



MINISTER  
AGRICULTURE, FORESTRY AND FISHERIES  
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Private Bag X250, Pretoria 0001. Tel: 012 319 7319. Fax: 012 321 8558  
Private Bag X9087, Cape Town 8000. Tel: 021 402 2727. Email: [FRAP2015appeals@daff.gov.za](mailto:FRAP2015appeals@daff.gov.za)

**10 July 2017**

## **GENERAL PUBLISHED REASONS FOR DECISIONS ON APPEALS**

### **HAKE INSHORE TRAWL SECTOR 2015/2016**

---

#### **(A) INTRODUCTION**

1. This document sets out the General Published Reasons for Decisions on Appeals in the Hake Inshore Trawl Sector 2015/2016 by the Minister of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (hereinafter referred to as the "*Appeals GPR*"). The document is structured as follows: (A) Introduction; (B) Appeals Process; (C) Grounds of Appeal; and (D) Decisions on Systematic Grounds of Appeal. Annexed to this Appeals GPR is a spreadsheet of the results of appeals process in terms of fishing rights allocations.
2. It is important to clarify from the onset that while this Appeals GPR is final, the results of the appeals in terms of fishing rights allocations are conditional pending finalization of a verification process of several assertions, allegations and information submitted by appellants. However in light of the likely lengthy process of finalizing the verification process and in view of the fact that fishing in the Hake Inshore Trawl Sector is yet to

commence with attendant ramifications for the industry and beneficiaries – due to the Interim Interdict which was only lifted by the Western Cape High Court on 4 July 2017 – the Minister has decided to release the results of the Appeals process pending the finalization of the verification process/forensic audit. The Department will therefore issue conditional permits to successful applicants and appellants on the basis of the Appeals process.

3. The entire appeals process in the HIT sector will therefore only be deemed final upon the finalization of the verification process which may include a forensic audit. Should a rights holder be found to have provided false information or made a material misrepresentation, the Minister will exercise his powers in terms of Section 28 of the Marine Living Resource Act No 18 of 1998 (MLRA).
4. This Appeals GPR addresses grounds of appeal of a systemic nature raised by appellants and how the Minister deals with the issues, determines and decides the appeals. Where necessary and appropriate, the Appeals GPR makes specific references to individual appeals, but does not respond to each and every claim and allegation by individual appellants especially where such complaint is overtaken by the decision adopted by the Minister on other grounds and/or was considered to have no bearing, merit or did not affect the decision by the Minister. Where appropriate and necessary, specific and individual complaints that may not have been addressed by the Appeals GPR are dealt with in the individual notification letters that will be sent to appellants.

5. Each appellant or affected applicant in the sector will receive the following documents by e-mail:

- The notification letter, if the applicant appealed and/or is affected by the Minister's decision even if they had not appealed, informing them of the Minister's decision on the appeal together with the reason for that decision;
- The Appeals GPR; and
- Copies of the adjusted score sheets on appeal of all the applicants in the sector after appeals.

6. The Minister reviewed the Regulation 5 (3) reports that were prepared by the DA. The general reasons and outcomes of the Minister's decisions on appeal are contained in this Appeals GPR, Results of the Allocations Spreadsheet, Score Sheets and the Notification Letters. The Minister considered legal memoranda and legal opinions. The contents of these documents are confidential and privileged and will not be released without the consent of the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries and the Minister.

## **(B) APPEALS PROCESS**

7. Appeals by the Minister are governed by the Marine Living Resources Act 18 of 1998 Section 80. The Minister is guided by the Constitution as well as applicable laws and policies governing the administration of justice and the fishing industry.
8. The Hake Inshore Trawl Sector Appeals period closed on 17 March 2017 with the Minister committing to finalise review and determination of the Appeals in the HIT sector within 90 days. This Appeals GPR is issued pursuant to that commitment.
9. The Minister received, reviewed and determined 91 appeals in the Hake Inshore Trawl Sector. 156 applications for the allocation in the HIT sector had been received and processed by the DA.
10. The Minister was assisted by an Appeals Advisory Team (AAT) comprised of: Advocate Patric Mzolisi Mtshaulana SC (Chair); Mr. Thulani Sithole and Dr. George Mukundi Wachira. The AAT was assisted by a Secretariat drawn from the Department comprising of Ms. Sisipho Fuzile and Ms. Kgomotso Paulus.
11. The AAT held several consultations with the DA's Assessment Team, subject matter experts, as well as administrative and resource management specialists. Where necessary and appropriate, the Minister's Appeals Advisory Team sought legal opinions and also sent the DA and appellants questions for clarification and further information. Where allegations were made by appellants about other appellants or

