate of the herd of mammals captured was 3000 dolphins and not the 3500 or 4000 indicated by the observer. So, if we use the highest mathematical number as a basis, we must start at 4000, during backdown 3000 dolphins were released, when the net was ripped 1000 were released and 200 actively, with this number crossed out and changed to 150. The total number of dolphins released is then 4200 or 4150.

Another contradiction appears on the same page 5, when he writes that there was a mortality of 200 dolphins due to entanglement, when earlier on page 2 he wrote that there were only 20 dolphins entangled. The question would be where did the other 180 additional dolphins appear from.

On the other hand, it cannot be clearly established that the observer indicated to the fishing captain that he had exceeded the DML, since although the observer's report indicates that the captain was advised of this, the statements of the captains and the crew contradict this and furthermore, in the observer's report, this was included by the field office after the trip had terminated.

From the above it is concluded that apparently there was mortality in the set due to the adverse weather conditions, as confirmed by the captains and crew saying that there were 60 dolphins killed, but it is not possible to accept the mortality determined by the observer, given that in addition to not being a person qualified for the job, he violated fundamental rules imposed on the observers and presented a report with inconsistencies in aspects fundamental to determining the true mortality of dolphins.

Sanctions imposed by the Party nation

In view of the observer's lack of professional qualities and the inconsistencies in the numbers presented in the observer's report, the competent national authority decided on the basis of the evidence established during the investigation and determined that the mortality had been 60 dolphins. Given this mortality the national authority, determined that the vessel, but not the Party Nation, had exceeded its DML and therefore, acting in accordance with the Agreement, decided to impose the following sanctions:

- i. Ordered the vessel to cease all sets on dolphins; and
- ii. Imposed a fine on the Captain equivalent to US\$ 123,912.00 (ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-THREE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND TWELVE DOLLARS), which is a high sum for the salary levels of the Party Nation.

The sanctions described were imposed in regard to what was really proved, the mortality of 60 dolphins. About everything for which there is no proof, there is doubt and in view of that doubt the Government must abstain from sanctioning, as a basic principle of national legislation and of international law.

In this regard, the sanctions imposed by the competent national authority are fully in accordance with the requirements of the Agreement and if these sanctions are compared, with those imposed by other Party Nations in similar cases, there is no doubt that they are the most severe sanctions imposed on a Captain and on a vessel in the history of the AIDCP. Without a doubt, the manner in which the competent authority proceeded, demonstrates the integrity of the Government of the Party Nation in applying the Agreement.

III. CONCLUSION

Taking into account that the investigation and the imposition of sanctions by the Party Nation were carried out in accordance with the Agreement and national legislation, and that it could only be established that there was a mortality of 60 dolphins, for which the respective sanctions were imposed; we ask the Parties, that respecting the principle of sovereignty that permeates the AIDCP, they determine that the Party Nation complied fully with the Agreement and that, even though the vessel involved in this case exceeded its DML, the Party Nation as such has not exceeded its DML. We also ask the Parties to respect the principle of confidentiality, a fundamental principle of the Agreement and essential to its proper functioning.

Appendix 4.

COMISION INTERAMERICANA DEL ATUN TROPICAL INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION

Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 8604 La Jolla Shores Drive, La Jolla CA 92037-1508, USA
Tel: (858) 546-7100 – Fax: (858) 546-7133 – www.iattc.org – Director: Robin L. Allen

September 20, 2001
Ref.: 0913-430

To: Participating Governments
From: Robin Allen, Director
Re: Proposed amendments to Annex IV of the AIDCP

During the 5th Meeting of the Parties to the AIDCP, held in El Salvador in June 2001, the Parties discussed various possible amendments to Annex IV of the AIDCP regarding the allocation of DMLs. The Secretariat has prepared the following draft proposals for consideration by the 6th Meeting of the Parties, scheduled for October 2001.

