



INTERNATIONAL
OIL POLLUTION
COMPENSATION
FUND 1992

ASSEMBLY
10th extraordinary session
Agenda item 12

92FUND/A/ES.10/12
17 February 2006
Original: ENGLISH

ADMISSIBILITY OF CLAIMS RELATING TO SUBSISTENCE FISHING

**TECHNICAL GUIDELINES TO ASSIST EXPERTS IN THE ASSESSMENT OF CLAIMS IN THE FISHERIES,
MARICULTURE AND FISHPROCESSING SECTORS, INCLUDING SUBSISTENCE AND SMALL-SCALE
OPERATIONS LACKING EVIDENCE OF EARNINGS.**

Note by the Director

Summary:

Draft Technical Guidelines on methods of assessing losses in the fisheries, mariculture and fish processing sectors, which are intended to assist the 1992 Fund's world-wide network of fishery experts in assessing claims, have been prepared. The Assembly established a correspondence group to review the draft Guidelines and to report to the Assembly with a recommendation on whether they should be published, and if so, in what form. The Assembly also decided that the group should address the need for more concise guidelines for claimants. Eight 1992 Fund Member States delegations and one observer delegation originally volunteered to join the correspondence group. At its October 2005 session the Assembly noted that only five respondents had submitted their comments and that the opinions of the respondents that had submitted comments were divided. The Assembly instructed the Director to continue to seek the views of interested delegations on the draft Technical Guidelines.

Action to be taken:

Decide whether to continue to seek the views of interested delegations on the draft Technical Guidelines for experts for the purpose of making a recommendation to the Assembly on whether, and if so, in what form the Guidelines should be published and whether more precise guidelines should be produced for claimants.

1 Introduction

- 1.1 At its February 1999 session the 1971 Fund Executive Committee considered the question of claims in respect of subsistence fishing, ie fishing carried out by individual fishermen mainly for the purpose of providing food for their families. The Committee instructed the Director to study further the admissibility of claims relating to subsistence fishing, in consultation with the Fund's experts and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), and to consider whether Guidelines on the admissibility of such claims should be developed (document 71FUND/EXC.60/17, paragraph 5.6).

- 1.2 A key feature of claims for compensation in respect of small-scale fishing activities, including subsistence fishing, is that they are rarely supported by evidence as to normal levels of income against which to assess claims. In order to assist the 1992 Fund in dealing with such claims in the future the Director engaged a firm of fishery specialists to prepare technical guidelines on methods of assessing losses in fisheries, aquaculture and processing sectors where evidence is likely to be limited or totally lacking.
- 1.3 The Guidelines were aimed primarily at the claims staff of the IOPC Funds' Secretariat and the shipowners' insurers as well as their experts working in the field and local claims office staff. One of the benefits of the Guidelines would be that they would enable the 1992 Fund to extend its current network of fishery specialists to include those who are not familiar with the compensation Conventions and the Fund's policy on claims assessment.

2 Previous consideration by the Assembly

- 2.1 At its October 2003 session the 1992 Fund Assembly considered a proposal by the Director that the authors of the Guidelines should be requested to publish a limited number of copies of the Guidelines, making it clear in the foreword that although they had been inspired by the 1992 Fund, the document had not been approved by the Fund and was not a Fund publication. The Director further proposed that the Guidelines could be made available to fishery experts appointed by the Fund and the P&I insurers to assist them in their assessment of claims, particularly in cases where the experts had limited experience in assessing claims for pollution damage.
- 2.2 Some delegations stated that although the Technical Guidelines might be useful for the work of the Fund, it was not possible for the Member States to authorise the publication of the Guidelines by either the Fund or the authors without first having had an opportunity to review them.
- 2.3 A number of delegations supported the 1992 Fund producing concise Guidelines for claimants in the fisheries, mariculture and processing sectors and considered that these might best be reviewed by a working group, although not the working group that at that time was looking at the revision of the 1992 Conventions.
- 2.4 In view of time constraints the Assembly decided to instruct the Director to submit a revised proposal to the next session of the Assembly, taking into account the above observations (document 92FUND/A.8/30, paragraph 28.8).
- 2.5 At its October 2004 session the Assembly decided to establish a correspondence group comprising representatives of interested delegations to review the draft Guidelines and to report to the Assembly with a recommendation on whether they should be published, and if so, in what form. The Assembly also decided that the correspondence group should address the need for more precise guidelines for claimants and report to the Assembly in due course. The Chairman invited those delegations that wished to participate in the correspondence group to provide the Secretariat with their e-mail addresses (document 92FUND/A.9/31, paragraphs 24.7 and 24.8).
- 2.6 At its October 2005 session the Assembly noted that eight 1992 Fund Member States and one observer delegation had originally volunteered to join the correspondence group, but that the Secretariat had only received comments from five respondents, the opinions of which had been divided.
- 2.7 The Assembly instructed the Director to continue to seek the views of interested delegations on the draft Technical Guidelines for the purpose of making a recommendation to the Assembly on whether, and if so, in what form the Guidelines should be published and whether more precise guidelines should be produced for claimants (document 92FUND/A.10/37, paragraph 25.3).

3 Recent developments

Since the October 2005 session of the Assembly one other delegation has submitted comments on the Guidelines. However, two more delegations have expressed an interest in reviewing the draft Guidelines, but have yet to submit their comments to the Secretariat.

4 Consideration by the Director

- 4.1 The Director is grateful to those respondents that have provided comments on the draft Guidelines, some of whom also provided valuable and detailed editorial suggestions. However, in view of the fact that only just over 50% of the respondents have submitted comments to date, and that the views of those that have responded were divided, he does not feel that there is a clear consensus as to the way forward. The Director therefore proposes to continue to seek the views of interested delegations as to whether, and if so, in what form the Guidelines should be published and whether more precise guidelines should be produced for claimants, including those who expressed an interest but have so far not provided any input.
- 4.2 The Director further proposes to set a final deadline for comments by 1 July 2006 with a view to making a firm recommendation to the Assembly at its October 2006 session.

5 Action to be taken by the Assembly

The Assembly is invited:

- (a) to take note of the information contained in this document;
 - (b) to decide whether to continue to seek the views of interested delegations on the draft Technical Guidelines for experts for the purpose of making a recommendation to the Assembly on whether, and if so, in what form the Guidelines should be published and whether more precise guidelines should be produced for claimants; and
 - (c) to give the Director such other instructions in respect of the issues dealt with in this document as it may deem appropriate.
-