applicants including those who did not appeal, letters were sent to such affected or interested parties for responses, most of whom responded. The Appeals GPR addresses and where possible includes the issues raised in those responses, and in some case some of the material allegations have been referred for further verification and/or forensic audits.

### **(C) GROUNDS OF APPEAL**

12. The following section highlights the various grounds of appeal raised by appellants per category:

#### **Category A**

- a. Failure of the quantum allocation methodology to observe and achieve the applicable principles and objectives of the MLRA;
- b. Admission of too many new entrants at the expense of existing right holders;
- c. Failure to allocate the entire TAC by setting aside a portion thereof to be used as rewards pool – 10%;
- d. Underweighting of black ownership under the transformation scores;
- e. Errors in scoring applicants;
- f. Allegations against other applicants;
- g. Black ownership of new entrants; and
- h. Unsuitable vessels nominated by applicants.

## **Category B**

- a. Ambiguity/lack of clarity of certain questions in the application form;
- b. Unsuitable vessels nominated by applicants;
- c. Errors in scoring applicants;
- d. Allegations against other applicants;
- e. Underweighting of black ownership under the transformation scores; and
- f. Exclusion on the basis of being paper quota risk holders.

## **Category C**

- a. Underweighting of black ownership under the transformation scores;
- b. Scoring of sections that were not applicable to completely new entrants who had never been involved in the fishing industry; and
- c. Errors in scoring applicants.

## **(D) DECISIONS ON SYSTEMATIC/CROSS CUTTING GROUNDS OF APPEAL**

13. This Appeals GPR addresses the following systematic and cross cutting grounds of appeal and the decisions made by the Minister on each of the grounds. The grounds include:

- a. Failure of the quantum allocation methodology to observe and achieve the applicable principles and objectives of the MLRA;
- b. Admission of too many new entrants at the expense of existing right holders;

- c. Failure to allocate the entire TAC by setting aside a portion thereof to be used as a rewards pool – 10%;
- d. Underweighting of black ownership under the transformation scores;
- e. Unsuitable vessels nominated by applicants;
- f. Exclusion on the basis of being paper quota risk holders;
- g. Errors in scoring applicants;
- h. Allegations against other applicants;
- i. Reward of poor performing applicants; and
- j. Ambiguity/lack of clarity of certain questions in the application form;

**(a) Failure of the Quantum Allocation Methodology to Observe and Achieve the Applicable Principles and Objectives of the MLRA**

**Category A**

14. Most appellants in category A challenged the quantum allocation mechanism adopted by the Delegated Authority on the basis that it:

- Failed to apply the overall scores from the balancing stage in determining quantum allocation and therefore overlooked applicants fishing performance, job creation, compliance, access to suitable vessels, overall transformation credentials and such other MLRA imperatives;
- Failed to balance and take into account all the objectives of the MLRA section 2 and 18;

- Over relied on black ownership to determine quantum allocation;
- Was rigid, irrational, illegal and unconstitutional including being discriminatory as it only applied to category A's and not the other categories;
- Promoted and rewarded poor scoring applicants;
- Failed to use DTI codes;
- Created paper quota risk holders; and
- Its impact led to absurdity of outcomes.
- Failed to allocate the entire TAC by setting aside a portion thereof to be used as a rewards pool – 10%.

15. On review of the claims, the Minister determined that the criticism by appellants that taking only black ownership at the expense of all other factors to determine quantum allocation by the DA for category A applicants was valid and accordingly sets aside the DA's quantum allocation mechanism for category A applicants.

16. Instead the Minister decided that for category A applicants, quantum allocation should be based on the total overall score of the balancing stage which takes into account all the other criteria that applicants were scored on – such as fishing experience, investments in the industry, compliance, access to a suitable vessel, job creation and importantly overall transformation rather than just black ownership.