1. Annex IV, Section III, paragraph 4: Concurrence of Parties with possible infractions

- (a) During the discussion of the interpretation of Annex IV (III) (4) of the AIDCP regarding when a Party will be “deemed to have provided concurrence” with a possible violation, one delegation stated that a written statement by a Party that a case is under investigation should be considered an “objection” for the purposes of that section of the Agreement. No delegation disagreed with this interpretation; however, it was noted that an amendment to the AIDCP might be appropriate in order to avoid any possible ambiguity. Accordingly, the Secretariat has drafted the following amendment to Annex IV:

An additional sentence would be added to the end of Section III, paragraph 4, of Annex IV, so that the end of that paragraph would now read as follows:

“For infractions described in (a), (b), (c), (d), (f), and (g), a Party will be deemed to have provided such concurrence if it does not object to the IRP within six months of a referral of a possible violation from the IRP. For the infraction described in (e), a Party will be deemed to have provided such concurrence if it does not object to the IRP within 12 months of such referral.

A notification by a Party that the possible infraction is being investigated shall be considered to be an objection for the purposes of this paragraph, provided that the notification is received by the Secretariat prior to the expiration of the relevant 6 or 12 month period.”

- (b) The Secretariat suggests that the Parties may also wish to consider another amendment to the beginning of the same paragraph. The first sentence currently says that a vessel’s DML cannot be adjusted upward if certain infractions occurred “during that year or the previous year”; we suggest that it be amended to read “during that year or the previous **two years**”. This suggestion is based on the possibility that the current language could, in practice, render the entire paragraph meaningless because of the time required for the Secretariat to identify possible infractions, the IRP to review them, for the Secretariat to send notices to the governments, and for the governments to investigate and concur that an infraction has occurred. The Secretariat’s experience is that in most cases this process takes approximately two years, thus negating the intent of the entire paragraph.

The proposal would thus be to modify the first sentence of paragraph 4, Section III, of Annex IV to read as follows:

“4. No vessel may have its initial DML adjusted upward by any Party if the IRP had determined, and the Party with jurisdiction over the vessel concurs, that during that year or the previous **two years:**”

2. Annex IV, Section III, paragraphs 2 and 3: Dates for reallocation of DMLs

(a) The Parties agreed general guidelines for granting vessels the exemption of force majeure or extraordinary circumstances (attached). The Secretariat noted that the efficient application of these guidelines would require the amendment of Annex IV (III) (2) of the AIDCP, which currently requires the Director to reallocate unutilized DMLs by April 15. Since the guidelines anticipate possibly two rounds of communications with the Parties after April 1, this April 15 deadline in the Agreement should be changed to May 1 to allow sufficient time for the necessary communications with governments and for the subsequent reallocation calculations. It was generally agreed by the Parties that the AIDCP should be so amended..

The Secretariat proposes the following amendment to Annex IV:

The date in the first sentence of Section III, paragraph 2, of Annex IV of the AIDCP would be changed from April 15 to May 1. The amended text of this sentence would read as follows:

“2. No later than May 1 of each year, the full-year DMLs assigned to those vessels that have not utilized them, pursuant to Section II, or have otherwise forfeited them, shall be redistributed among the Parties by the Director, consistent with the formula established pursuant to Section I, paragraph 5, but after first adjusting such formula as set forth in subparagraphs (a), (b) and (c) below.”

(b) Also, although it was not discussed by the Parties during the meeting, the Secretariat suggests changing the date in the last sentence of Section III, paragraph 3, from May 5 to May 20 in order to allow sufficient time for the governments to adjust the DMLs. The amended text of this sentence would read as follows:

“3. A Party making such an adjustment shall so notify the Director no later than May 20, and no such adjustment shall take effect until the Director has been notified.”

3. Annex IV, Section II, paragraph 1: Decisions on *force majeure* exemptions

Several delegations expressed the view that, with the adoption of the general guidelines for allowing the exemption of *force majeure* or extraordinary circumstances, the Agreement should also be amended to reflect in a clear way how decisions are made by the IRP on such requests.

Accordingly, the Secretariat proposes amending Annex IV by adding a new penultimate sentence to Section II, paragraph 1. The amended text of this new paragraph would read as follows:

“1. Any vessel which is assigned a full-year DML and does not set on dolphins prior to April 1 of that year, or which is assigned a second-semester DML and does not set on dolphins by December 31 of that year, or which is assigned a per-trip DML from the RDA and does not set on dolphins during that trip, unless as a result of force majeure or extraordinary circumstances, as agreed by the IRP, shall lose its DML and may not set on dolphins for the remainder of that year. **Notwithstanding the provision in Annex VII, paragraph 9, regarding decision making by the IRP, a request by a Party, on behalf of any of its vessels, for an exemption due to *force majeure* or extraordinary circumstances, shall be considered to be agreed by the IRP unless a majority of the government members of the IRP supports a formal objection to any such request made by any other Party.** Any vessel that loses its DML on two consecutive occasions shall not be eligible to receive a DML for the following year.”

**GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR ALLOWING THE EXEMPTION OF FORCE
MAJEURE OR EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES**

June 2001

1. All requests for exemption contemplated under Section II of Annex IV of the AIDCP shall be sent to the Secretariat by April 1.
2. The Parties shall send the evidence necessary to demonstrate that the facts on which the request for exemption is based are unforeseeable or beyond the vessel owner's control.
3. The Secretariat shall immediately send the request to the other Parties for their consideration, duly coded in order to maintain the anonymity of the name, flag and owner of the vessel.
4. The request shall be considered accepted, unless a Party objects to it formally and with cause, in which case the Secretariat shall notify all Parties of the objection. The objection shall be considered accepted if it is supported by a majority of the government members of the International Review Panel.

AGREEMENT ON THE INTERNATIONAL DOLPHIN CONSERVATION PROGRAM
ACUERDO SOBRE EL PROGRAMA INTERNACIONAL PARA LA CONSERVACION
DE LOS DELFINES

6TH MEETING OF THE PARTIES
6ª REUNION DE LAS PARTES

CARTAGENA (COLOMBIA)
29 DE OCTUBRE DE 2001- OCTOBER 29, 2001

DOCUMENTO MOP-6-04

PRESUPUESTO DEL APICD PARA 2002 Y 2003

El PIR solicitó a la Secretaría preparar presupuestos alternativos ilustrando el efecto de un programa de reuniones reducido y de cuotas de buques iguales y diferenciadas para miembros y no miembros de la CIAT. En las Tablas 1-4 se presentan estas alternativas, basadas en la información presentada en el documento IRP-28-10, con las cuotas actuales y con cuotas incrementadas para eliminar los déficits en 2002 y 2003. Los costos en todas las tablas son las mismas, por lo que se presentan los rubros en la Tabla 1 solamente.

REDUCCION DEL PRESUPUESTO

En las tablas se han reducido los costos por concepto de reuniones de las Partes, el PIR, and Grupo de Trabajo sobre el Seguimiento del Atún por US\$20.000 con respecto al presupuesto presentado en el documento IRP-28-10, reflejando la estimación aproximada de la Secretaría de los ahorros que resultarían de celebrar dos reuniones de dos días para el PIR y el Grupo de Trabajo y una reunión de las Partes de un día en La Jolla, además de las reuniones en junio. El PIR pidió también un análisis más detallado de los rubros individuales del presupuesto presentado en el documento IRP-28-10 para permitir a las Partes considerar si sería posible eliminar algunos de los mismos. No es posible realizar este análisis en esta reunión, y será remitido a las Partes antes de la próxima reunión del PIR.

DOCUMENT MOP-6-04

AIDCP BUDGET FOR 2002 AND 2003

The IRP asked the Secretariat to prepare alternative budgets showing the effect of a reduced meeting schedule and equal and differential vessel assessments for IATTC members and non-members. Tables 1-4 show these alternatives, based on the information presented in Document IRP-28-10, with the current assessments and assessments which have been increased to eliminate the deficits in 2002 and 2003. The costs in each of the tables are the same, and consequently the line items are shown only in Table 1.