17. The Minister decided that quantum allocation for category A applicants would be calculated by adjusting the 2015 historical allocation with the readjusted (on appeal)



total score from the balancing stage taking into account the TAC set aside for new entrants. Annexed hereto is the quantum allocation spreadsheet (Annexure 1).

18. Some appellants such as Seavuna complained that the DA had given insufficient weighting to black ownership within the overall transformation score. They submitted “that it would be more appropriate for black ownership element of transformation to be given a weight of 25% in accordance with the 2013 BEE codes”. The Minister reiterates and acknowledges the importance of promoting and encouraging black ownership of the fishing industry. He therefore decided that the scoring and weighting for black ownership under the transformation criteria for category A applicants during the balancing stage should be increased from 5% to 30% so that under the transformation section, black ownership is the highest scored and weighted factor.

19. In order to increase the percentage of black ownership under transformation from 5% to 30% the Minister reviewed, reduced and/or zero weighted certain sections under transformation based on several complaints by appellants that include among others the following:

- Unclear sections and/or whose scores could have been prejudicial to certain applicants due to ambiguity (section 6.3); Indeed one of the appellants stated that “considering the ineffective and unclear nature of the original 6.3 and deficiencies of the scoring system adopted in relation thereto, it is submitted the DA should not have allocated any weight on the scoring of this section. A nonsensical question resulted in unhelpful answers and ineffective scoring which ought to have been

discarded. Appellant submits that on appeal minister should 0 weight 6.3 and transfer the score of 5% under transformation to 6.1". The Minister agreed with this view and transferred the score to section 6.1.

- Sections 6.21 and 6.22 (skills development levy and skills plans) could not be qualitatively measured.

20. The relevant sections that were impacted upon by the Minister decision for category

A thus include:

- Zero weighted section 6.3 (Shareholders HDI), 6.21 (Skills Plan), 6.22 (Leadership Programme ) and the 15% goes to 6.1 (Black Ownership);
- Reduced section 6.10 (Local Economic Development) from 30% to 25 % and that 5% goes to Black Ownership; and
- Reduced the section score in 6.8 (percentage of net profits that goes to corporate social investments) from 10% to 5% and transfer to 6.1 Black Ownership.

## **Category B**

21. For category B appellants the Minister upheld the quantum allocation mechanism adopted by the DA save for an adjustment to the transformation score in order to increase the percentage of black ownership from 5% to 50% with 40 weighting by reducing, and or zero weighting certain sections as was done in category A as is explained in paragraph 22 below.

22. The Minister also noted that several appellants complained about the scoring in section 1.27 on the basis that it was vague and not clear since it required applicants to indicate which other businesses they were involved in. Different applicants seem to have interpreted the question with significant variance and in order to avoid causing prejudice to certain applicants/appellants over others, the Minister decided to zero weight the section.

23. Accordingly, the relevant sections that will yield the 50% black ownership for category B include:

- Zero weighted section 6.3 as was the case with category A appellants (shareholding and member interest – given its ambiguity with regard to what was expected in terms of years of service, gender, age, race and disability) – that score is moved to section 6.1 on black ownership.
- Zero weighted section 6.10 and 6.11 (LED – landing and processing of fish) since category B had rights in diverse fishing sectors and not all these sectors required landing in harbours that were scored. In fact many of the appellants claimed that it was not clear whether it was their existing fishing rights landing or the envisaged new allocations which may have resulted in errors in scoring LED sections for category B applicants. Therefore the score for LED was also transferred to 6.1.
- Zero weighted sections 6.21 and 6.22 (work place skills plan and learnership programmes). While these sections are very important, the Minister based on

several complaints by appellants agreed and decided that it was difficult to determine the quality of the skills plans and learner ship programmes – since the questions only required a yes or no answers - and therefore the score was transferred to section 6.1 since in any event the object is transformation.

- Black ownership for categories B will thus account for 50% (i.e section 6.3+6.10+6.11+ 6.21+6.22 will be zero weighted).