BUDGET REDUCTION

In the tables the costs for meetings of the Parties, the IRP, and the Tuna Tracking Working Group have been reduced by US\$20,000 compared to the budget presented in document IRP-28-10, reflecting the Secretariat's rough estimate of the savings resulting from holding two two-day meetings of the IRP and the Tuna Tracking Working Group and one one-day meeting of the Parties in La Jolla, in addition to the meetings in June. The IRP had also asked for a more detailed analysis of the line items of the budget presented in document IRP-28-10 to allow the Parties to consider whether there were any items that could be eliminated. This analysis cannot be accomplished at this meeting, and will be sent to the Parties before the next meeting of the IRP.

TABLA 1. Los déficits en el presupuesto del APICD en 2000 y 2001 (US\$180.084 y US\$100.411, respectivamente) fueron cubiertos por la CIAT. En su 68ª reunión la CIAT decidió que su contribución se limitaría al 30% de los costos asociados con el programa de observadores para buques de miembros de la CIAT solamente. Por lo tanto, los ingresos en 2002 y 2003 de la CIAT son inferiores a los de los años anteriores, con déficits resultantes de US\$149.810 y US\$198.164, respectivamente. Las cuotas para 2002 reflejan las cantidades facturadas por la Secretaría, con cuotas diferenciales para buques de no miembros. Los costos e ingresos para 2001, 2002 y 2003 son estimaciones.

TABLE 1. The AIDCP budget deficits in 2000 and 2001 (US\$180,084 and US\$100,411, respectively) have been covered by the IATTC. At its 68th meeting the IATTC decided that its contribution should be limited to 30% of the costs associated with the observer program for vessels of IATTC members only. Accordingly, the revenue in 2002 and 2003 from the IATTC is less than that in previous years, with resulting deficits of US\$149,810 and US\$198,164, respectively. The assessments for 2002 reflect the amounts invoiced by the Secretariat, with differential assessments for non-member vessels. Costs and revenue for 2001, 2002 and 2003 are estimates.

COSTOS	COSTS	2000	2001	2002	2003
Observadores (sueldos, viajes, equipo)	Observers (wages, travel, equipment)	1,278,847	1,225,826	1,327,887	1,335,208
Personal Atún-Delfín (programa de observadores y otra porción del APICD)	Tuna-Dolphin staff (observer program and other AIDCP share)	519,845	532,087	559,438	593,511
Administración (programa de observadores y otra porción del APICD)	Administration (observer program and other AIDCP share)	286,186	287,340	296,146	306,518
Oficinas regionales (porción del programa de observadores)	Field offices (observer program share)	253,978	266,481	277,140	288,226
Servicios por contrato para ingreso de datos	Contractual services for data entry	13,510	14,050	14,612	15,197
Cursos de entrenamiento	Training courses	3,000	3,120	3,245	3,375
Costos de la certificación <i>AIDCP Dolphin Safe</i>	<i>AIDCP Dolphin Safe</i> certification costs	-	20,000	30,000	30,000
Reuniones de las Partes, el PIR y el GT de Seguimiento de Atún	Meetings of Parties, IRP, and Tuna Tracking WG	29,219	50,833	32,866	34,181
TOTAL DE COSTOS	TOTAL COSTS	2,384,585	2,399,738	2,541,334	2,606,216
INGRESOS	REVENUE				
Ingresos por cuotas – países miembros	Assessment revenue - member countries			1,227,094	1,227,094
Ingresos por cuotas – países no miembros	Assessment revenue - non-member countries			520,029	520,029
Total de cuotas	Total assessment	1,497,891	1,600,655	1,747,123	1,747,123
Contribución de la CIAT	Funds from IATTC	886,694	799,083	644,402	660,929
TOTAL DE INGRESOS	TOTAL REVENUE	2,384,585	2,399,738	2,391,524	2,408,052
Superávit (déficit)	Surplus (deficit)	0	0	(149,810)	(198,164)
Contribución acordada por la CIAT	Funds IATTC agreed to provide	706,610	698,671	644,402	660,929
Exceso de costos sufragado por la CIAT	Excess costs borne by IATTC	(180,084)	(100,411)	0	0
Cuota por metro cúbico	Assessment per cubic meter				
Miembros de la CIAT	IATTC members			\$12.552	
No miembros de la CIAT	IATTC non-members			\$17.93	

TABLA 2. Costos iguales que en la Tabla 1; cuotas iguales para todos los buques, en el nivel acordado en 1998 (US\$12,552/m³). El déficit de US\$149,810 en 2002 con cuotas diferenciales (Tabla 1) se incrementa a US\$305,819 en este caso.

TABLE 2. Costs as in Table 1; equal assessments for all vessels, at the level agreed in 1998 (US\$12.552/m³). The deficit of US\$149,810 in 2002 with differential assessments (Table 1) increases to US\$305,819 in this case.

TOTAL DE COSTOS	TOTAL COSTS	2,384,585	2,399,738	2,541,334	2,606,216
INGRESOS	REVENUE				
Ingresos por cuotas – países miembros	Assessment revenue - member countries			1,227,094	1,227,094
Ingresos por cuotas – países no miembros	Assessment revenue - non-member countries	1,497,891	1,600,655	364,020	364,020
Total de cuotas	Total assessment	1,497,891	1,600,655	1,591,114	1,591,114
Contribución de la CIAT	Funds from IATTC	886,694	799,083	644,402	660,929
TOTAL DE INGRESOS	TOTAL REVENUE	2,384,585	2,399,738	2,235,516	2,252,043
Superávit (déficit)	Surplus (deficit)	0	0	(305,819)	(354,173)
Contribución acordada por la CIAT	Funds IATTC agreed to provide	706,610	698,671	644,402	660,929
Exceso de costos sufragado por la CIAT	Excess costs borne by IATTC	(180,084)	(100,411)	0	0
Cuota actual por metro cúbico	Current assessment per cubic meter			\$12.552	

TABLA 3. Cuotas de los buques incrementadas para producir un superávit en 2002 y un déficit similar en 2003, con cuotas diferenciales.

TABLE 3. Vessel assessments increased to produce a surplus in 2002 and a similar deficit in 2003, using differential assessments.

TOTAL DE COSTOS	TOTAL COSTS	2,384,585	2,399,738	2,541,334	2,606,216
INGRESOS	REVENUE				
Ingresos por cuotas – países miembros	Assessment revenue - member countries			1,349,803	1,349,803
Ingresos por cuotas – países no miembros	Assessment revenue - non-member countries	1,497,891	1,600,655	572,032	572,032
Total de cuotas	Total assessment	1,497,891	1,600,655	1,921,835	1,921,835
Contribución de la CIAT	Funds from IATTC	886,694	799,083	644,402	660,929
TOTAL DE INGRESOS	TOTAL REVENUE	2,384,585	2,399,738	2,566,237	2,582,764
Superávit (déficit)	Surplus (deficit)	0	0	24,902	(23,452)
Contribución acordada por la CIAT	Funds IATTC agreed to provide	706,610	698,671	644,402	660,929
Exceso de costos sufragado por la CIAT	Excess costs borne by IATTC	(180,084)	(100,411)	0	0
Cuota por metro cúbico	Assessment per cubic meter				
Miembros de la CIAT	IATTC members			\$13.81	
No miembros de la CIAT	IATTC non-members			\$19.72	

TABLA 4. Cuotas de los buques incrementadas para producir un superávit en 2002 y un déficit similar en 2003, con cuotas iguales.

TABLE 4. Vessel assessments increased to produce a surplus in 2002 and a similar deficit in 2003, using equal assessments.

TOTAL DE COSTOS	TOTAL COSTS	2,384,585	2,399,738	2,541,334	2,606,216
INGRESOS	REVENUE				
Ingresos por cuotas – países miembros	Assessment revenue - member countries			1,484,783	1,484,783
Ingresos por cuotas – países no miembros	Assessment revenue - non-member countries	1,497,891	1,600,655	440,465	440,465
Total de cuotas	Total assessment	1,497,891	1,600,655	1,925,248	1,925,248
Contribución de la CIAT	Funds from IATTC	886,694	799,083	644,402	660,929
TOTAL DE INGRESOS	TOTAL REVENUE	2,384,585	2,399,738	2,569,650	2,586,177
Superávit (déficit)	Surplus (deficit)	0	0	28,315	(20,039)
Contribución acordada por la CIAT	Funds IATTC agreed to provide	706,610	698,671	644,402	660,929
Exceso de costos sufragado por la CIAT	Excess costs borne by IATTC	(180,084)	(100,411)	0	0
Nueva cuota por metro cúbico	New assessment per cubic meter			\$15.19	

TABLA 5. Cuotas de los buques sin contribución de la CIAT, con un superávit en 2002 y un déficit similar en 2003, con cuotas iguales.