24. The result of the applying the overall rescoring adopted by the Minister was that one of the previously allocated applicants no longer qualified for an allocation: Dazzalle Traders (Pty) Ltd and was replaced by Cyrel Burrel Fishing CC.

### **Category C**

25. For category C appellants the Minister set aside the DA's quantum allocation mechanism since the scoring of applicants in category C by the DA overlooked the fact that most of the sections that were scored were not applicable to completely new entrants since they had never been involved in the fishing industry.

26. The Minister decided that based on the application form the only sections that category C applicants could have reasonably been expected to comply and score were three: Transformation (HDI); Access to a suitable vessel; and Compliance. The Minister decided that successful category C appellants would be determined by their ranking based on the overall scores in the three sections only.

27. The Minister would like to clarify that new entrants were not only accommodated on the basis of their HDI status. Several appellants had complained that some of the new entrants had lower black ownership than some of the category A applicants. While transformation of the industry is one of the important imperatives of introducing new entrants to the industry the Minister reiterates that HDI status alone does not qualify applicants for allocation of rights. In fact, the Minister ascertained that all the successful category C applicants/appellants either owned a suitable vessel or had a valid catch agreement in order to avoid becoming paper quota risk holders.

28. Category C appellants will thus be scored on three criteria as follows:

- Compliance question 3.3 (since some of the appellants even if they had never been involved in the sector – either their directors or shareholders could have failed to disclose a violation of the MLRA) will account for a score of 5%.
- Access to a suitable vessel - being a competitive process, the Minister decided that while it not an exclusionary criteria in terms of the HIT Policy, it was important for new appellants to at least show they had made an effort to access a suitable vessel or would work towards investing in one if allocated a right – will account for 20%
- Transformation (Black Ownership) section 6.1 – will account for 75%.

29. On the basis of the above criteria and formula 10 appellants were tied at 87% and only 5 qualified after the tie breaker as described in paragraph 30 below.

30. The Minister decided to apply a tie breaker to determine who would qualify to be granted fishing rights given that only 6 category C appellants could be accommodated from the 30% TAC that was available to Category B and C. The Minister decided to employ affirmative action in favour of women owned or directed companies that were tied as the tie breaker.

31. The result as illustrated in the annexed tie breaking table yielded five (5) appellants who had between 60-100% women ownership and directorship who therefore qualified for allocation.

32. The result of the allocation methodology and rescoring meant that five (5) previously allocated appellants by the DA no longer qualified for a right and were replaced by five of the others that qualified for a right based on the appeals process. The following therefore no longer qualified for a right largely because they do not have access to a suitable vessel in terms of the HIT policy apart from Boloko Trading and Investments (Pty) Ltd whose score fell below the cut off points.

- Boloko Trading and Investments (Pty) Ltd.
- Ocean Prince Marine Products (Pty) Ltd.
- Southern Peninsula Trawling Co (Pty) Ltd.
- Atlantis Seafood Products (Pty) Ltd.

- Kalmia Trading 1001 CC.

33. The following new entrants in Category C qualified for a fishing right and allocation. It is worth noting that apart from Ukuloba that scored 100% the rest were tied at 87% points. The Minister decided to make use of affirmative action to grant fishing rights among those who were tied at 87% to those who had a higher percentage of women shareholders as the tie breaker. Merca Fishing with the same score at 87% had the highest female directors.

- Ukuloba Kulungile Investments (Pty) Ltd – Scored 100%.
- Blue Wave Fish Traders (Pty) Ltd – 100% Female Shareholding.
- Coastal Trawlers (Pty) Ltd – 75% Female Shareholding.
- MoiSource (Pty) Ltd – 75% Female Shareholding.
- Phambile Makhosikazi (Pty) Ltd – 60% Female Shareholding.
- Merca Fishing (Pty) Ltd – 66.7% Female Directors.

**(b) Admission of “Too Many” New Entrants at the Expense of Existing Right Holders**

34. Several Category A appellants contested the accommodation of “too many” new entrants on the basis that:

- The significant amount set aside for new entrants (30%) was at the expense of existing right holders;

- The large number of new entrants (12) was not justified;
- No proper assessment was done to determine viability; and
- That the new entrants had no experience, skills, resources or capacity to participate optimally in the sector and would thus become paper quota risk holders.