TABLE 5. Vessel assessments with no contribution from the IATTC, with a surplus in 2002 and a similar deficit in 2003, using equal assessments.

TOTAL DE COSTOS	TOTAL COSTS	2,384,585	2,399,738	2,541,334	2,606,216
INGRESOS	REVENUE				
Ingresos por cuotas – países miembros	Assessment revenue - member countries			1,987,892	1,987,892
Ingresos por cuotas – países no miembros	Assessment revenue - non-member countries	1,497,891	1,600,655	589,713	589,713
Total de cuotas	Total assessment	1,497,891	1,600,655	2,577,605	2,577,605
Contribución de la CIAT	Funds from IATTC	886,694	799,083	-	-
TOTAL DE INGRESOS	TOTAL REVENUE	2,384,585	2,399,738	2,577,605	2,577,605
Superávit (déficit)	Surplus (deficit)	0	0	36,270	(28,611)
Contribución acordada por la CIAT	Funds IATTC agreed to provide	706,610	698,671	644,402	660,929
Exceso de costos sufragado por la CIAT	Excess costs borne by IATTC	(180,084)	(100,411)	0	0
Nueva cuota por metro cúbico	New assessment per cubic meter			\$20.33	

AGREEMENT ON THE INTERNATIONAL DOLPHIN CONSERVATION PROGRAM
ACUERDO SOBRE EL PROGRAMA INTERNACIONAL PARA LA CONSERVACION
DE LOS DELFINES

6TH MEETING OF THE PARTIES

CARTAGENA (COLOMBIA)
OCTOBER 29, 2001

DOCUMENT MOP-6-06

ALLOCATION OF PER-STOCK, PER-YEAR DOLPHIN MORTALITY CAPS

During the 1st Meeting of the Parties, held in July 1999, two proposals for the allocation of stock mortality limits (SMLs) were presented, one for a global allocation for the year 2000, and the other for national limits based on past fishing on the various stocks. It was agreed to adopt a global allocation method for the year 2000. During the 3rd Meeting of the Parties, held in June 2000, it was agreed that “until a new system for addressing the per-stock, per-year mortality caps is established, the global system in effect for 2000 would continue to be used” and that the matter would be discussed in future meetings of the Working Group on Per-stock, Per-year Dolphin Mortality Caps and the Parties.

In this paper, three options are presented for the consideration of the Parties for allocation of stock mortality.

The first option is the current system of global allocation of SMLs, in which the SMLs are not assigned to countries or vessels but are available to all (Table 1).

A second option is to allocate to each country an SML for each stock in the same proportion as the country’s DMLs. Thus, if a country’s fleet had applied for 15 DMLs out of a total of 100 DMLs requested for the international fleet, then that country would be allocated 15% of the SMLs for each of the seven major stocks. Table 2 shows the number of SMLs that would be allocated to each country based on the number of DMLs that were assigned for 2001 at the October 2000 meetings. Second-semester DMLs are considered as one-half of a full-year DML. As with DMLs, SMLs not utilized by 1 April would be redistributed amongst the international fleet. Flag changes by vessels would result in a redistribution of the SMLs in accord with the changed distribution of DMLs.

The third option takes account of the number of sets made on a particular stock by a country’s fleet during the previous year and its DMLs in the following year. The allocation is weighted by a) the proportion of of the overall DML for the following year issued to that country’s fleet; b) the proportion of of the total number of sets on dolphins made by that country’s fleet on that particular stock in the previous year; and c) a specified proportion assigned to the national and global portions. The equations for calculating the SMLs for a given country and a given stock are:

$$R_c = (DML_C + \frac{1}{2} DML_{C2}) / (DML_T + \frac{1}{2} DML_{T2})$$

where:

R_c is the ratio of DMLs for that country compared to all DMLs,

DML_C is the number of vessels of country C with full-year DMLs,

DML_{C2} is the number of vessels of country C with second-semester DMLs ,

DML_T is the total number of vessels in the international fleet with full-year DMLs ,

DML_{T2} is the total number of vessels in the international fleet with second-semester DMLs,

and

$$P_{CS} = S_{CS}/S_{TS}$$

where:

P_{CS} is the proportion of sets made by vessels of country C on stock S,

S_{CS} is the number of sets made by vessels of country C on stock S during the previous year,

S_{TS} is the total number of sets on stock S made by the international fleet during the previous year.

With a weighting of 75% national and 25% global, the SML for each country is allocated in proportion to $R_c \times ((0.75 \times P_{CS}) + 0.25)$. Other weights could be used: the closer the national weighting is to 1, the more weight is given to the number of sets on that stock during the previous year. Again, SMLs not utilized by 1 April would be redistributed amongst the international fleet. Flag changes by vessels would result in a redistribution of the SMLs in accord with the changed distribution of DMLs.

The DMLs assigned for 2001 and the number of sets made in 2000 by each fleet requesting a DML are shown in Table 3. The proportion of sets made by the fleets of each country on each stock are shown in Table 4. The proposed SMLs for each country based on this scheme are presented in Table 5. The proportion of sets on each stock is based on 2000 data. For countries whose vessels made less than 30 sets on dolphins in 2000, the international fleet averages of the proportions of sets by stock were used. In practice, if this system were being used in October of any year to assign SMLs in the next year, the weighting for sets on a particular stock would have to be calculated from the last 12 months for which data were available.

Discussion

The main advantages of the current system of global allocation of SMLs are that it is relatively simple to implement and that it avoids partitioning relatively small SMLs among countries. However, it exposes all countries to the risk that a high mortality within one fleet may restrict the activity of the others, a problem which the more complex systems of national allocations avoid.

The second option provides a larger allocation to those countries with larger fleets of vessels with DMLs. By allocating SMLs solely on the current capacity to fish on dolphins (based on the number of DMLs issued), it allows flexibility to change fishing areas, and for new fleets to enter the fishery. However, it would not be efficient in the sense that countries which habitually fished on particular stocks might be assigned SMLs which are too small in some cases and too large in others.

The third option provides a larger allocation to those countries that have made a greater number of sets on a given stock in the recent past and have a greater number of vessels with DMLs. This may produce a more-efficient utilization of the SMLs by allocating a larger proportion of a particular stock to fleets that have a history of setting on that stock. At the same time, it would allow countries the opportunity to enter the fishery, allow vessels to change fishing areas, and allow countries to increase their allocation over time as the numbers of DMLs and sets on a given stock increase.

TABLE 1. Option 1: Current SMLs for 2001 for the seven major stocks and incidental dolphin mortality in 2000. Abundance estimates (N) and coefficients of variation (CV) from Wade and Gerrodette (1993; unpub. data for northern and central common dolphins). Minimum abundance estimates (N_{min}) based on Potential Biological Removal guidelines described in Wade and Angliss (1997).

Option 1		Current SMLs for 2001				
Stock		N (x 1000)	CV	N_{min} (x 1000)	0.1% N_{min}	2000 mortality
Northeastern spotted	NES	730.9	0.142	648.9	649	298
Western/southern spotted	WSS	1,298.4	0.150	1,145.1	1,145	427
Eastern spinner	ESD	631.8	0.238	518.5	518	272
Whitebelly spinner	WBS	1,019.3	0.187	871.9	872	262
Northern common	NCD	713.7	0.367	562.7	563	56
Central common	CCD	239.4	0.383	207.3	207	222
Southern common	SCD	2,210.9	0.217	1,845.6	1,846	9

TABLE 2. Option 2: Numbers of DMLs allocated to national fleets in October 2000 and number of SMLs allocated to each country requesting DMLs for 2001. Second-semester (SS) DMLs are considered as one-half of a full-year (FY) DML. The DMLs in this table do not reflect changes of flag or other changes in the fleets that may have occurred after October 2000.