35. The Minister reflected on the fact that fishing rights are granted for 15 years - and therefore the next time a new allocation will be done for the HIT sector will be in the year 2032. He therefore considered the short and long term effects of his decision to accommodate new entrants. Taking away a sizeable portion of the TAC from previous rights holders has short term consequences. In the first place it affects them and their businesses and this in turn may have an effect on the economy. There is a possibility that some may have to down size. This may have consequences for job creation and loss of existing jobs.

36. This consideration should however be weighed against the short and long term. If only a small portion of the TAC is given to the new entrants, South Africa will have the same structure of the fishing industry in 15 years (almost 40 years after the dawn of liberation). The Minister's considered view is that there are various objectives to be achieved and one has to have regard to both the short and long term effects.

37. There is no doubt that initially and because of lack of experience the new entrants may not be able to harvest as much as the established companies did. This may be good for the marine resources stocks which are reducing but may have negative effects for the economy and the businesses of those from whom the TAC was taken.



38. As the new entrants gain experience they will employ more people and will be able to harvest more fish from the sea. In the long term the equilibrium will be restored but this will be achieved together with restructuring of the sector and redressing the imbalance created by Apartheid.

39. Having considered all the objectives of section 2 of the MLRA and taking into account the short and long term effect, the Minister decided that accommodating new entrants by setting aside a sizable but in reality still a modest amount and in this case 30% for new entrants is fair and justifiable. The 30% reflects what the Minister considers to be the position which the country must have achieved after 40 years after freedom. Put differently, the Minister is of the view that that he would be failing if he retained the *status quo* which would inevitably result in the domination of the fishing industry by present few established players half a century after liberation.

40. The Minister considered the possibility that he could allocate the whole 30% to one new entrant. However, that would guarantee success for that entrant but that would not change much in terms of the requirement for restructuring and involvement of more players especially disabled, women and youth.

41. The Minister therefore adopted an approach that allows more new entrants and giving them what has been demonstrated as being feasible for survival in the sector. The established companies seem to suggest the profit model guarantees success and in that model 3% allocation for a new entrant is a disaster. The Department's technical and resource management experts advised that viability can be determined by what

is referred to as the Effort Management Model among others. While not perfect given the complexity of socio economic data and related indicators – it can help to determine viability. It is on that basis that the Minister decided that 3% allocation for new entrants who will solely rely on Hake is feasible and in effect the number of new entrants among category B and C that could be accommodated with 30% allocation.

**(c) Failure to Allocate the Entire TAC by setting aside a Rewards Pool**

42. Several appellants complained against the setting aside of a 10% rewards pool on the basis that the DA should have allocated the entire TAC since there was no clarity on how the rewards pool would be allocated and that it was not envisaged by the MLRA, General Policy or HIT Policy and therefore had no legal basis.

43. The DA's decision for creating a rewards pool was stated as among others giving effect to the need to utilise marine living resources to achieve economic growth consistent with the development objectives of the national government and to promote empowerment and optimal utilization within the fishing industry.

44. However, in the absence of clarity on how the rewards pool would be utilised and also having regard to the short term effects on the economy and on the established businesses, based on the decision to admit new entrants, and of course having regard to the objects of the MLRA Section 2, the Minister decided that it is better to increase the share of the TAC to be shared by the previous right holders and therefore have no rewards pool. The Minister thus decided to allocate the entire TAC and that category

A applicants will share 70% TAC and the new entrants in the HIT Sector approximately 30% TAC.

**(d) Unsuitable Vessels Nominated by some Applicants**

45. Several appellants alleged that some of the appellants/ applicants had nominated vessels that were unsuitable for the Hake Inshore Sector and as such should not have been granted rights. The Minister noted that access to a suitable vessel was not an exclusionary criteria but rather than a balancing criteria as per section 7.2 of the 2015 HIT Policy. Had it been an exclusionary criteria, established companies like I&J Ltd which had nominated an unsuitable vessel in terms of the HIT Policy would have been excluded. Accordingly, while access to a suitable vessel in section 4 was scored for those who provided proof of access to a suitable vessel, failure to have a suitable vessel did not exclude applicants from award of rights but they were scored zero.