Option 2		National SMLs in proportion to 2001 DMLs								
		2001 DMLs		SMLs						
		FY	SS	Spotted		Spinner		Common		
				NES	WSS	ESD	WBS	NCD	CCD	SCD
Colombia	COL	5		37	65	29	50	32	11	106
Mexico	MEX	44	2	335	592	267	451	291	107	954
Panama	PAN	2		14	26	11	20	12	4	42
Peru	PER		1	3	6	2	5	3	1	10
El Salvador	SLV	1		7	13	5	10	6	2	21
United States	USA	1	1	11	19	8	15	9	3	31
Venezuela	VEN	24		179	315	142	240	155	57	509
Vanuatu	VUT	5		37	65	29	50	32	11	106
RDA		3		26	44	25	31	23	11	67
Total		85	4	649	1,145	518	872	563	207	1,846

TABLE 3. Numbers of DMLs allocated to national fleets in October 2000 and the numbers of sets made in 2000 on each of the seven major dolphin stocks by each country requesting DMLs for 2001. Second-semester (SS) DMLs are considered as one-half of a full-year (FY) DML. The DMLs in this table do not reflect changes of flag or other changes in the fleets that may have occurred after October 2000.

		Number of sets on each stock in 2000									
		2001 DMLs		Spotted		Spinner		Common			Total
		FY	SS	NES	WSS	ESD	WBS	NCD	CCD	SCD	
Colombia	COL	5		213	378	40	182	1	1	1	816
Mexico	MEX	44	2	2,482	1,144	916	667	66	53	0	5,328
Panama	PAN	2		23	29	2	2	0	1	0	57
Peru	PER		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
El Salvador	SLV	1		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
United States	USA	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Venezuela	VEN	24		906	1,039	301	416	0	831	8	3,501
Vanuatu	VUT	5		167	210	24	65	0	18	5	489
RDA		3									
Total		85	4	3,791	2,800	1,283	1,332	67	904	14	10,191

TABLE 4. Proportions of the total number of sets on the seven major dolphin stocks made by each national fleet. For countries with national observer programs for which set data by stock were not available, the totals were extrapolated from data from trips by vessels of that country covered by the IATTC program. For countries whose vessels made less than 30 sets on dolphins in 2000, the international fleet averages of the set proportions (P_{CS}) were used.

		Proportion of sets on each stock							
		Spotted		Spinner		Common			Total
		NES	WSS	ESD	WBS	NCD	CCD	SCD	
Colombia	COL	0.261	0.463	0.049	0.223	0.001	0.001	0.001	1.00
Mexico	MEX	0.466	0.215	0.172	0.125	0.012	0.010	0.000	1.00
Panama	PAN	0.404	0.509	0.035	0.035	0.000	0.018	0.000	1.00
Peru	PER	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
El Salvador	SLV	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
United States	USA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Venezuela	VEN	0.259	0.297	0.086	0.119	0.000	0.237	0.002	1.00
Vanuatu	VUT	0.342	0.429	0.049	0.133	0.000	0.037	0.010	1.00
Average		0.372	0.275	0.126	0.131	0.007	0.089	0.001	1.00

TABLE 5. Option 3: National SMLs for the seven major dolphin stocks (rounded down to the nearest whole number).

Option 3		National SMLs for 2001						
		Spotted		Spinner		Common		
		NES	WSS	ESD	WBS	NCD	CCD	SCD
Colombia	COL	30	86	24	60	31	9	106
Mexico	MEX	375	533	293	448	295	89	950
Panama	PAN	15	36	9	16	12	4	42
Peru	PER	3	6	2	5	3	1	10
El Salvador	SLV	7	13	5	10	6	2	21
United States	USA	11	19	8	15	9	3	31
Venezuela	VEN	148	327	129	235	152	78	510
Vanuatu	VUT	35	82	24	50	31	10	108
RDA		25	43	24	33	24	11	68
Total		649	1145	518	872	563	207	1846