46. The DA scored applicants who had nominated vessels which met the criteria set under section 7.2 of the HIT policy as long as the vessel had a certified SAMSA certificate, was within the 35 meters maximum length and whose combined power did not exceed 900 horse power and was fitted or capable of being fitted with a functioning Vessel Monitoring System. While some of the vessels nominated were not specifically targeted at Hake and Sole, the Minister on appeal based on expert advice accommodated vessels that were nominated and complied with all the other requirements of a suitable vessel in the HIT sector even where such vessels were

historically targeted at other fisheries but complied with all the technical specifications, and could be reconfigured for suitability in the HIT Sector.

47. On that basis the Minister decided to accept vessels that were nominated by applicants provided they satisfied all the technical requirements for a suitable vessel as per sections 7.2 of the HIT Policy. However, in order to ensure that any allegation made against all appellants and or applicants were valid, part of the verification process will include all vessels nominated by all successful appellants in the HIT sector and in the event that it is found that some of the vessels nominated are unsuitable, appropriate action will be taken against such rights holders.

**(e) Exclusion on the Basis of Being a Paper Quota Risk Holder**

48. A number of appellants in category B and C complained that they were excluded by the DA on the basis that they were paper quota risk holders despite scoring above the cut-off point. The basis for such exclusions by the DA was due to the fact that they had entered into exclusive catch agreements for the entire duration of the fishing rights for catching, processing, and marketing fish, which meant that they had no serious intention to share the risk of fully participating in the sector as defined by section 7.8 of the General Policy.

49. The Minister reviewed all the catch agreements by appellants who complained on this basis and decided to uphold the DA's decision to exclude applicants who despite

scoring high points to qualify for fishing rights had entered into exclusive catch agreements for the entire duration of the right.

**(f) Errors in Scoring Applicants**

50. Several appellants complained about errors by the DA in their scores. The Minister noted that there were indeed some errors for example in the case of BMC Visserye CC which had erroneously been captured as 90% HDI instead of 100% HDI and in others it was a case of misunderstanding by appellants of the basis for scoring. Where complaints in errors were found to be valid these have since been corrected and are reflected in the adjusted score sheet.

**(g) Allegations Against other Applicants by Appellants**

51. Several allegations of misrepresentation were made by several appellants against other applicants. Letters were sent to the applicants/appellants against whom allegations were made against, and most responded and clarified some of the issues raised.

52. Granted and as noted in the paragraph 2 of this Appeals GPR, the Department has embarked on a verification process that includes a forensic audit to determine the veracity of some of the material allegations – a process that may take some time – and in the interests of resuming fishing in the HIT sector - the Minister decided to release the results of the appeals process conditionally pending the outcome of verification process and in order to comply with the Western Cape High Court Order.

**(h) Reward of Poor Performing Category A applicants**

53. Several category A appellants complained that some of the existing rights holders – in category A - were still awarded rights and in fact rewarded with more quantum than their previous allocations despite being poor performers and also for being low scoring applicants.

54. The Minister decided that while it may be logical to not allocate any right to those who were poor performers among existing rights holders, the Minister was of the view that that such poor performance could have been attributed to the minimal and non-viable allocations during the previous allocations. The Minister decided to uphold the decision by the DA to allocate all previous rights holders the minimum quantum that was determined as a viable quota – 3% for those who had no rights in any other sectors and 2 % for those who had rights in other sectors which will be the basis upon which they will be judged on future allocations.

**(i) Ambiguous or Inapplicable Questions in the Application Form**

55. Several appellants complained that there was lack of clarity in some of the questions in the application form which may have prejudiced certain applicants. In addition some of the questions in the application form that were scored could not have been applicable to some of the applicants especially in category C.

56. The Minister noted and observed that there were indeed a few ambiguities in the application questionnaire as raised by several appellants. He therefore decided that some of the ambiguities in the questionnaire may have prejudiced certain appellants

against others. For instance the Minister noted that Section 1.27 of the application form required applicants to state what other business they were involved in which could have been interpreted to mean other businesses and not necessarily sectors within the fishing industry such as fish processing, and ownership of a vessel. Most category B and C appellants made the claim. The Minister decided, given the likelihood that some of the applicants who filled N/A or did not fill the form may have been influenced by lack of understanding of what the question had required of them, it was only fair and just to zero weight the question for category B and C applicants so that none of the applicants could suffer prejudice.

57. The Minister also noted that while section 6.3 of the application form on shareholding and interests of the appellant according to years of service, gender, age, disability and race was a valid criteria it needed to have been explained to applicants especially on how it would apply. Without prior or subsequent explanation the Minister decided that the criteria made it difficult for certain applicants to understand how it would be marked. That score was therefore taken to section 6.1.

Sincerely



Hon. Senzeni Zokwana MP

The Minister of Agriculture, Forestry & Fisheries


















MINISTER  
AGRICULTURE, FORESTRY AND FISHERIES  
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

FRAP 205/16 HAKE INSHORE TRAWL FISHING RIGHTS APPEAL: SUPPLEMENTARY DECISION LIST.

NO. APPLICATION NUMBER	APPLICANTS	CAT	MINISTER'S DECISION		MINISTER'S SIGNATURE
			HAKE	SOLE	
1 HITM150653	SEAVUNA FISHING COMPANY (PTY) LTD	A	17,666	27,342	<i>[Signature]</i>
2 HITM150017	VIKING INSHORE FISHING (PTY) LTD	A	9,617	15,991	<i>[Signature]</i>
3 HITM151508	CHETTY'S FISHERIES CC	A	3,000	1,549	<i>[Signature]</i>
4 HITM150655	BMC VISSERIE CC	A	2,123	1,656	<i>[Signature]</i>
5 HITM151505	SEEHEIM VISSERIE (PTY) LTD	A	1,106	2,004	<i>[Signature]</i>
6 HITM151512	NKUNGA FISHING CORPORATION (PTY) LTD	A	1,500	1,620	<i>[Signature]</i>
7 HITM150014	ULWANDLE INSHORE (PTY) LTD	A	4,145	5,585	<i>[Signature]</i>
8 HITM151504	CAPENIS INVESTMENTS (PTY) LTD	A	1,106	1,039	<i>[Signature]</i>
9 HITM151507	VECTO TRADE 126 (PTY) LTD	A	1,106	0,685	<i>[Signature]</i>
10 HITM151506	NAMUTONI VISSERIE (PTY) LTD	A	1,106	2,533	<i>[Signature]</i>
11 HITM150121	EYETHU FISHING (PTY) LTD	A	3,479	3,208	<i>[Signature]</i>



12	HITM151550	EZABANTU FISHING (PTY) LTD	A	2,000	2,043	
13	HITM150543	DYER EILAND VISSRYE (EDMS) BEPERK	A	2,000	2,185	
14	HITM150025	IRVIN & JOHNSON LIMITED	A	18,423	5,417	
15	HITM150061	LORCOM THIRTEEN (PTY) LTD	A	3,000	7,876	
16	HITM151510	LETAP CC	B	2,000	1,607	
17	HITM151503	MAYIBUYE FISHING (PTY) LTD	B	1,107	1,607	
18	HITM150008	CAPE FISH PROCESSORS CC	B	2,000	1,607	
19	HITM151514	FISHERMAN FRESH CC	B	1,500	1,607	
20	HITM150124	OCEAN UKHOZI FISHING (PTY) LTD	B	2,000	1,607	
21	HITM151132	CYREL BURREL FISHING CC	B	2,000	1,607	
22	HITM150067	UKULOBA KULUNGILE INVESTMENTS (PTY) LTD	C	3,000	1,607	
23	HITM151213	BLUE WAVE FISH TRADERS (PTY) LTD	C	3,000	1,607	
24	HITM151101	COASTAL TRAWLERS (PTY) LTD	C	3,000	1,607	
25	HITM151242	MOISOURCE (PTY) LTD	C	3,000	1,607	
26	HITM150344	PHAMBILE MAKHOSIKAZI (PTY) LTD	C	3,000	1,607	
27	HITM150588	MERCA FISHING (PTY) LTD	C	3,000	1,607	